

**Reston Planning and Zoning Committee – Regular Meeting.
Monday, June 18, 2018 at 7:30 PM North County Government Center
Minutes**

Present: Cupina, Hovermale, Jennings, Kennedy, Mastran, Moran, Murphy, Oak, Pegues, Petrine, Walker and Weber. Carter and Harrison also attending.

1. Called to Order by the Vice Chair, Mr. Walker at 7:30 pm.

2. Minutes Approved

The Vice Chair requested approval of April 23rd Meeting Minutes. With appropriate motions and seconded, the Committee approved.

3. 11111 Sunset Hills – Informational (postponed)

The Vice Chair stated that this project would not be discussed at the meeting, and might possibly be on the June 25th agenda.

4. Sunrise Technology Center - Core Site (Vote)

Applicant: Core Site
Applicant Representative: David Gill
PC Hearing Date: TBD
BOS Hearing Date: TBD
Staff Report: TBD

Project Description:

CoreSite (the “Applicant”) is the owner of the Sunrise Technology Center, a complex of four office buildings immediately west of the USGS on the south side of Sunrise Valley Drive. The Applicant is seeking a rezoning to the I-5 District and special exception for additional FAR to facilitate the renovation, replacement and expansion of the existing office buildings on the Property to create a new data center complex. The development will occur in 4 phases with a total FAR of .99. The first phase is by-right and is currently under construction. This revitalization effort, which will ultimately result in 942,477 square feet of updated buildings, will generate less traffic than the existing use and will result in a site design that has less impervious surface and more open space.

The applicants provided an update on the project, noting that they would highlight discussion on water use/reuse, parking space reduction under the proposed use, planned architectural fence, still-unrequited outreach to the local community, and a planned June 28th Planning Commission vote.

Applicants affirmed that they still wanted a vote by the Committee at this meeting. They reiterated that a major factor for the project is that consumers and providers of data prefer the kind of access to data centers that this project would provide.

Mr. Walker clarified the current zoning and potential change that would permit the project.

Ms. Petrine said she would have liked to see the plans pre-meeting, and applicants said there were no changes to the earlier plans. She also asked about the discussions and impacts on the neighborhoods near the project. Applicants repeated that they had reached out but had not gotten a response.

Mr. Moran asked about the planned pedestrian path and how it will connect with the existing and planned pathways connecting to the project.

Mr. Walker noted that the Committee strongly encourages green building practices and technologies and asked about LEED certifications. Applicants said there would be Silver for new buildings but couldn't get to Silver for existing buildings.

Mr. Jennings did not have questions or comments.

Mr. Hovermale talked about the increase of the pervious service at the project and asked about potential differences of light impact at night and about noise impacts, when built out. Applicants stated that there would be less light than now, and said that, after discussions with County staff on noise, they have included buffers and screens.

Mr. Murphy asked about plans to adapt the current brick buildings to the design/look for the new buildings and whether a pink external covering was temporary. Applicants said there will be a synthetic stucco for the brick buildings, like the new buildings, and that the pink covering is transitory.

Mr. Kennedy said he is concerned about any impacts on the existing neighborhoods and noted that applicants have reached out without a response. He also asked applicants to recite the benefits of this type of project to the local economy, which they did: these data centers are the backbone of the digital economy and proximity is very attractive and beneficial. He was informed that this project will be the largest by orders of magnitude in Fairfax County. He also inquired about the reduction in parking spaces from 900 to 200 and was told that the nature of the project will be less employee and car visitor intensive.

Ms. Oak asked about planned building materials. Applicants said they will cover existing buildings in the synthetic stucco and would build ultimately in 3 or 4 phases. She asked about green roofs, and applicants said they had adopted reflective materials but were unlikely to use vegetated roofs due to electronic equipment and technology in buildings that could be incompatible with such approach. She also asked about plans for solar energy, and applicants said they are not looking at solar but are open to possibility.

Mr. Pegues said that most of his questions had been addressed. He said he understood the issues re: green roofs but encouraged looking at solar and other types of roofs and materials.

Mr Cupina mentioned that these data centers are often seen in Loudon County and asked about numbers of planned employees when fully built out. Applicants said that they projected to have a maximum of 50 employees.

Mr. Murphy then asked why so many parkings spaces – 200 – still are needed? Applicants said that it is intended to handle peaks of visitors by customers who value proximity.

