

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
January 23, 2017 MEETING MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING

Present: Cupina, Penniman, Kennedy, Walker, Straits, Murphy, Stevison, Jennings, Oak, Hovermale, Webber, Wilcox, Thompson, Murphy

Absent: Vanell, Wynands

Agenda Item 1: Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority’s Special Exception and Public Facility Review Determination

1. Introduction: Noah Klein of Odin Feldman & Pittleman PC.

Noah Klein presented on Reston Town Center’s South Entry Pavilion. This entrance will be located on 1.88-acres of land outside of the original right-of-way of the Dulles International Airport Access Highway / Dulles Toll Road (Rt. 267) on properties owned by Reston Crossing, LP, and JBG/Summit, LLC, portions of which will be acquired by the Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project. The entrance pavilion and pedestrian bridge will be owned and operated by Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (“WMATA”) after their acceptance into the Metrorail system. The access road and areas for pedestrians; bus transfers; bicycle storage; kiss-and-ride and short term vehicle waiting will be owned and operated by Fairfax County after their completion. Specific discussion included request for open space waiver. This request is driven by the site’s large area and existing deciduous trees, which has eliminated need for landscaping and tree canopy after consultation with urban forestry. Design team has redacted site’s bicycle rack in order to accommodate future Capital Bike Sharing facility. Final consultant for ‘Art in Transit’ has been selected but is not under contract. Art will be on pedestrian bridge and walkway.

2. Committee Comments:

- a. Mr. Cupina
 - i. Asked if site is located within ½ mile of Reston Town Center.
 - 1. Mr. Klein responded yes.
- b. Mr. Penniman
 - i. No questions.
- c. Mr. Kennedy
 - i. Asked the presenter to provide greater description of open space waiver.
 - 1. Mr. Klein provided greater clarity of intention of waiver.
 - ii. Mr. Kennedy indicated that due to the nature of the site, open space is very challenging.
- d. Mr. Weber
 - i. Spoke to his perspective that the south east is unaffected by roundabout location.
- e. Ms. Straits
 - i. Spoke to her desire to see the site meet minimum open space requirements so as to achieve a Reston-like aesthetic.
- f. Mr. Murphy
 - i. Agreed with Ms. Straits’ comments.
- g. Mr. Stevison
 - i. Agree with Ms. Straits comments. Asked if there are plans to incorporate permeable paving into the project’s design.
 - 1. Mr. Klien indicated that this was being considered where appropriate.
- h. Mr. Jennings

- i. No comment.
- i. Ms. Oak
 - i. Spoke to her desire to see more open space and more trees on the site.
- j. Mr. Hovermale
 - i. Spoke to his desire to see more open space and more trees on the site.
- k. Mr Weber
 - i. Asked about design plans for traffic circle located in the center of the traffic circle. Who owns the traffic circle?
 - 1. Mr. Klien answered that low shrubs and ground cover would be included as part of traffic circle. Mr. Klien was unable to answer Mr. Webber's second question because it was not part of the application before P&Z.
- l. Mr. Cupina
 - i. Asked presenter to provide more clarity about open space located on the property as a whole, beyond the site being discussed during the presentation.
 - 1. Sara Ross answered on behalf of presenters. She indicated that the design team has maximized the amount of open space available on the site.
- m. Motion to approve with a recommendation to adopt recommendations provided by committee members.
 - i. 8 approved. 4 against. 2 abstentions.

Agenda Item 2: Kensington Senior Development, LLC

1. **Introduction:** Mark Looney of Cooley LLP
 Kensington Senior Development, LLC ("Kensington") has filed a Planned Residential Community plan concurrent with a Special Exception (SE 2016-HM-024) for an assisted living facility at 11501 Sunrise Valley Drive in Reston [Tax Map 17-4 (17) Parcel 1C], located on the south side of Sunrise Valley Drive, approximately 675 feet east of the intersection with Soapstone Drive, currently the site of Good Beginnings Preschool. Site is commercially zoned, not residentially zoned. Plan is replace Good Beginnings Preschool with 91 unit assisted living facility that includes a memory care component. Project's sponsor anticipated approximately 125 beds based within a 4 story building. Kensington is requesting a 20 unit parking unit reduction, thereby reducing from 82 spaces to 62 spaces.
2. **Committee Comments:**
 - a. Mr. Cupina
 - i. Asked why Kensington's sponsor is not replacing trees on the opposing side of the proposed wall.
 1. Mr. Looney agreed to explore with homeowners located on opposing side of the property's proposed wall.
 - ii. Asked Mr. Looney to reexamine proposed development's impact on street parking.
 - b. Mr. Murphy
 - i. Asked if alternative parking options were explored in private lots nearby.
 1. Mr. Looney indicated that this solution was not likely given that the request would be part of peak parking, and therefore unattractive to private lot owners.
 - c. Mr. Penniman

