

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE  
October 17, 2016 MEETING MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING

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

**Procedural Items and Announcements:**

Chairman Wilcox called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. He announced that the agenda had been modified with the deferral of the St. John's Woods application to the November Reston P&Z Committee meeting although that had not yet been confirmed. He also noted the agenda had been modified at the request of Supervisor Hudgins so that she could make a brief presentation on the zoning process in Fairfax County. In addition Chairman Wilcox noted that comments and questions at tonight's meeting would be limited to the zoning process presentation and the 1831 Wiehle Avenue presentation. He also stated that comments regarding the St. John's Woods application would not be addressed during the meeting and that any questions on that application could be submitted to the committee by the Reston P&Z Committee online portal or by email to the Reston P&Z Committee.

**Agenda Item 1: Supervisor Hudgins' Discussion of Land Use Process**

1. **Introduction:** Fairfax County Board Supervisor Cathy Hudgins  
Supervisor Hudgins acknowledged that there are a lot of development projects coming to Reston and recognized a need to get out information regarding these developments. Consequently she wanted to take a few minutes to talk about the county zoning process by having Ms. Regina Coyle from the Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning give a presentation on this topic. Supervisor Hudgins then discussed the origins of Reston saying that it was considered from the start a well planned community that received widespread recognition in the mid-1960's as very forward looking. The Comprehensive Plan as it related to Reston was revisited during the rail project in the late 1990's and we are to follow this and the zoning ordinances as our guide. The Reston P&Z Committee has been given to the Reston community as one of the earliest citizen input processes in Fairfax County. The citizen input that is available through the Reston P&Z Committee is intended to try and discern the citizen input, the P&Z Process, the Comprehensive Plan and give recommendations. Following this the County Planning Commission goes through its process and makes its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. The question is how can the County be more thorough in getting information out to the community. Sometimes when the community hears about projects it is not apparent to the community that the project had been planned years ago with citizen input at that time. Supervisor Hudgins thanked the Reston P&Z Committee, recognizing it is not an easy job but it is an important one. This is something that started early in Reston and has been continuous. She then introduced Regina Coyle to go through the actual process that development cases go through in the County Planning and Zoning Department.
2. **Presentation:** Ms. Regina Coyle, Fairfax County Department of Planning and Zoning  
Ms. Coyle presented the process that development applications go through from submission to approval by the Board of Supervisors.
3. **Committee Comments:**
  - a) Messrs. Cerny, Murphy, Jennings, Hovermale, Walker and Thompson had no questions or comments.
  - b) Mr. Cupina

- i. Asked when do adjacent owners or the community at large first hear about a development proposal?
    - 1. Ms. Coyle responded that the Department of Planning and Zoning notifies the Supervisors when an application is accepted and then the individual Supervisors' offices notify their constituents through their individual methodologies.
  - ii. Mr. Cupina followed this by asking when does the county ask the applicant to reach out directly to the community?
    - 1. Ms. Coyle answered that applicants are encouraged to reach out to the community very early in the process starting with the pre-application meetings held between the developer and County staff.
- c) Mr. Weber
- i. Commented that the Reston P&Z Committee does not get Department of Planning and Zoning staff reports on an application before the monthly Reston P&Z Committee meetings which are held once per month.
    - 1. Ms. Coyle responded that they try to get staff reports into their online system 2 weeks prior to the applicants scheduled hearing before the Department of Planning and Zoning. She said that more than 90% of the time they are able to do that. She also said that Reston P&Z Committee members can reach out to the staff handling a case to find out what the issues are that they have identified.
  - ii. Weber asked if Reston P&Z Committee could get the transportation report for an application before the final staff report?
    - 1. Ms. Coyle responded that if it is final and signed by the branch chief then it might be possible.
  - iii. Weber commented that there is a lot of redevelopment on Sunrise Valley and there appears to be no cooperation between developers towards creating a grid road system while over on Sunset Hills there appears to be a lot of cooperation between developers towards the grid system. Why does one area have cooperation and another does not on the grid road system?
    - 1. Ms. Coyle responded that the Department of Planning and Zoning staff is very much in tune with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and the desire and need for a grid road system in the various parts of Reston. They are encouraging the applicants to provide this.
  - iv. Mr. Weber asked again how can we get property owners to coordinate their plans because he feels that the existing street system was not designed to support the traffic these properties are generating.
    - 1. Ms. Hudgins commented that there is a grid system being designed and applications going through the process have made their commitment to adhere to the grid system. There just happen to be applications in different stages of the process just like it is happening in Tysons Corner.
- d) Mr. Kennedy commented that Supervisor Hudgins' Supervisors report, available online and by email, has a nice tracking of all the coming development and applications that is a very helpful piece of information for the public. Ms. Harrison of Supervisor Hudgins' office also commented that anyone who signed in at the start