Mr. Weber asked how the project fits into bike paths and flows, and was told that VODA and the County would direct how the paths would be “striped”. He said he is happy to see a project that reduces traffic.

Public Comments were then invited. One member expressed surprise that solar power is not being considered. He also asked about the expected electric power usage, and was told that the projection is about 51 MW during Phase 1 and 2 and then slight increase to 54MW in subsequent phases.

Applicants also countered on the energy usage issue by saying that the best results come from using higher efficiency cooling units, as planned. They described the testing and monitoring processes they will follow quarterly, monthly and yearly per Dominion, in testing different loads.

Applicants also described how the cooling units are housed internally and buffered in differing ways to alleviate sound.

One public member asked if this kind of project might make Reston a higher-profile target for cyber attacks. Applicant said that seems unlikely because the data would not be sensitive or higher security.

A motion to approve the project was then seconded and the project was then approved by a unanimous vote. APPROVED. (FYI, Mastran did not vote on this application. She arrived at the meeting after.)

4. Reston Town Center West (vote)

Application number: RZ/FDP 2016-HM-017

Applicant: JBG/Reston Executive Center , LLC

Applicant Representative: Brian Winterhalter and Amanda Williams

PC Hearing Date: TBD

BOS Hearing Date: TBD

Staff Report: TBD

The Applicant proposes to rezone the property from the I-5 district to the Planned Development Commercial (“PDC”) district to permit approximately 1,349,500 square feet of additional development, which would bring the total development on the property to approximately 1,868,372 square feet at a total FAR of 3.1 and an effective FAR of 2.94 The Applicant intends to retain the existing office buildings and parking garages on the property, and construct five additional buildings consisting of two multi-family residential buildings, three office buildings, and ground floor retail throughout the property.

Applicants mentioned that it had been before the Committee several times and did request a vote at this meeting. Mr. Kennedy noted that he appreciated that applicants had submitted in the new template format, stating that it was very well done and valuable.

Applicants summarized some of the enhanced “green” commitments they have added, including enhanced stormwater containment, green roofing, flexibility to add solar panels and green space additions to the linear parks and pocket parts. They also explained plans to enhance public open spaces and to connect and engage with the W&OD Trail and pocket parts.

Mr. Weber said that project still “does not turn him on”, saying the project is trying to squeeze too much and build too high. He voiced concern about traffic generation and the projections. Applicants asserted that they are meeting the projected levels and also noted that the overall Reston plan is to change pedestrian and driving usage patterns. They also asserted that they have provided a perfect grid as a good inner parcel to the project, which will assist in traffic flows.

Mr. Walker noted that Level E is the threshold and applicants noted that they have redesigned the project to accommodate the Toll Road underpass and to contribute to the Road Fund.

Mr. Cupina asked about parking requirements, questioning if these were based on real use of cars. Applicants explained that the idea is to attract other modes of transport, not necessarily based on two-car families. They also said they are following the County’s requirements in providing for 6 lanes..

Mr. Pegues said he is concerned that Leed certification is for residential spaces only and asked about plans for Vegetated roofing. Applicants said this is still being worked out but plans are to be 25%. Mr. Pegues stated that is could be much more, and explained benefits. He also talked about possible options to consider.

Ms. Mastran asked about access to the project space from the west and was informed that the project will permit building and access. She also expressed concern that the applicants were aiming too low on LEED certifications.

Ms. Oak asked about the phased plan for buildings. Applicants discussed this and noted that the leasing delivery/closings will drive the buildout but is expected to occur over a 2-3 year time frame.

Mr. Kennedy noted that parking currently is limited and asked about plans for more. Applicants said that current nearby parking is available and thought maybe signage can be improved. Mr. Kennedy also mentioned that he is concerned about pedestrian access and whether it will be up and running by the time the new Metro station operates. Applicants said they will do what they can to coordinate access and timing. Mr. Kennedy urged applicants to push Boston Properties on this. He also said he is pleased by the 16% workforce housing and asked about planned mix of multifamily and urged applicants to be open to mixes of income levels for residents. Applicants said they would make rental/sale decision closer to building, but expect most units to be rental. He also asked about the end-date for build out (2030) and about the way that the bike lines would go from the W&OD Trail to Sunset Hills Road.

Mr. Murphy discussed the linear recreation park and asked about landscaping responsibility and how to limit balls, etc. coming into the paths. Applicants said they anticipate that buffers will be in place. He also asked if the retail park would have curbs or not, and was told that it would be a street without curbs.

