

## **Reston Planning and Zoning Committee - Regular Meeting**

Monday, September 18th, 2017 at 7:30

North County Government Center

Draft – Minutes

Present: Cupina, Hovermale, Jennings, Kennedy, Moran, Murphy, Oak, Penniman, Varnell, Walker Willcox, Wynands.

Absent: Cerny, Straits, Stevison, Weber,

### **1. Introduction of new candidate for P and Z Committee replacement for Paul Thompson - John Moran**

After calling the meeting to order, the Chair, Mr. Willcox, introduced John F. Moran as a potential candidate to join the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee (the “Committee”).

Mr. Jennings provided a brief introduction of Mr. Moran as a long-time friend and neighbor. Mr. Moran gave a brief description of his professional and personal background, noting that he had lived in south Reston with his family since 1993 and has been involved in various community activities.

The Vice Chair, Mr. Walker, asked whether Mr. Moran, if approved, would be an Associate Member in replacing Paul Thompson. The Chair indicated that Mr. Moran would be an Associate Member and that he would be joining the Committee to take notes and provide the Minutes for the Committee meetings.

The Chair then moved the approval of Mr. Moran in that role, which motion was seconded and received unanimous approval. Mr. Moran then proceeded to take the minutes for this Committee meeting.

### **2. Change to Meeting Agenda and Presentation by Larry Butler, Reston Association**

Mr. Willcox next introduced Larry Butler, Senior Director for Parks, Recreation and Community Resources – Reston Association, to provide an update on matters relating to the Reston Association and the submission of comments and input to the Committee. Mr. Butler discussed the outlines of a template that RA has been developing to facilitate the RA Board in its efforts to receive, consider, and submit comments to the Committee on applications and issues considered thereon. Mr. Butler noted that the template will be used to include project-specific comments, within the elements defined in the template. [A copy of that template is attached.]

Mr. Willcox asked Mr. Butler to confirm that the Committee would consider the RA submission as guidelines, pulled from the RA Board’s Resolution on the relevant project or matter before the Committee. Mr. Willcox also asked Ms. Harrison from Supervisor Hudgins’ office to confirm this understanding. Both she and Mr. Butler confirmed.

Mr. Butler discussed the progress on new RA memberships from occupants of new residential units, saying there was good response from residential buyers, but not from renters. He mentioned that the latter stemmed from the fact that pro forma leases included provisions that renters would not have to pay RA fees.

Mr. Murphy said that those renters would be using RA fields and facilities and that he will insist that they be RA members for him to support a project before the Committee. Mr. Kennedy inquired on why developers of rental units would not agree to this, and asked if this could not be negotiated with the respective developers. Mr. Butler indicated that RA could customize an agreement with each project/unit/building and could look at different approaches on taking care of common property, access and maintenance.

Mr. Walker indicated that waivers are possible, given older practices and precedents such as water retention. Mr. Butler said that RA would study this further. David asked if the VA Assembly or other legal authority would compel that renters pay the RA fee. Mr. Butler stated that RA is not able to subject corridor land to RA covenants and obligations. Mr. Cupina asked if any existing project did require tenants/owners to pay RA fees. Mr. Butler said that only Comstock has done so.

Mr. Willcox then proceeded to item #2 on the Committee meeting agenda, noting that the Committee would strike that item and discussion, and would not hear an informational presentation on the preliminary application by Inova Health Care Services and the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax, as initially scheduled. This matter will be heard at a future Committee meeting in October or November.

Having struck Agenda Item #2, the Committee proceeded to Agenda Item #3.

**3. Midline - JBG/EYA – Wiehle Avenue - Informational only Applicant: JBG/1831 Wiehle, LLC and EYA Development LLC Applicant Representative: Brian Winterhalter – of Cooley LLP PC Hearing Date: December 6th BOS Hearing Date: TBD Staff Report: TBD**

*The project is an application for rezoning of 4 parcels of property totaling approximately 17.5 acres of land currently zoned I-4 to permit a mixed-use transit oriented development known as Midline in the WiehleReston East Transit Station Area. The applicant seeks approval of a rezoning and conceptual/final development plan to replace the existing office buildings on the property with approximately 1,688,000 square feet of development consisting of the following uses: 824 multi-family units, 60 single family attached residential units, 130 independent living units, 259,845 square feet of office space, and 248,145 square feet of ground floor retail.*

Mr. Willcox welcomed Mr. Winterhalter and the developer team to present. Mr. Winterhalter gave a very brief introduction and turned to Mr. Quinn of EYA Development LLC (“EYA”).