of this meeting would be added to the email distribution of the Supervisor's newsletter that contains this information.

**4. Public Comments:**

- a) Arlene Krieger, Grass Lantern Court, read a statement stipulating that the Reston Community lost its independent voice in the land use process when the Reston Citizens Association gave up the Reston P&Z Committee established by RCA and that until the Reston P&Z Committee is independent from the Supervisor the Reston Community will have no meaningful voice in land use discussions within Reston. She said that she felt that for a recent unnamed application the "system" totally and completely failed in every conceivable way through total incompetence. She further questioned how they could trust the application being presented this evening by the same "cast of characters" after what they had already done on this prior application. Ms. Krieger then stated that the Reston P&Z Committee is not recognized by her or many others she knows because the committee is not elected, they do not know who the committee is, the committee has not been vetted and they do not know whose interests the members represent. Since this body is not part of representative democracy it should be disbanded and a committee should be elected by residents of Reston. And since the Reston P&Z Committee is not part of RA they don't want it to use RA facilities and equipment that are paid for by Reston citizens. She then said that anything the Reston P&Z Committee decides is illegal, null and void. Finally, Ms. Krieger asked if the next Reston P&Z Committee meeting could be moved to a day other than during the week of Thanksgiving because such a date favors developers. On this last point Chairman Wilcox noted that Reston P&Z Committee meetings are always held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday of each month.
- b) Doug Pew, Palmer Terrace, commented that he attended every meeting of the Reston Master Plan Task Force and that it was clear the developers and attorneys had been through this kind of process many times compared to citizens on the Task Force. Therefore, eventually minimum requirements were developed that came primarily from the developers because of their experience with the process. He also noted how many of the applications he sees online have many requests for zoning exceptions with examples from Michael Faraday and Sunrise Valley applications mentioned. Hence his question/comment was why are developers requesting so many exceptions when they know the zoning requirements and why are they being approved?
- c) John Looney, Hampton Point, had two series of questions.
  - i. Given the unique nature of the Reston Association, at the point of initial land use case notification to the Board of Supervisors does Reston Association get notification at that point? And at notification of a public hearing on a land use case affecting Reston is RA notified? If not, why might that not be appropriate?
    1. Ms. Coyle responded that the County Planning and Zoning Staff notifies the Board of Supervisors and lets each Supervisor decide how to notify their constituencies since each region is different and the methods of communication and notification are different.
  - ii. Would County Staff consider meeting with citizens early in the process of a land use case, especially controversial ones, since Mr. Looney had experience in another jurisdiction from the planning side where such early

meetings with citizens provided he and other planning members information and insight they found very useful and might not have known otherwise?

