

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 20th, 2017 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

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

Absent: Wilcox; Weber; Moran; Stevison;

Procedural Items and announcements:

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

Administrative item:

To Approve the October meeting minutes.

This agenda item was deferred to our December meeting to provide time for the minutes to be distributed and reviewed. It was also mentioned that we had not approved the September meeting minutes as they had not been issued for review.

- 1. Agenda Item 1 - Application: Reston Town Center North (Informational)
PCA 2017-0198, PCA 2017-0199 and RZ 2017-0197
Applicant: INOVA and Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Applicant's Representative: Joan Beacham and Tim Sampson**

Presentation: Tim and Joan provided an overview of the land use plan proposed for Reston Town Center North. Loan provided a hand-out.

Committee Comments:

- Mr. Vanell (No comments);
- Mr. Cupina asked who owns the treed open space;
- Ms. Straits was interested to know the % of open space planned;
- Mr. Kennedy explained that the purpose of this application was to establish the grid-of-streets, landbays and general land use along with establishing ownership between Fairfax County and INOVA;
- Mr. Penniman asked about the size of the open space and whether it could be used for athletic fields; Penniman also asked if the landbays would include any residential or mixed-use;
- Mr. Murphy asked if the grid-of-streets works with the newest buildings such as the new North County Government;
- Mr. Hovermale also had questions regarding land ownership;
- Mr. Walker expressed concern that the common green appeared to be too programmed and was not being shown with more lawn and general active athletic uses as was contemplated during the Reston Master Plan.

Public Comments: Greener open space and less programmatic for the common green; The Reston 2020 plan recommended the common green be a larger green open space with less program.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 20th, 2017 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

2. Agenda Item 2- Application: Langston Hughes Middle School PRC Plan (Informational)
Applicant's Representative: John McGranahan and Sunny Sarna (FCPS)

Presentation: John stated the PC Hearing is scheduled for January 10th. John presented a power point that provided an overview of the planned school expansion.

Committee Comments:

- Mr. Vanell – had comments regarding traffic flow
- Mr. Cupina- no comments were noted.
- Ms. Straits – asked if the design team consulted with the teachers during the design. She liked that stormwater management was considered but asked if they consulted with RA regarding stormwater and also if they considered a green roof.
- Mr. Kennedy – stressed the importance of serving the required student population; the numbers implied the student increase was only 150 students.
- Mr. Penniman- asked if they are considering solar. Bill is concerned over the inefficiencies of the two-story glass atrium. The architect discussed considering sonotubes (for light), they also design to CHIPS standards.
- Ms. Oak – had interior and exterior architectural comments.
- Mr. Murphy – he believes this is a nice addition and had questions regarding the Ridge Heights drop-off area.
- Mr. Hovermale – asked about school population.
- Mr. Walker – likes the plan but had a little concern regarding more screening will be required of the loading area.
- Mr. Jennings – no comment
- Ms. Wynands – no comment

Public Comments: Larry Butler from RA commented it was great to see them provide stormwater management and the trail connection to Ridge Heights. Other public comments questioned whether the increased capacity was sufficient to handle the future projections. Another public comment was regarding why additional parking spaces are being added.

Applicant's Comments: They need to return to the P&Z for a vote in December prior to their January PC Hearing. They are to coordinate this with the Chairman Jared Wilcox.

3. Agenda Item 3- Application: Roland Clarke Place Development Plan Amendment; PCA and PRC Plan
Applicant's Representative: Mark Looney from Cooley

Presentation: Mr. Looney presented a power point of the planned development. They recently received their first County comments and there is no PC Hearing date established. The proposed density is not presently permitted by the current PRC without a

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 20th, 2017 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Zoning Amendment. The applicant may also consider switching the proposed zone to another district.

