

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
September 19th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Present: Cupina, Wilcox, Hovermale, Jennings, Kennedy, Murphy, Straits, Walker, Oak, Thompson, Wynands, Penniman, Cerny
Absent: Vanell, Weber

Procedural Items and announcements:

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

Administrative items:

1. Chairman Wilcox provided a brief recap of the special Reston Association (RA) meeting on 09.14.2016 regarding the St. John's Woods development proposal; RA will be formally recommending against the project.
2. There was a general discussion on the bylaws of the Planning & Zoning Committee (P&Z) with regard to the overall purpose of the committee. Consensus is that P&Z needs to consider both the community and developer equally.
3. Mrs. Oak provided an update on the residential towers development on the Lerner property in front of Oracle.

Agenda item 1: Approve minutes of July 18th Reston Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting

July 18th meeting minutes approved.

AYE: 12

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: 1 (Penniman)

Agenda item 2: Pulte – Lofts at Reston Station: Application Number: RZ 2015-HM-005

1. **Presentation:** Brian Winterhalter, Don Hughes, Matt Marshall
Brian stated the project would be presented to the Fairfax County Planning Commission on the 29th. He also acknowledged the staff report which recommends against the project as presented. Brian provided a brief overview of the project and commented that the architecture is unchanged from the previous presentation. He discussed modifications and responses to the county's concerns on the following topics:
 - Road configuration
 - Contribution to the Reston road fund
 - Open space and site design – the staff report supports either removing 2 of the 2-over-2 units or 'flipping' the site plan to better align with the Rooney property to the south.
 - Workforce dwelling units
2. **Committee comments:**
 - Mr. Walker expressed that he was originally concerned about the development of the small parcel without an understanding of its context within the overall development area. The work that has been done has gone a long way towards alleviating those concerns. Rob also asked for clarification on the SWM fund.
 - Mr. Cerny asked for clarification on workforce dwelling units. Three 3-bedroom units will be designated as WDU's.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
September 19th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

- Ms. Straits agrees with the county staff report that more open space is necessary within the development without relying on shared commitments. Sue also requested clarification on the SWM replacement fund with concerns that there is too much reliance on existing SWM infrastructure. Mr. Hughes responded that the newest standards will be met
- Mr. Jennings is conflicted about the context of this site within the overall development area and commented on the need to improve the process when adjacent development is planned.
- Mr. Murphy asked clarifying questions on the stoops, garage access to both 2-over-2 units, and roofs/downspouts.
- Mr. Hovermale had no comments
- Ms. Oak expressed her challenge in visualizing the site within the overall context and that the developers have done their best given the conditions.
- Mr. Wilcox asked for further clarification on the county's concerns regarding open space. Jared suggested changes to building dimensions to contribute more of the site to open space. Mr. Wilcox also asked about using parking credits to gain more open space. Mr. Penniman agreed with the reduction in parking and garage space to provide more open space. Mr. Winterhalter responded that the county does not support a parking reduction.
- Mr. Cupina is glad to see Reston Association membership in the proffers, asked for confirmation of public access to the site park, and likes the variety of housing options proposed for this area.
- Mr. Thompson asked for confirmation that all units will be owned, not rented.
- Mr. Penniman had clarifying questions around open space calculations, open space details, WDU covenants, and TDM commitment. Bill expressed concerns about neighboring uses which lead to a review by Mr. Winterhalter of all proposed adjacent development projects.
- Mr. Kennedy likes the type of proposed housing for this location. Dick requested that the income ceiling be reduced for WDU qualification.
- Ms. Wynands asked for details on the alleys and expressed concerns that a significant portion of outdoor space will be concrete and asphalt. Nicole asked if additional landscaping at the rear of units could be considered and questioned the location of the proposed public art space.

Public Speakers

- None

Motion: Motion by Mr. Kennedy: The Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Committee recommends approval as submitted with a request to work with the county to increase open space if possible.

Mr. Murphy seconded the motion.

