

Reston Planning and Zoning Committee – Regular Meeting.
Monday, June 25, 2018 at 7:30 PM Reston Association Headquarters
Minutes

Present: Hovermale, Jennings, Mastran, Moran, Murphy, Penniman, Petrine, Stevison, Straits, Vanell, and Walker. Carter and Harrison also attending.

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

2. 11111 Sunset Hills - Informational

Application number: RZ/FDP 2017-HM-006

Applicant: RP 11111 Sunset Hill LLC

Applicant Representative: Scott Adams

PC Hearing Date: July 19, 2018

BOS Hearing Date: July 31, 2018

Staff Report: TBD

The Applicant proposes to rezone the property from the I-4 district to the Planned Development Commercial (“PDC”) district to permit approximately 426,678 square feet of additional development. Of the new development, 200,000 square feet will be residential use, constituting 13 townhomes and a 175 dwelling unit multifamily building. The remaining 226,678 square feet of development will primarily be either office, hotel, or senior living uses. The Applicant intends to retain the existing office building (222,444 square feet) and parking garage on the property, which will result in a total gross floor area of approximately 649,122 square feet, a 1.5 FAR.

Applicant provided an overview on the project, including Open Space and soundwall improvements, discussions on possible improvements to the street grid, and more specifics on affordable housing included in the project.

Mr. Walker asked if Applicants wanted a vote at this meeting, and was told yes.

Ms. Straits asked about the decibel levels with the sound wall as designed. Applicants said it would be below 65 decibels.

Ms. Petrine asked about number of WDU in the project and was informed that there would be about 12% of the units. She mentioned cautionary concerns about having art on a sound wall, suggesting that it is preferred to have the wall “disappear” rather than be highlighted with art. She also asked about the dimensions of play spaces, and was informed that it would be 46’ x 82’.

Mr. Walker noted his continuing and vocal views on sound walls, noting that it is better to have it “disappear” and also raising his concerns about what the outer side of the wall at 30’ would show to other Reston residents. He asked for more details on the wall than have been provided to date. He

raised the option of a polycarbonate wall and stressed that there is still no support for the sound wall and that more details are needed. Applicants said that the plan makes it hard to move/shift residents and other locations.

Mr. Hovermale also expressed concerns about the soundwall and suggested that the Applicant has created the sound wall issue by choice of size and location of other facilities. Applicants contended that the wall would only be 30' in relatively limited location and reiterated that it would be hard to relocate other facilities without the sound wall. Mr. Walker said they would have to agree to disagree with the Applicants.

Mr. Jennings had no specific questions but said he was not happy that a vote was requested when the scheduled agenda indicated that the project was for information only.

Mr. Murphy asked about how long the Mews area would be, and said it was a darker design and use of darker materials than was necessary. Applicants stated they did not change design or materials, but Mr. Murphy said that it seemed to have a more blackish brick now. He noted that the timing meant that the Committee was serving this project as architectural review and he reiterated concerns about colors and dark space. Applicants responded that they had taken grey hues and put them on the bays. Mr. Murphy stated the project lacked reflectively of the lighter-colored buildings.

Mr. Vanell said he was agnostic on the soundwall but agreed there was a lack of detail. He also said he thought the vote should occur next time (be postponed). Applicants agreed to seek a vote at the next meeting.

Mr. Murphy returned to the design issues, noting that muted colors, subtle lime or concrete might work on the sound wall but it was hard to consider without further details. Applicants asserted that they had provided elevation drawings for the wall, stating that it will be very hard to see the wall from the Toll Road side. Mr. Walker expressed concerns about the roadside landscaping, and Applicants said they will provide plans on landscaping, shrubs and ornamental plantings.

There then was further discussion about the rendering of the wall design and the source for stating the measurements, e.g., 6' drop, 30' Sound wall includes the retaining wall, and questions on types of trees planned.