Mr. Hovermale said this is a very big and busy project, and asked for clarification on the athletic field proffer. Applicants said they will make a contribution but have not contributed space.

Mr. Jennings raised the concern about too little or limited retail, and wondered how this might impact potential residents.

Mr. Walker praised the applicants for revising the rear parking area (from perpendicular to parallel) in an effort to increase the recreational open space. However, it appears most of the additional land gained is made-up in a large than necessary sidewalk and the net increase in the recreational play area appears negligible. Applicants said part of this is due to the County wanting the sidewalk access for the recreation areas. He later asked if Dominion Power is on board with the planned changes and linkages to the easements. Applicants said that they have met and discussed with Dominion, which seems to be on board

Ms. Petrine asked about the proffer and the green spaces for people who will live there. She also didn't like the grid design and asked about dog parks, for example. Applicants said each building will have a dog run, and will have robust on-site Associations and management for the properties.

Mr. Carter noted that the Planning Commission will want variety on the types of recreational facilities provided. He also encouraged consideration of lighting the W&OD Trail and hopes for a better split on residential/commercial than 40/60.

Mr. Butler of RA encouraged the lighting of the path. He also said the split of use between resident and non-resident users of the facilities are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Weber asked why there is no RA contribution, and was told that they make a Reston Town Center contribution, which Mr. Butler said is recognized as the same, per the Comprehensive Plan.

The Public was then invited to comment.

One member expressed concern about so many building being planned for the space. Applicants said they are at the lower end of density levels and also very close to Metro (where density is appropriate).

A motion to approve was then made and seconded. A vote yielded 8 yeas and four Nays (Petrine, Weber, Pegues and Oak opposed). The project was APPROVED.

5. Pulte Sunrise Valley Drive – Vote

Applicants noted that the project would be for information only, not for vote. Applicants had not provided the plans to the Committee prior to the meeting and also were not aware of the new template. They provided an overview of the project, and discussed the possible timetable for going forward with the Committed and with other bodies, including the Design Review Board.

Ms. Petrine asked where the public would park to access the wetlands area. Applicants said that the current owners will continue to permit public use of private parking and that there would be additional spaces provided.

Mr. Walker asked if there is a new traffic signal proposed on Sunrise Valley Drive. Applicants said they have not. He also asked how private residents might feel about driving through an office building parking lot to access their property. Applicants had considered a western entrance but County was concerned about the traffic impact.

Mr. Jennings asked how the project fits within the Comprehensive Plan with respect to residential and commercial, and was told that this conforms. He did ask whether there is a sidewalk planned on the

north side of Sunrise Valley Drive, and applicants said the streetside area is very tight with wetlands and underground utilities.

Mr. Hovermale inquired if other parts of the property parcel can be developed and was told that an additional 30 acres could be developed. He said he continues to have reservations about the project and the townhouses. Applicants suggested that the area needs a mix of housing and noted that condo and vertical construction options poses different cost challenges.

Mr. Murphy said he is troubled by the mix and said he is disappointed by the design to date.

Mr. Kennedy said he has ambiguous feelings about the project, and noted that the County has held/expressed considerable value in retaining and permitting access to the wetlands area.

Ms. Oak echoed concerns about the site, noting the proximity of the wetlands.

Mr. Pegues and Ms. Mastran voiced similar concerns.

Mr. Cupina said he is okay with the notion of the transitional flow from single –family homes to townhouses to higher-density multifamily, but said it seems more like a Herndon project.

Mr. Walker confirmed that this is a Reston project.

Mr. Weber said that he thinks this is better than the earlier projects considered at the meeting.

Mr. Carter said the Planning Commission would raise/address turnaround areas and parking in the driveways. Applicants said that the driveways are necessary.

Mr. Butler said that RA membership for residents has been discussed. He also confirmed that RA considers the wetlands area important.

Ms. Petrine stated that the townhouse design seemed too skinny and also is concerned that an additional 30 acres could be developed at additional traffic/people impact in the area.

Mr. Walker inquired whether the applicants did want to proceed with a vote, or wait. Applicants said they appreciated the feedback and would provide the plans in advance of a next appearance.

6. Motion to adjourn moved, seconded and approved at 10:40 pm.

7. Next meeting will be held on June 25th at 7:30 PM at The Reston Association Headquarters