1. Ms. Coyle stated that during the process their interaction with the community comes in many forms. The staff will come to meetings such as tonight's to present general information and education of broad interest. It is not customary for staff to come to a community meeting to discuss the points on a particular land use case.
- d) Tammi Petrine, (address not provided), expressed appreciation to the Reston P&Z Committee for what they do but said that the planning process is very frustrating because citizens have no power against the County. She believes the Hunter Mill Planning Commission member is pro-developer who rarely stands up for the residents of Reston. The only matter citizens have recently prevailed on was the Reston National Golf Course issue. She said people moved to Reston for a suburban environment and now there is a gash of urban down the center and we don't want the whole area to become urban.
- i. When is someone going to stand up for the residents of Reston?
    1. Supervisor Hudgins commented that there might be a disjointedness between where we actually are and where people think we are in the development process. There is nothing in today's plans that has more density than what was laid out in 1964 other than the village centers and transit station areas. When the comprehensive plan was updated for Reston it was very clear that everything outside of the village centers and transit station areas would stay as-is. She then iterated that her reason for attending tonight's meeting was around improving communication. Her office will publish notice of an application having been submitted even prior to it being accepted by the County staff. She also said that there seems to be a misunderstanding about the role of the Reston P&Z Committee.
  - ii. Ms. Petrine felt that the Reston P&Z Committee has no power and that even if they were to vote no on something the County Planning and Zoning would still approve it.
    1. Supervisor Hudgins replied that even when that is the case the citizen comment process in Reston is very more involved than in other regions and just by going through the process issues do get worked out along the way to a "yes" vote.
- e) Steven Cannon, Bell Castle Court, commented that the community cannot seem to get its voice heard before the County Planning and Zoning staff issues their report which is just 2 weeks before the case hearing before the Planning and Zoning board. He suggested that rather than "encouraging" County staff and Developers to engage citizens earlier in the process we should be "requiring" this to occur before staff writes their report.
- f) John Lovass, Washington Plaza
- i. Who appoints members of the Reston P&Z Committee?
    1. Chairman Wilcox responded that the Reston P&Z Committee is officially under Supervisor Hudgins and that every year applicants submit resumes that are reviewed by the existing committee members for acceptance.

- ii. Mr. Lovass then alluded that the Reston P&Z Committee was not an independent body since it is associated with Supervisor Hudgins' office whereas it used to be under the auspices of the Reston Citizens Association.
  - 1. At this point committee member Kennedy mentioned that authority in Fairfax County rests with the Board of Supervisors and that the Reston P&Z Committee just makes recommendations to the Supervisor and Planning Commission and cannot require things.
  - 2. Chairman Wilcox then clarified that the Reston P&Z Committee is under the Supervisor's office but no members are appointed by her.
  - 3. Committee member Murphy spoke up to say that, having been on the Reston P&Z Committee for 30 years, it is true that the Reston P&Z Committee used to be under RCA. But he reminded everyone that RCA has ebbed and flowed over the years – existed, not existed, barely existed, gone away, come back – with no consistency. It was Arthur Hill, a former Reston P&Z Committee member, who then went to the Supervisor's office asking for some support since the committee was essentially a rudderless ship.
- iii. Mr. Lovass intimated again that since the Supervisor supported committee it is under the [influence] of the Supervisor's office. He then suggested that perhaps the community itself, outside of Reston Association and the Supervisor's office, needs to pull something together to represent itself.
  - 1. Committee member Jennings then spoke to say he has lived in Reston for 30 years and is not an architect or lawyer, he doesn't know storm water management or road/transportation design and is simply a resident and a Reston small business owner. He wanted to do something for the community so he joined the Reston P&Z Committee to give input. To say that citizens don't have input is wrong because anyone can go online, join the committee, attend meetings, listen to presentations and ask questions. He then reminded everyone that the committee is a group of citizen volunteers who live in the community and are just trying to do a good job and asked that people who don't know the committee members stop casting aspersions that members are in the pockets of Supervisor Hudgins or the developers.
- iv. Mr. Lovass apologized and said he had not meant to cast aspersions, that he knows several of the committee members to be good people.
  - 1. Committee member Cerny then also took issue with Mr. Lovass' suggestion that the committee was not truly independent of the Supervisor. He said that when Supervisor Hudgins took office she created the Hunter Mill Land Use Committee that member Cerny now chairs. Members of that committee are selected and appointed by the Supervisor. However, applicants to the Reston P&Z Committee are reviewed by representatives of five different organizations: RCA, RA, Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce, the Reston Design Review Board and the Reston P&Z Committee itself.