Mr. Quinn highlighted that the submitted plan now has three several changes, as indicated by the Park Narratives exhibit that was provided to the Committee (attached\*). He discussed three variations on the project plan:

- a. the Primary Development plan first shown, which has more retail/commercial space included in the eastern, lower-density areas;
- b. a second option with more residential (and less retail) in the C and D blocks (in the eastern areas); and
- c. New, hybrid “Frankenstein” plan which different, flexible options on C and D blocks that would depend on how they can develop and determine what to do on C Block (more residential or more retail), based on sales and commitments as developed.

The project team discussed several changes to the Park Narrative plan, including integrating adjacent outdoor dining space next to park space to give a more expansive feel. The team said that the changes to the Block B park design reflects comments received on the earlier design regarding parkscape, grass areas, and eating opportunities.

Mr. Murphy asked about ramps and public access to the Parkspace, and was told that the space would be accessible by elevators. Mr. Quinn said the revised plan is intended to improve access points and give a bigger more open feel.

Mr. Kennedy questions whether the Wiehle Avenue plan was realistic, given the high-volume of traffic on that road. Mr. Quinn suggested that Wiehle high-volume is primarily limited to rush-hour periods, so that the space along the road would be utilized/not impacted by traffic congestion for most of the day.

Ms. Wynands asked about a possible water feature along Wiehle for noise reduction and appearance. The Committee also asked about moving the project closer to Wiehle and thus opening more internal park space, noting some doubts about having the Wiehle Avenue front space as user-friendly. Mr. Quinn replied that the roadside space is necessary for retail visibility, and his colleague (woman) explained that they are committed to a good overall commuter space on Wiehle, while ensuring an appropriately-sized parkspace.

EYA also discussed the changes to the streetscape areas and to the proposed sound wall. On the streetscapes, EYA explained that the new model was similar to the design of Bethesda Row, using a 12' LAP, with 2' pedestrian area and 2' building zone, stating this is preferred by retailers and would provide more outdoor dining opportunities. Parking would be on street with entry in the breaks between the outdoor dining areas. EYA noted that it is still discussing this plan with the County, which has preferred a smaller (8") LAP and larger building zone area (4').

Mr. Jennings asked about the County's views, which EYA confirmed to favor the smaller LAP area at this point of discussions.

Ms. Oak inquired about park space dimensions under the plan. EYA responded that there are 2.5 acres of park and open space – or at least 25% of the overall space – and also 100,000 (square feet?) of private amenities.

Mr. Willcox advised that the plan needed to be cognizant of the significant amount of rooftop space and the need for use/design of screens. He also noted that the accessibility of trash collection vehicles and delivery vehicles was important and could be discussed in greater detail at the next presentation. He commended the presenters for the “good step” and improved design and use of urban space in this plan.

Mr. Walker also commended the team for a good job on this presentation but strongly urged them to reconsider the 20' sound wall and its impacts. He said that good optics on an external sound wall is mandatory and that vines are not the answer.

Mr. Hovermale echoed the concerns about the sound wall and said he likes the concept of urban parks.

Mr. Quinn responded on the sound wall issues, saying the wall would range from 13' to 20' and that MWAA will not work with them on optics for the external wall. He mentioned that the Rooney wall was different, given the topography and location further east along the Toll Road.

Ms. Wynands asked about the feasibility of a dog park in the project design. She also queried the idea of including a playground so close to the sound wall, asking if there had been thought given to the varying ages and accessibility (ADA) of the users. She also asked whether there would be swimming pools and suggested there should be more green space for the linear park area, asking if the plan involved brick or paver stones. EYA said there would be pools in Blocks A and C, and said that the plan would involve the formation of a recreation association to maintain the recreational greenspaces.

Mr. Penniman noted the concern on the danger of “disappearing retail” for the plan, remarking that if the developers opt for less retail, then the overall plan of mixed use disappears. He also shared the concern on the sound wall, and asked about the interest in establishing a sizeable community space for events and gatherings within the development. He also asked to hear more at future meetings about the possibility of innovations using renewable energy and also on the community association concept.

Mr. Murphy noted that there is a 17 acre space and wants to ensure that there is a coordinated plan and effort among the different parts of the community, i.e., “who is doing what” to maintain the common spaces, identifying the rental units, sold units, retail spaces and independent living units? He also asked if there would be a grocery store. EVA replied that there was space to house a grocery store and they are in discussions with several grocery retailers about this. Mr. Quinn stated that the current plan was consistent with the guidelines.

Mr. Moran had a clarifying question on the proportions for the streetscape, which was answered.

Mr. Kennedy said he was very excited about the plan and commended the presenters on an important development. He noted the plan to put park space on top of a garage is interesting but he is a bit wary. He also noted that his impression – and likely that of others- on Wiehle Avenue traffic congestion differs from the developers: it is congested more than just during am and pm rush hours. He said that ultimately the decision is the developers but he’d like to see how the Wiehle front plan would work. He also agreed with concerns about the sound wall and noted that the Rooney development is dependent on the retail space in this plan; retail space is critical overall. Lastly, he suggested that it would be great to include more affordable housing and perhaps deeper subsidies.