Mr. Penniman mentioned that he also is interested in seeing further details on the sound wall and its design. He also asked if it is correct that the dog park was bigger than the play area, asking for a larger play area, if that is the case. He also suggested enlarging the open spaces for human use. In addition, he suggested that proffers should include the LEED certification levels and asked if there might be a way to recede the sound wall by design to reduce visibility. Applicants said the plan is to minimize its visibility, not just paint it white. Mr. Penniman also asked about any green roofing, solar designs, and environmental measures planned. Applicants said that the Green roofs on wood frames are difficult, but said that solar measures are under consideration. Too speculative at this point.

Mr. Steverson said he is familiar with instances of green roofs on wooden frames. It can be done. He echoed concerns about the sound wall design and visibility. On the Mews, he suggested that there be thought on how to design so that pedestrians are drawn to the space and connected with the spaces as a public amenity. He asked for more detail on the streetscape and noted that a business incubator in the community space would be welcome.

Ms. Mastran encouraged the inclusion of green roofs. She expressed distaste for the architectural design, saying it was too derivative and needed to be more diverse and unique like some of the original Reston designs.

Mr. Carter was pleased that there was coordination with other projects in the adjacent areas. He questioned why the sound wall needed to be so high. Applicants said this is a product of the sound modeling. Mr. Carter reiterated that the wall was too prominent in the current design.

Mr. Walker stated that the next iteration of the plan required more detail and should be buttoned up for the next meeting discussion. He also asked for detail on materials and specs needed to review and vote.

Mr. Murphy reiterated the Committee is the backstop for the architectural design for this project and would need more details and specs.

3. Isaac Newton Square – Informational

Application number: Not yet submitted / assigned
Applicant: APA Properties No. 6, L.P. & MRP Realty
Applicant Representative: Andrew Painter, Walsh Colucci PC
Hearing Date: TBD
BOS Hearing Date: TBD
Staff Report: TBD

The Applicant owns approximately 32 acres (60 percent) of Isaac Newton Square. The Applicant is interested in appearing before P&Z to introduce its concept for redevelopment of the site's existing flex-industrial/office buildings into a mixed-use project which would primarily be comprised of residential uses, along with supportive commercial uses on a 90:10 (residential : non-residential) basis. While the precise uses, product type, number of dwelling units, and square footage/FAR is unknown at this time, the project would include several development blocks and approximately eight acres (or more) of publicly-accessible open space, which would include a large neighborhood green that could be used for public events and athletic purposes. The Applicant is still in the conceptual stage, but it is likely that the ultimate build-out would be between 1.5 FAR to a 2.0 FAR. It is the Applicant's intention that the proposed project will be designed to be in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations.

Ms. Mastran asked if the IMS condos were part of the plan.

Mr. Stevison was complimentary of the athletic fields location and inclusion, stating that public access and integration with retail looked good. He applauded this a good start. Applicants noted that the field is situated to provide access to all high intensity areas.

Mr. Penniman asked about the alignment of the street grid with the possibility of diverting traffic off of Sunset Hills to divert traffic. He likes the field placement and asked if there will be a bridge over the WO&D Trail. Applicants said the bridge is included. Mr. Penniman stated that it would be good to avoid enclosures and to encourage integration of the community, so he hoped the Trail would not be too buffered.

Mr. Vanell asked if there was a projection on the mix of residential units in the project. Applicants said that they do not yet know that.

Mr. Murphy asked who will schedule and control field access and asked if there will be dedicated parking for the field. Applicants said that the Park Authority controls and requires certain parking minimums, which Applicants will meet. Mr. Murphy and Mr. Penniman urged the Applicants to include RA membership for residents.

Mr. Jennings likes the plan and likes the field location.

Mr. Moran also likes the proposal and asked the Applicants to coordinate with FCPS and transportation authorities on the impact on their respective facilities and projections.

Mr. Walker said he really likes the start and the concept for the field. He also encouraged the Applicants not to shy away from higher spaces and nooks/crannies in the design. He also urged them to coordinate with neighboring projects on how best to align and develop.