- g) Jody Bennett, off of Hunter Mill Road, asked what it would take to get staff reports earlier than 2 weeks before the hearing? She also commented that we go through the process of hearing presentations and asking questions about projects and then several months go by and when all is said and done most of the requested project waivers get approved or proffers get amended anyway. This is very frustrating to citizens.
- h) Rob Whitfield, (no address given), mentioned two concerns. First is that the issue of having adequate public facilities (e.g. community centers, etc.) to accommodate the massive growth plan for Reston should be of concern to everyone. Second is that Kristen Calkins who is leading the Reston Network Analysis Group looking at funding sources for transportation infrastructure needed to accommodate the development growth mentioned that the RNAG is dominated by developers. He iterated the need for improving all communication between interested parties so that everyone could work together.
- i) Judy Pew, Palmer Terrace, expressed appreciation to Reston P&Z Committee and County staff for all their work with all the development going on in Reston. She said that the Reston Master Plan is a great document and asked that as the corridor and village centers get developed the Master Plan be followed. She urged the Reston P&Z Committee to make sure projects follow the Master Plan and to be the eyes and ears of Reston.

**Agenda Item 2: Informational Presentation of 1831 Wiehle Avenue Project**

1. **Presentation:** JBG/1831 Wiehle, L.L.C., EYA Development LLC, and The Chevy Chase Land Company of Montgomery County, Maryland propose to rezone the Property from the I-4 district to the Planned Residential Mixed Use District to permit the development of: (i) five mid/high-rise multi-family buildings consisting of 739,618 square feet and 713 residential units, (ii) two multi-family buildings consisting of 203,030 square feet and 127 residential units, (iii) 60 single family attached residential units consisting of 123,162 square feet, (iv) an independent living facility of 155,100 square feet with 130 units, (v) a highrise office building consisting of 205,917 square feet of office space, and (vi) 260,945 square feet of ground floor retail uses.

A Planning Commission public hearing date is to be determined.

The Applicants seek approval of a rezoning and conceptual/final development plan (“CDP/FDP”) to replace the existing office buildings on the Property with approximately 1,688,000 square feet of development consisting of the following uses: (i) 840 multi-family residential units (ii) 60 single-family attached residential units, (iii) 130 independent living units, (iv) 205,917 square feet of office space, and (v) 260,945 square feet of ground floor retail (collectively, the “Proposed Development”).

Brian Winterhalter, Cooley, LLP, Bailey Edelson, JBG and McLain Quinn of EYA presented the project.

2. **Committee Comments:**
  - a. Mr. Cerny

- i. Asked if Marymount and Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC) are still in any of the existing buildings.
    - 1. Ms. Edelson replied yes.
  - ii. Expressed a desire to keep these institutions of higher learning in Reston and asked if the applicants have had any conversations with Marymount and NVCC about their possibly relocating in Reston, preferably near a Metro station.
    - 1. Edelson replied that discussions are being had with them both. NVCC has started the process for approval with the state about relocation options. The applicants have discussed relocating NVCC within the new development but that would require NVCC to move out and then back in (two moves) which is an issue for NVCC. Edelson's understanding is that NVCC will likely stay in Reston. With respect to Marymount Edelson's understanding is that they would like to co-locate with NVCC.
- b. Mr. Murphy
- i. Are the green rectangles shown in the middle of the buildings' rooftop amenities and not "Texas Donut" parking lots?
    - 1. Edelson replied, yes, they are amenities and that all parking is below ground.
  - ii. Reminded applicants that since the project is not under the authority of the Reston Design Review Board it will be critical for the architecture of the project to be brought forward to the Reston P&Z Committee. Chairman Wilcox clarified that this committee is Planning and Zoning but it also has a passion for architecture and that the Reston DRB has offered to have courtesy reviews of projects and he encouraged the applicants to do so with this project.
    - 1. Winterhalter said that the applicants will be happy to share architectural information with everyone as their case moves along.
- c. Mr. Jennings
- i. Asked that when applicants come back they indicate point-by-point from the Reston Master Plan how their project is compliant rather than just providing general statements that various aspects of the project are compliant.
    - 1. Winterhalter acknowledged they could do that although maybe not point-by-point because it might end up being 150 pages.
  - ii. Why is there a waiver requested with respect to having to install "No Parking" signs every 50 feet? Seems kind of an odd request.
    - 1. This is related to a park area where applicants feel this requirement is not necessary and would negatively affect the look and feel of the park. The Fire Marshall has understood this kind of request at prior projects.
  - iii. What does the waiver request to modify the definition of dwelling to remove the offset requirement for abutting units mean?
    - 1. Quinn replied that this applies to the townhomes where the applicants are looking for an architectural design here that from the public realm will feel more like a multi-family building so that having a forced requirement to move the structure wall in and out a foot or two every so often reduces their flexibility to get the feel they want.
  - iv. Another waiver asks to not have to have privacy yards so these townhomes would not have yards?