Vote Outcome

AYE: Cupina, Hovermale, Kennedy, Murphy, Straits, Walker, Oak, Thompson, Wynands, Penniman, Cerny

NAY: Jennings

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
September 19th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

ABSTAIN: Wilcox

The motion to approve as noted was passed 11-1.

Agenda item 3: Brookfield: Application number: RZ 2016-HM-007

Presentation: Mark Looney of Cooley

Mark provided an overview of the project. This is the first presentation in front of P&Z for this project. Main points include:

- Total development is 36 acres
- FAR between 2.0 and 3.0
- New grid of streets
- New urban parks and connected public spaces
- Proposed FAR is 2.45 with a mix of residential, office, retail, an optional hotel, and 5 distinct parks

Committee comments:

- Ms. Wynands is very happy to see the abundance of open space and feels that the type of open space and use would be unique to the community.
- Mr. Kennedy is excited by the presentation and asked for comments on development phasing. Mr. Looney responded that residential buildings would likely be first.
- Mr. Penniman commented that the quantity of retail seems low, asked for connections to neighboring sites with ‘pockets’ of retail, and to work with other developers on adjacent site interconnections.
- Mr. Thompson likes the overall design and appreciates the open space concepts and associated activities. Paul is not convinced the optional hotel is viable. Mark responded that in the absence of a hotel, additional residential would be developed. Paul is also a proponent of ownership rather than rental residential properties.
- Mr. Cupina asked for clarification on location of optional future retail as well as connection of proposed roads with existing Tishman site to the north.
- Mr. Wilcox asked about the conversion of Edmund Halley Drive from a private road to a VDOT road as this is important to the success of the project. Jared asked about a connection to the Reston Heights development and commented on the need for more articulation along Reston Parkway to reduce the impression of long massed blocks.
- Ms. Oak agrees with Mr. Wilcox on the need to minimize ‘relentlessly long facades’ and commented that some of the buildings could be taller. Ms. Oak questions the placement of the parking garage along Reston Parkway which will need to be screened or relocated.
- Mr. Hovermale likes the open spaces and asked if Block D could be developed as additional open space to create a ‘central park’ and draw people through the entire site; the other residential buildings could be taller to accommodate the removal of the residential in Block D.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
September 19th, 2016 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

- Mr. Murphy asked for clarification on the two options for roundabout location and was concerned if not built in the ideal location it may create an awkward connection with Road B. Art mentioned the potential for the street grid to be used as a cut through to the Metro instead of using Edmund Halley Drive. Art does not like the planned garage on Reston Parkway and would like to know what is planned for neighboring sites.
- Mr. Jennings is supportive of the open space design. Mike asked if the existing SWM ponds are any different than standard detention ponds. Mark responded that they are terraced and more appealing than typical detention ponds. Mark also commented that while the existing ponds are grandfathered into use, the overall SWM requirements will be met. Mike asked about traffic analysis effects on the nearby intersections. Mr. Looney responded that the county is analyzing the Reston Parkway/Sunrise Valley Drive intersection for a final configuration and that this new development will contribute about 10% of the overall trips to this intersection.
- Ms. Straits commented on the strong visual appeal and likes the north/south street with retail, which really 'pulls' people into the site. Sue feels this design creates a sense of place not seen in other developments.
- Mr. Walker asked for clarification on parking location, finds the landscaping and open spaces interesting, and is intrigued by opening Block D. Rob commented that a lot of the green space is shown as private and interior to buildings and expressed concerns about the parking garage on Reston Parkway. Rob's final comment was that Reston is not just another area of Fairfax County; there are higher standards here.

Public Comments

- None

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

Close of meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Cupina to adjourn the meeting several committee members seconding.

Vote Outcome

AYE: Unanimous.

The motion passed

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30pm.

Next scheduled P&Z meeting: 7:30pm October 17th, 2016 at Reston Association Headquarters, 12001 Sunrise Valley Drive, Reston, VA 20191

Respectfully submitted,
Jake Hovermale, Reston P&Z Member and Committee