Ms. Petrine asked about how the streets will handle the additional (3200) units. She encouraged Applicants to employ a sustainable, environmentally friendly design with maximization of tree canopy and cover. She suggested that they not use 2 over 2 design and voiced strong support for ensuring the adjacent golf course is kept as a golf course. She congratulated Applicants for such a good start.

Ms. Straits liked the multi-generational focus and said the main challenge is to maximize views and maintain connections to the Metro.

Mr. Carter said that he is pleased to see an urban design approach not often seen. He felt that it echoes Robert E. Simon and the Reston concept well. He suggested that they consider taking it a step further to coordinate in establishing a linear park with adjacent projects. This is a chance to coordinate with a bigger idea, he said.

Public Comments:

A phased approach is necessary, and the speaker said it is mandatory that the plans coordinate with any loss of parking.

Another speaker said that it is lamentable that there is no contemplation on even more impacts on traffic and congestion.

4. Fellowship House – Informational

Application Numbers: PCA A-502-03/DPA A-502-09/PCA A-502-05

Applicant: New Lake Anne House, LP

Applicant's Representative: Lynne J. Strobel

PC Hearing Date: October 4, 2018

BOS Hearing Date: October 16, 2018

Staff Report: Not Yet Published

The applications are filed on approximately 5.96 acres in Lake Anne Village Center and developed with Fellowship House. Fellowship House is comprised of 240 affordable multifamily senior residential units located in two buildings constructed in 1971 and 1976. Fellowship House is owned and maintained by Fellowship Square Foundation, Inc., a non-profit committed to maintaining affordable housing. The existing buildings are out-of-date and inefficient. New Lake Anne House, L.P., as the contract purchaser, proposes to construct a new multi-family residential building comprised of 240 affordable units to replace the outdated buildings and to continue to meet the needs of current and future senior residents. Construction of the improvements will be phased so that none of the senior residents are displaced during the construction process. The new building will have indoor and outdoor amenities. Parking will primarily be located in a garage beneath the building and access to North Shore Drive is unchanged. The remainder of the property will be developed with up to 60 single-family attached dwelling units that will diversify the housing mix in Lake Anne Village Center and finance the construction of the new affordable senior building.

Applicants gave an update on the project, noting that there will be a public hearing in October and then Applicants will be back to the Committee. DRB gave concept approval for the new Seniors building and they now are looking at a town house design, not 2/2.

Ms. Straits confirmed that the PRC prefers the new, revised plan.

Ms. Petrine applauded the move to the townhouse design and recommended looking at the Fairview model.

Mr. Walker also applauded the newer design.

Mr. Moran noted that he liked that the new design appears to integrate more completely with Lake Anne Village.

Mr. Hovermale said he likes new design and prefers the townhouse design.

Mr. Jennings was pleased with the new design.

Mr. Murphy was happy to see that the DRB approves, and commended the increased open spaces in the new design. He said he preferred the previous design's color schemes.

Mr. Vanell felt the new design looks a bit too institutional, and asked if the bus turnaround space was sufficient. Applicants confirmed that it is designed for the bus turnarounds.

Mr Penniman applauded the concept of build first, then move residents. He also asked if there is a way to make the green spaces more functional/useable.

Mr. Steverson noted that the townhouses will abut Hickory Cluster which is very distinctive. He suggested this is an opportunity to extend an architectural heritage and encouraged them to do so. He also urged the Applicants to work with Lake Anne Village to bring in/draw visitors to the Plaza off of Baron Cameron. Applicants said the plan is to put in an attractive sign at that corner.

Ms. Mastran asked about the location of the sidewalk and urged Applicants to remove bamboo growth .

Mr. Carter stated the project is too close to North Shore and suggested that the Applicants move the terrace back. He also expressed concerns about the bus turnaround space being adequate.

The public wanted assurance that the move of the seniors would follow construction of the new building.

5. Motion to adjourn moved, seconded and approved at 10:17 pm.

6. Next meeting will be held on July 16th at 7:30 PM at North County Government Center.