1. Quinn said correct. These townhomes are a more urban format that provides private rooftop space rather than small yards.
  - v. Another waiver requests a parking reduction per the tabulations in the drawings and sheet 2 of the drawings has a chart of calculation of Required Spaces but it is not clear to Jennings if the numbers reflect what the county requires and the project will be less or something else. He requested that in subsequent presentations the applicants clearly show what the county requires versus what they are proposing.
    1. Edelson replied they will do so.
  - vi. A modification is also requested of the streetscape guidelines of the Plan in favor of the streetscape elements shown on the CDP/FDP and Mr. Jennings said he could not find these streetscape elements in the CDP/FDP.
    1. Quinn replied that the county streetscape requirements are fairly restrictive, one-size-fits-all and their project has needs for some streetscapes be different.
  - vii. He asked that in future documentation the applicants make it clearer what the county requirement is that they are asking a waiver from so that the committee can more easily understand the difference between the requirement and what the applicant desires.
- d. Mr. Hovermale
- i. Asked if there was a standard sound wall at the southern end of the project border with the Dulles Toll road and ramp?
    1. Quinn said yes they anticipate a sound wall running the entire southern border of the property. It is expected to range between 22 to 30 feet high.
  - ii. So the townhomes facing south will be seeing a wall?
    1. Edelson commented that most of the townhomes will be facing away from the wall with their back ends towards the wall.
  - iii. With 1,000 units in the development it seems reasonable there could be 2,500 residents which is a lot more people than are in this area today. He has a concern about how these people will move across to Metro and the W&OD trail because even today the road intersections are jam packed with people and traffic. The project appears to add one more cross-walk across Wiehle on the southern end of the project near the end of the Toll Road off-ramp but are there any other things they can do reduce the congestion effects of these additional people? He also raised concern that without some type of median barrier on Wiehle we'll have lots pedestrians crossing in places other than the crosswalks creating a dangerous situation.
    1. Edelson replied that they are also hoping to make one of the median dividers on Wiehle Ave wide enough so that pedestrians could stand but they don't know if VDOT will go along.
  - iv. Is there on-street parking proposed on the east side of Wiehle along the project? He foresees this making things worse in an already congested area.
    1. Edelson said they're looking at off-peak, on-street parking along Wiehle and so far they haven't been told no.
- e. Mr. Walker



- i. Parking along Wiehle is a non-starter, bad idea. The Master Plan envisioned this to be a higher education oriented Metro Station area and he would like it to be a priority for the applicants to find a space on their property where Marymount and NVCC could go. Perhaps build something they can move into without having to move away first. He also believes the project might not be fully aligned with the “identity” Master Plan components with respect to the character and mix of residential and office. Density seems to be more horizontal than vertical and the vision for this area was for more height with more ability to have amenity space on the ground. He is not yet seeing the connectivity and open space elements that are envisioned.
    - 1. Quinn replied that as the application moves along they will have more detailed drawings showing these things.
  - ii. Looking at the sound wall, there are currently no sound walls anywhere along the Toll Road anywhere in Reston so applicants should be careful expecting to get this. However there will be a significant need for this given the proximity of the townhomes and recreational areas to the Toll Road. Lots of concern that the noise will be a real issue for the recreational area.
  - iii. Lot of conflicts on drawings between landscape plan and utilities that need to be cleaned up. Also keep in mind that an FDP is quite a different level of plan than a CDP and we’ll need to see a lot of that as the plan progresses.
- f. Mr. Wilcox
- i. Congratulations to development team for the apparent high level of communication between adjacent property owners. Looks like articulation of buildings is good at this point. The senior living product seems a little peculiar in its configuration. Would like to see some articulation in that especially along Sunset Hills Road. Concerned about sound along the southern wall and heavy requirements necessary there. If there hasn’t been any contact with Reston Association he would encourage that this happen sooner rather than later so that they can get the word out to the Reston community about the project and to start the process towards whether the project will be part of RA or not.
- g. Mr. Cupina
- i. What is the timing of this project versus the Pulte project on Michael Faraday Dr as he is concerned about access of the Pulte project to Wiehle Metro?
    - 1. Edelson said this project is 6-9-12 months behind the Pulte project and she’s not sure when they plan to start construction. This project’s intent is to get everything going as soon as they can but likely the Pulte project will be done first. Quinn added that they are talking with adjacent owners about this question with respect to utility coordination.
  - ii. Seems like two public facility waivers are in conflict/not compatible. #4 on page 10 and #6 on page 10. One asks for something to help meet a requirement and the other asks for a reduction from the requirement. Take a look at these and see if they are compatible or not.
    - 1. Part of the issue is that most of the trees along Wiehle and Sunset Hills are in the public right of way and cannot be counted in their tree canopy requirement.
- h. Mr. Weber