- i. Asked Mr Looney to confirm that transit would move in a 'right-in, right-out' motion, and if 'left-in, left-out' would also be allowed.
 - 1. Mr. Looney indicated that there were no plans currently to control traffic on the site.
 - ii. Asked Mr. Looney to opine on the property's sidewalks.
 - 1. Mr. Looney explained that sidewalks would be constructed as part of a broader county plan for the area.
 - iii. Asked about lighting requirements.
 - 1. Mr. Looney confirmed that the lighting would meet regulatory expectations.
 - iv. Identified concerns about proposed FAR.
 - 1. Mr. Looney confirmed that the property would have a quasi-public use, and therefore would not be held back by the same FAR requirements placed on retail use in close proximity to proposed project.
 - v. Asked if the property will be LEED certified.
 - 1. Mr. Looney did not know if the property was LEED certified.
 - d. Mr. Kennedy
 - i. Indicated his concern that the fire department would want access to rear of the proposed senior facility.
 - 1. Mr. Looney responded by clarifying that the Fire Marshall's requirements for a building that is 50 feet tall and constructed using non-combustible materials.
 - ii. Asked Mr. Looney to justify the need for this product.
 - 1. Development team is currently assessing supply and demand metrics currently.
 - iii. Spoke to his thoughts that proposed open space is a radical change from existing use.
 - iv. Identified his hope that proposed loading facility requires strong architectural design.
 - e. Mr. Walker
 - i. Spoke positively about strong need for proposed product.
 - ii. Would have preferred to see 360 walking circulation as part of presentation. Would prefer more height, less massing.
 - 1. Mr. Looney reported that surrounding homeowners' biggest concern is height.
 - 2. The project's garage size is driving massing and building footprint.
 - iii. Asked Mr Looney to provide greater clarity on project's walking footprint.
 - 1. Mr. Looney spoke to a plan to build sidewalks on a portion of controlled lot.
 - f. Ms. Straits
 - 1. Spoke to her general approval of proposed use. Indicated her concern about massing.
 - g. Mr. Murphy
 - i. Spoke to his strong concerns about likelihood of firefighter access into the proposed project.
 - h. Mr. Stevison
 - i. Described his concerns about loading area aesthetics.

- ii. Mr. Stevison also spoke positively about use of brick material, and that the parking reduction request was not a concern to him.
- i. Mr. Jennings
 - i. Spoke positively about the project's architecture. He indicated that the architecture fits with Reston's overarching aesthetic.
 - ii. Asked Mr. Looney to provide more clarity on traffic patterns and anticipated circulation trends.
 - 1. Mr. Looney responded that the development team's metrics are based on property size and population.
 - iii. Stated that the roadway in front of the property was one of the worst areas for traffic in Reston.
 - iv. Concerned about transitional yard barrier.
- j. Ms. Oak
 - i. Expressed her interested in increasing the proposed building's height.
 - ii. Asked if the loading area is enclosed.
 - 1. Mr. Looney responded no.
 - iii. Expressed her concerns about fire department access.
 - 1. Mr. Looney reported that the Fire Marshall had not comments on building's massing or concerns about access.
 - iv. Questioned if the proposed property's balconies are not evident.
 - 1. Mr. Looney responded that the balconies were more like terraces.
- k. Mr. Hovermale
 - i. Parking space reduction is not evident.
 - ii. Was happy to learn that neighbor input was taken seriously.
 - iii. Identified discrepancy on planting figures provided as part of presentation package.
 - 1. Mr. Looney confirmed that there was a math error, and that it would be corrected.
- l. Mr. Wilcox
 - i. Discussed his thoughts on mechanical systems.
 - ii. Asked for clarification on storm water infrastructure
 - 1. Mr. Looney confirmed development team's intention to install bio-retention filters in an underground system.
 - iii. Applauded the project's architecture.
 - iv. Parking as proposed was not a concern.
- m. Mr. Thompson
 - i. To receive vote of approval, will need to see: (i) proffered LEED certification; (ii) architectural plan that hides loading dock; (iii) 360 sidewalk footprint.
 - 1. Mr. Looney confirmed that the loading dock would be blocked by both plantings and a brick wall.
- n. Mr. Webber
 - i. Discussed his concerns about traffic congestion.
 - ii. Identified his interest in seeing more pathways along the golf course to the proposed property.
 - iii. Spoke to his concerns about requested parking reduction's negative impact on adjacent retail property. Mr. Webber spoke to his belief that visitors of Kensington would use retail's parking units.