Committee Comments:

- Mr. Vanell – expressed concern regarding 699 units accessing Sunrise Valley Drive from Roland Clarke Place; he believes a traffic signal will be important; he believes the architecture looks like buildings in Merrifield and that there were too many of these; in general he was appalled by the architecture; he does like that they are proposing work-force units.
- Mr. Cupina – was glad to see no noise wall is proposed; commented the site is far from metro; questioned whether a bus stop is near-by; he had parking reductions questions.
- Ms. Straits – no comments
- Mr. Kennedy – was also concerned about the treatment of the garage.
- Mr. Penniman he was curious how far it is to metro and how people will travel to get there; per his calculation this site would be 115 du/acre; he believes the regional trail connections need to be worked-out now; he believes the open spaces are too small and many are not useful.
- Ms. Oak – she was concerned about the architecture; believed the open spaces were too small; and she had questions regarding connections to off-site parcels.
- Mr. Murphy - asked if this property was subject to the Design Review Board. The answer was no. Art was also not pleased the applicant's presentation did not include the garage elevations we received in the package. He felt the applicant was disingenuous. He stated he would scrutinize the architecture throughout this entire process!
- Mr. Hovermale – asked if these proposed units would count toward the Reston maximum density number presently being discussed with the Zoning Amendment; had concerns regarding traffic; he liked the roof amenities.
- Mr. Walker – liked the entry road curvilinear architecture and treatment but was very concerned that the garage must be architecturally treated along the Toll Road.
- Mr. Jennings – expressed concern regarding trees and the need for tree preservation.
- Ms. Wynands – asked about the status of existing trees along the Toll Road. She also had questions regarding the safety of the trail in the rear. Nicole was very concerned about the architecture, commenting red accents are awful!

Public Comments: Larry Butler from RA questions how this plan can remain in the PRC District which has a maximum units density of 50 du/acre. In other words the project does not work as presented. Other public comments included what was the unit type break-down. (The applicant stated 30% studios with the balance of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments); no quality of life: building wall to wall which goes against Reston's design principles.

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 20th, 2017 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

4. Agenda Item 5 – Application: Renaissance Centro 1801 LLC
Conceptual Development Plan and Final Development
Plan- RZ 2016-HM-034 and FDP 2016-HM--034
Applicant’s Representative: Andrew Painter from Walsh Colucci

Project Description: Rezoning and Final Development Plan to rezone the property from C-3 Commercial District to PRM Planned Mixed-Use District. The plan proposes a multi-family residential building with approx. 236,435 sq. ft. resulting in an FAR of 3.0. With bonus density the FAR is approx. 3.6. The height of the building is 260 ft. including penthouse.

Committee Comments:

- Mr. Vanell – likes the presentation but believes the height of the building should be reduced by 75%.
- Mr. Cupina – also likes the presentation and believes this is a good project.
- Ms. Straits – she agreed with both David’s and Roberts comments but wants to see a staff report before voting.
- Mr. Kennedy – he was disappointed that the right-in /right-out entrance was eliminated; was disappointed that the work force housing issue was not solved. This is nothing new according to Dick. Therefore, Dick cannot vote in favor until the work force housing issue is worked-out.
- Mr. Penniman – he is concerned this project is not reducing parking; he asked about LEED; is the applicant providing electric charging stations; Bill is ok with the building height.
- Mr. Murphy – he appreciates the architecture and had some additional recommendations; the height does not bother him. He is ready to endorse.
- Mr. Hovermale – no comment
- Ms. Oak – no comment
- Mr. Walker – he believes the building height and scale is still a problem because it is not in conformance with the County Comp Plan recommendations and goes against discussions during the Reston Master Plan regarding stepping down from the Town Center /Reston Parkway.
- Mr. Jennings – he likes the building but is still concerned about the loss of the right-in/right-out along Reston Parkway and the applicant has not presented more evidence of why it was deleted.

Public Comments: Kate Hanley spoke on behalf of the Stratford Condominium Owners Association. She pointed -out that the latest written proffers contained language that would contradict commitments made on the plans regarding issues such as; ADU’s; crosswalk along Reston Parkway and even the right turn lane along Temporary Road; She believes this project is not in conformance with the County Comp Plan; She does not understand why PRM zoning is allowed since the site does not meet the minimum PRM size requirements; no staff report is available.

The Committee voted on the application with a decision of denial :

Final Vote: 5 for 6 against

RESTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 20th, 2017 MEETING MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

The Committee's reasoning for denial included the following select committee members comments; the plan was not in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan in regards to scale with neighboring properties; the proposed height was too tall; the Applicant had not made a final commitment to WDU's; the Applicant did not provide additional evidence regarding why the right turn lane along Reston Parkway was not viable (as the Committee previously requested); draft proffers and a staff report were not provided to the Committee yet some of the specific project commitments listed in draft proffers contradicted commitments being made on the plans.

The meeting adjourned.

Next scheduled P&Z meeting: December 18th, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

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