- i. Agreed with other committee members' comments against parking on Wiehle Ave. Asked if Sunset Hills entrance to project is a left turn.
    - 1. Edelson replied it is a right-in/right-out.
  - ii. Commented that Reston Station Boulevard is terrible, ends in a parking lot. Suggested that a third lane should be considered. Requested to see traffic studies at future presentations on the project. Mentioned that previous traffic studies – Wiehle Ave bridge, Dulles Toll Road – seemed inaccurate since these projects had to be widened years after the initial construction because traffic ended up much higher than originally projected. Asked that studies provided to the Reston P&Z Committee include turning movement counts, level of service and delay.
  - iii. Asked whether a 3<sup>rd</sup> property adjacent to theirs shown in the same colors as applicant's property was theirs and questioned the alignment of Reston Station Boulevard in that section.
    - 1. Quinn replied it was Rooney's property and that the center line of Reston Station Boulevard has been aligned for through traffic.
  - iv. Recommended that there be no parking on Reston Station Boulevard near Wiehle Ave.
- i. Mr. Thompson
- i. Thanked applicants for presentation. Said he EYA was a name he did not recognize and asked if they had many other projects in Reston?
    - 1. Quinn replied they have no projects in Reston.
  - ii. Stated that he felt that EYA's lack of projects in Reston was evident and that it was not clear to him if EYA understood the history of Reston and the central drivers that promote what Reston's identity is. This may not be the case but he is hearing more of how the applicant is trying to mimic the Mosaic area of Fairfax County in Reston. He is not convinced that Mosaic fits in Reston and encourages the applicant to look at the history of Reston in developing plans. He will be very critical of the architecture going forward until such time that it fits with the history of Reston's architecture and landscaping.
  - iii. Glad to see early commitment to condominiums. Feels we need to have greater degree of ownership type units included in future projects.
  - iv. Stated that it is also not clear to him how this plan fits with Master Plan. Will need to see more information regarding this project's relationship to the Master Plan and not just statements that it complies.
  - v. Would like to see a lot more trees not only surrounding property but also within the property. Thinks perhaps should be building more vertically to allow a greater degree of green space within.
  - vi. Very concerned about traffic congestion and that adding another 1,000 units is only going to exacerbate a big problem. Will need to hear a very comprehensive strategy about traffic mitigation in order to feel positive about applicant's plan.
- j. Mr. Kennedy
- i. Finds this to be an exciting stage of the project. The idea of higher education in this Wiehle area was certainly made part of the Master Plan's objectives so please pursue this. Expect a lot emphasis on this.
    - 1. Edelson replied that they hear this and agree would love to keep Marymount and NVCC and are working as hard as they can to keep them. Relocation for a couple of years and then another relocation to

come back is the biggest issue. Relocating to an existing building while another part of the project is happening is difficult because the applicant feels they need to develop both sides of Reston Station Boulevard at once.

- ii. Parking on Wiehle Ave. is a shock to him and he can't imagine it working. He urged the applicant to not spend too much time on that.
- iii. What is the open space estimate? What percentage?
  - 1. Quinn replied they are exceeding the open space 20% requirement by 30 or 40%. It is the urban park requirement they are little below on. They are short .27 acres if you factor in the spaces within the public right of way.
- iv. Commented that there is a nice mix of housing diversity and would urge the applicant to be creative with respect to workforce housing. The 100-120% is not getting us anything. Try to come up with some package, being so close to the Metro, that can be sold to the County with slightly deeper subsidy levels. This would be a good spot for it.
- v. Would be great to have all the parks, etc. available within 5 years but probably not going to happen so there will be upcoming questions on the phasing of the project.
- vi. Two plans submitted so will need future explanation of what that means.
- vii. There is a big appetite for senior housing.