Mr. Cupina strongly affirmed concerns about the sound wall, saying that there must be other ways to do this. He also noted that parking needs to be adequate overall with streetside parking included. He expressed disappointment that both Marymount and NVCC would not be tenants in the project.

Mr. Vanell applauded the team for the presentation and the changes to the plan. He said he prefers the first option and is not as keen on B or the hybrid options with less retail. He asked for information about the range of retailers that might come in. He also asked about how to manage and slow traffic in the development. EYA explained that the narrower streets, streetside parking, extended curbs and table-top intersections, along with bike lanes, are designed to slow down and redirect traffic flow. He also asked about availability of two-car garages, with EYA answering that all houses have a two-car garage option. Mr. Vanell urged the developers to avoid emulating purple lights and parking lights of the Reston Station building.

Public comments were welcomed. One participant lamented the loss of Marymount and NVCC, noting that the Reston Master Plan encouraged the presence and availability of higher education in the community. EVA explained that they had extensive discussion but could not meet NVCC’s needs, and

Marymount is committed to being near or adjacent to another higher education institution. They will report on additional news on where those institutions may relocate.

Another participant urged the developers to engineer the outdoor spaces to be weather-flexible, noting concerns about few trees and artificial turf, which is very hot in summer and has safety and health concerns. The speaker also agreed that Wiehle Avenue traffic is congested for longer periods than suggested.

The presentation concluded with a brief discussion about the status of the VDOT traffic study and its relevance/impact to the development. EYA said that the traffic plan should result in more traffic entering from Sunset Hills. Mr. Willcox suggested that they pursue efforts to move most loading to private streets and off main thoroughfares.

The Committee then proceeded to Agenda Item #4.

**4. Campus Commons Drive – informational only Applicant: TF Cornerstone Applicant Representative: Brian Winterhalter – of Cooley LLP PC Hearing Date: TBD BOS Hearing Date: TBD Staff Report: TBD TF**

*Cornerstone has submitted a rezoning, conceptual /final development plan and proffered condition amendment application to rezone an 11.6 acre site at the southeast corner of Wiehle Avenue and the Dulles Toll Road from I-3 to Planned Residential Mixed Use. The Campus Commons proposal includes a 3-acre open space network, approximately 1,183,000 SF of residential development with up to 1,097 residential units, between 18,480 and 26,480 square feet of ground floor retail uses, and the retention of 233,390 square feet of office development*

Mr. Winterhalter gave a brief introduction of the project plans, to date, at Campus Commons Drive, before turning the podium over to Jon McMillan, Director of Planning for TF Cornerstone, the applicant.

Mr. McMillan gave an overview of TF Cornerstone’s projects and strategic vision, before bringing up Lee Quill of Cunningham Quill Architects which is based in Washington DC. Mr. Quill provided some personal perspective, having lived near Lake Anne earlier and having met Robert Simon. He explained that the developers are focused on how to “bring nature into the site” as a fundamental component of the project.

The team then had the project’s landscape architect discuss how the parkspace at the northwest corner of the property would be a premium space that welcomed the pedestrians to flow in and down through the project spaces. She, together with Mr. Quill, explained how the two existing properties on the site would become part of the fabric of the new development and how the design is intended to flow from low to high, from the south and west to the east to minimize shadows and follow the topography of the land.

Mr. Willcox applauded the team’s presentation and plan to date, but noted that road improvements at Wiehle and the intersection with Sunrise Valley Drive were fundamental to proper expansion along that site.

The developers (Mr. Cochrane) explained that the current plan is to include a pedestrian crosswalk nearer the Toll Road, across Wiehle. Mr. Willcox said that it is imperative to bring in the traffic study relating to Commerce Park as soon as possible and to sort out what VDOT and the County DOT might

permit, because there already are significant traffic and pedestrian challenges at this location, given the T intersection of Sunrise Valley and Wiehle. The developers acknowledged the importance of this process and said they will report further.

Mr. Walker said that the intersection is already bad and queried why this should be added. The developers responded that there would only be one new internal road added.

Mr. Willcox asked about whether impact on the single-family homes on the other side of Sunrise Valley had been considered. Mr. Quill replied that they are sensitive to the tree buffer and the older vintage neighborhood of single-family homes, and said that the “low-to-high” design and tree buffering was intended to integrate with that. Mr. Willcox also inquired about the area east of Campus Commons, and was told that the area is an office park and that the low-to-high design is also intended to meld with that area.