3. Public Comments:

- a. Arlene Kreeger
 - i. Traffic is a “nightmare” at property’s location.
 - ii. Questioned development team’s commitment to affordability. Stated that people in Reston want to be able to afford senior living.
 - 1. Mr. Looney responded that the property will lease using market-based rents. He indicated that a percentage of total beds will be set aside for individuals who qualify for relevant grant funds.
 - iii. Spoke to her disinterest with seeing the building’s height above 50 feet.
- b. Kelly Weterhopper
 - i. Supports 360 sidewalks so as to make consistent with surrounding community.
 - 1. Mr. Looney spoke to development team’s interest in exploring outdoor amenities in front of Sunrise Valley Drive.
- c. John Bowman
 - i. Asked questions about staffing.
 - 1. Mr. Looney confirmed that project’s highest staffing levels will occur during daytime hours: 40 staff members from 7am to 3pm. Staffing count drops after 3pm.

Agenda Item 3: AAFMAA application American Armed Forces Mutual Aid Association

- 1. Introduction:** Andrew Painter of Walsh Colucci
 American Armed Forces Mutual Aid Association (“AAFMAA”) has filed Proffered Condition Amendment (PCA 78-C-098-04) and Final Development Plan Amendment (FDPA 78-C-098-05) to replace the existing three-story office building with two three story campus. AAFMAA is an existing corporate tenant in Reston, VA. Discussion included history of parcel in question, as well as FAR and requested amendment’s relative to Reston’s Master Plan.
- 2. Committee Comments:**
 - a. Mr. Kennedy:
 - i. Appreciates the architecture.
 - ii. Supported design strategy that would link proposed trail to existing trails.
 - b. Mr. Cupina
 - i. Stated his concerns that access to property’s gazebo has been cut-off from proposed development plan.
 - 1. Mr. Painter responded that Fairfax County wants the project to have pathways. AAFMAA would be submitting comprehensive recirculation plan as part of their resubmission.
 - c. Mr. Penniman
 - i. Spoke to his hopes to allow project’s pond to be publically acceptable.
 - ii. Strongly encouraged approval and eventual development of the project.
 - iii. Spoke to his support of project’s green roofs.
 - 1. Mr. Looney indicated that there were no plans currently to control traffic on the site.
 - d. Mr. Walker
 - i. Asked that the circle between existing house and proposed building to look more like a plaza.
 - ii. Asked if the path located on the western portion of the project would be for public use.
 - 1. Mr. Painter discussed concept of possible connection to surrounding trail to promote green space.

- iii. Supportive of new entrance. Makes sense for loading.
- e. Mr. Murphy
 - i. Asked for confirmation on location of project's generators and transfers.
 - ii. Asked for clarity on how fire department accesses the site.
 - 1. Mr. Painter confirmed that the project's height is less than 50 ft. Therefore, does not require 360 access; only front access.
 - 2. Mr. Painter also discussed challenges with finding adequate fire access to the proposed buildings.
 - iii. Spoke to his concern about project's massing.
- f. Mr. Steverson
 - i. Spoke to his appreciation of the project's design.
 - ii. Indicated that he is not concerned about massing. He asked the design team to include a rendering from the low point at the site's pond.
 - iii. Asked about the materials used for project's framing.
 - 1. Mr. Painter confirmed that the project will be constructed using a steel frame.
- g. Mr. Jennings
 - i. Spoke positively about the project's architecture.
 - ii. Indicated concerns about project's negative impact on traffic.
 - 1. Mr. Painter confirmed that the design team will provide operational analysis including traffic impact to Planning & Zoning as part of future submissions.
- h. Ms. Oak
 - i. Expressed her concern about project's massing.
 - ii. Offered a suggestion to break-up project's facades.
- i. Mr. Hovermale
 - i. Expressed his positivity about the project's plan.
 - ii. Asked if the design team had plans for the nearby distillery.
 - 1. Mr. Painter confirmed that the design team has no plans to develop the distillery. Not part of the application.
 - iii. Expressed concern about traffic patterns.
- j. Mr. Wilcox
 - i. Generally positive about project's design.
 - ii. Expressed hopes that project's design team will minimize impact of the site's well.
 - iii. Spoke to his interest in design team's finding connections with WMOD trail.
 - iv. Expressed his concerns about project's negative impact on traffic.
- k. Mr. Thompson
 - i. Spoke negatively about the project's impact on Reston's traffic patterns. Indicated his intention to vote no going forward unless a mitigate to future traffic impact is mitigated in design's plan.
- l. Mr. Webber
 - i. Spoke about his concerns about project's massing length. Specifically, concerned about project's proposed height.

3. Public Comments:

- a. Kelly Wetenhoff
 - i. Very concerned about protecting bike traffic passing along the project's site. Also concerned about project's negative impact on auto traffic.

- b. Larry Butler – Reston Association
 - i. Spoke to his concerns about project's impact on surrounding ecosystems.
Concerned that project's lighting may not be adequate.