### 3. **Public Comments:**

- a. Arlene Krieger, Grass Lantern Court, stated her concern about keeping with the Master Plan. Feels there have been so many exemptions to the Master Plan that it has become the norm and is very disturbing. Stated that Reclaim Reston wants to enforce adherence to the Master Plan. Felt that citizens are having to compare projects to the Master Plan line by line because applicants are not providing sufficient detail as to how their projects comply. Asks that we adhere to the Master Plan especially with respect to parking and traffic. Very concerned about any exemption to parking.
- b. Ms. Lintz (sp?), no address stated, said this project is so different than what exists in Reston.
  - i. Asked what makes the applicant think they will be successful in Reston? What brought the applicants to Reston and why do you think you're going to be successful with renting and buying of townhomes?
    - 1. Edelson replied that JBG has been in the D.C. metro area since 1960 and are focused solely on DC/MD/VA. They have property at each of three new Metro stations in Reston and have owned 1831 Wiehle for over 10 years. Are very familiar with the market having done a lot of work locally. They do a lot of research and look at "comps" at Reston Town Center and Comstock's project across the street. They see Reston as a place that is very vibrant and also a place with Metro coming and a Master Plan supporting new development at those places.
  - ii. Ms. Lintz (sp?) then asked if applicant has dealt before with other homeowners associations with stringent requirements such as in Reston?
    - 1. Edelson said yes and that they have already done a lot of work with the Reston Association on several of other projects in Reston. Could not

have been successful for almost 55 years in the region if had not worked closely with communities everywhere.

2. Quinn replied that EYA has not been active in Reston but over the last 25 years have built 4500 homes in the DC metro area largely within walking distance to existing Metro stations – Georgetown and Alexandria for example - places that have very strong senses of identity and unique character. He commented that the fact Metro is in Reston does change Reston in some ways. They understand the changes certainly do need to be compatible with Reston.
- c. Larry Butler, Reston Association, observed that he was surprised to see these type of structures right across from the iconic building being built by Comstock. Strongly encouraged applicant to take a hard look at the resulting deficiency in urban park standard. Echoed concerns about potential loss of education organizations and asked that applicant do whatever they can to maintain this presence at this property per the Master Plan.
  - i. Asked what kind of senior housing is planned at this project? 55+ age restricted or truly senior/continuing care? He was recently at a 55+ advisory committee meeting where the desire for 55+ age restricted housing was discussed since there is none in Reston now.
    1. Edelson replied that they don't yet have a senior housing provider on board. However, they are working closely with one that would likely do a mix of independent and assisted living so not solely age restricted.
    2. Quinn commented that a large contingent of their buyers are empty nesters leaving a single family home wanting a lower maintenance lifestyle and smaller home so that is something they cater to.
  - ii. Will there be a bike share station here?
    1. Edelson said they hope to, conversations on this have just started and they have space for it.
  - iii. He can orchestrate the DRB review when desired.
  - iv. Looks forward to conversation with applicant about Reston Association membership.

#### **4. Close of Meeting:**

- a. Chairman Wilcox thanked Mr. Butler and Cate Fulkerson from Reston Association for use of the their meeting facilities that were needed due to absentee voting activities taking place at normal meeting site at the North County Government Center.
- b. Mr. Murphy moved to approve the minutes of the September 12 and 19, 2016 P&Z Committee meetings. Mr. Walker seconded the motion.
  - i. Vote Outcome – AYE: Unanimous
  - ii. The motion passed.
- c. Mr. Cupina moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.
  - i. Vote Outcome – AYE: Unanimous
  - ii. The motion passed.
- d. The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:50 pm.
- e. Next scheduled Reston P&Z Committee meeting: Monday, November 21, 2016, 7:30pm at Fairfax County North County Government Center.