Mr. Murphy asked about access points to the project property. The developers said that the plan is designed to be very accessible, “permeable” to traverse through the property and flow through the buildings in a folded plane design as it comes down from Wiehle.

Mr. Varnell said that the plan constitutes an interesting new approach to an area that has always been an office park. He commended the plan for representing significant thought into an area that is limited by the surrounding roads.

Mr. Cupina asked if there would be a sound wall. The developers said there will be no sound wall, and that the building size and parking lot location address that issue. He also questioned whether there needs to be a waiver request for the size of corner lots, but was told that that issue has gone away with modifications on zoning. Finally, Mr. Cupina expressed his concerns about phased reductions for parking fees. The developers noted that, like with Tyson, the plan is to use higher rates at the outset and then reduce rates as the project is built out.

Mr. Kennedy complimented the plan as a fascinating idea but noted concerns about dealing with the traffic and pedestrian flows at the location.

Mr. Moran also noted that it is an innovative plan and it will be critical to see how the traffic issues are addressed.

Mr. Jennings thanked the team for providing the background of TF Cornerstone and the other team and for the interesting new plan. He noted the traffic congestion and potentially dangerous conditions with added pedestrians and cars, and he asked about the feasibility of a tunnel under Wiehle Avenue. The team suggested that an underground tunnel is not very attractive to pedestrians and might not be used enough, as pedestrians would opt to cross above ground. They also suggested that the appropriately-timed traffic lights can increase pedestrian awareness and usage. Mr. Jennings reiterated his concerns about further burdens on traffic at that location.

Mr. Murphy applauded the team for the creative effort to address a very challenging sight. He also noted that there is a difference between townhomes and multifamily units, e.g., with sales versus rentals. [So he queried whether it makes sense to have the number of multifamily units in the plan.

Mr. Penniman asked for clarification on the numbers of residential units (1097), retail space (26,000 square feet) and parking spaces (2400). He said he likes the concept of low to high and taller building

but is concerned about 1000 new residents at that location. He also expressed concern that the retail space may not be enough to attract workers and residents, leading to more drivers and cars. He said that, in a true urban area such as New York City, it might work, but he is worried here. He looks forward to future discussions.

Ms. Wynands expressed the possibility that south Restonians may prefer a less innovative, cutting-edge type of design to what the developers propose. She also asked whether a gym/club was part of the plan, e.g., a Soul Cycle or something unique. The team said they were not opposed but the open spaces and outdoor life styles were part of the development plan. Mr. Quill emphasized that the project team had spent months analyzing and digesting the site and plans and is strongly committed to it as unique and exciting in a growing and innovative community – Reston.

Mr. Hovermale emphasized that success of this project will depend on parking and flow, and the location is a tough one. The critical factor is a tunnel or the new cross-walk. He also noted that there is quite a bit of effort focused on the multi-family site at the corner. The developers expressed the view that the Wiehle crossing issue (tunnel or cross-walk) is not key, and stated that if the cross-walk proposal does not work, they have other options to pursue. Mr. Hovermale urged them to push for an effective option to permit pedestrian flow, for safety and access reasons.

Mr. Walker stated that, without an effective connection across Wiehle to the Commerce Park area, the project density would have to be reduced. He said that this is a regional problem and must be solved by an underpass, an overpass, or a new crosswalk. He urged that the traffic study would have to address this, and pushed back on the idea that would add to the Sunrise Valley traffic flow approaching Wiehle from the east to west. He also said that he is not crazy about townhomes.

Ms. Oak asked about the height of the multifamily homes and why the pools needed to be located to the east of the development and parking lots. The developers said that the pool location is fungible and they favor an active recreation view from units. Ms. Oak also encouraged a nice cover with good materials for the long parking lot and also expressed concerns about traffic, density and townhomes/multi-family units at the project.

Mr. Willcox thanked the team for a fresh, new and innovative proposal, and welcomed the involvement of such a strong and experienced team. He echoed the concerns about traffic and pedestrian flow, and also said that a large parking garage along the Toll Road could have challenges.

The public was welcomed to pose questions and comments. One participant urged the developers to look at the grade of the northwest corner of the site, noting that a wide-enough tunnel, more like a bridge than a narrow tunnel may work. They expressed genuine concern about a crosswalk and noted that Restonians use tunnels of various sizes throughout the town.

There was a brief discussion about a pedestrian cantilever across the Toll Road along Wiehle, and the discussion was then ended, with thanks to all participants.

## **5. New Business**

The Chair asked if there was any new business. There was none.

**6. Adjourn**

The Committee then adjourned for the evening at 11:37 pm. The next meeting has not been scheduled but is planned for October, likely the third Monday: October 16<sup>th</sup>.