

Reston Planning and Zoning Committee – Regular Meeting.
Monday, September 17, 2018 at 7:30 PM Reston Association Headquarters
Minutes

Present: Cupina, Kauppila, Kennedy, Mastran, Moran, Murphy, Oak, Pegues, Penniman, Petrine, Stevison, Straits, Vanell, Walker and Willcox. Carter and Harrison also attending.

1. **Called to Order** by the Chair, Mr. Willcox at 7:30 pm.
2. **Minutes for 6/15/18 Meeting** - Reviewed. Ms. Petrine provided edits (i.e., Fellowship project on Waterford Square on Fairview Drive”, to be revised. Approval tabled subject to review by Mr. Vanell.

3. Reston Corner - Vote

Application: RZ/FDP 2018-HM-004; SE 2018-HM-002

Applicant: AG-ARC Reston 1 Owner LLC, AG-ARC Reston 2 Owner LLC, AG-ARC Reston 3 Owner LLC

Applicant Representatives: Mark Looney and Ben Wales, Cooley LLP

PC Hearing Date: October 4, 2018

BOS Hearing Date: TBD

Staff Report: September 20, 2018

The application property is located at 12001, 12005 and 12007 Sunrise Valley Drive. The Applicant is concurrently processing a Rezoning/Final Development Plan (“RZ/FDP”) application and a Special Exception (“SE”) application to rezone approximately 4.3 acres of the Reston Corner center from the I-4 zoning district to the Planned Residential Mixed-Use (“PRM”) district to allow the development of up to 145 multi-family residential units. These uses will be constructed on an area of existing surface parking and a storm-water pond. The application also proposes the provision of attractive public urban park space and construction of an above-grade parking structure within the PRM district to serve tenants of the existing office buildings and to provide additional spaces for residents. The majority of the parking spaces required to serve residents on the Property will be provided by structured parking beneath the residential building. As a result of deleting land area from the I-4 zoning district, the Applicant also is requesting approval of a special exception application to permit an increase in density of the I-4 district from 0.5 FAR to 0.7 FAR. No new office square footage is proposed with this change.

Applicants (Mr. Looney) provided an overview on the RZ/FDP application, mentioning the plans to have multifamily units on empty service lot closest to Metro; 0.7 FAR request; and a commitment to Green building measures. He also described discussions with the County DRB on the public urban park space and changes to window designs.

Mr. Willcox asked whether there were discussions on developing adjacent greenspace on the USGS property. Applicants stated that there are no immediate plans to develop or build on USGS green space

and committed that the Project has a proffer to accommodate any vehicular and pedestrian connections relating to the adjacent space. They clarified that that property is Federally-owned, not leased.

Mr. Vanell stated that he was not certain to support the new allocation between apartments and commercial space. Applicants noted that the DRB had stated that this change was needed for their support. Mr. Vanell asked about the grading changes and about location choices of balcony overlooks. Applicants said they had “beefed up” the façade and rooflines to add character and also chose not to build balconies overlooking day-care facilities. Mr. Vanell also asked for description on the pedestrian walkways to the Metro, which Applicants described.

Ms. Straits confirmed that Applicants had met with Reston Association and also confirmed that residents would send children to Fairfax Schools per the local pyramid (South Lakes/Hughes MS/Elementary options). She noted the need for recreational space and opportunities for the residential community.

Ms. Petrine inquired if the USGS planned to build a barrier along the property line. Applicants stated that they did not know of such plan. She noted her concern that such a big project without ready access to nearby woods and greenspace is a concern. She applauded the decision not to have balconies overlooking the daycare space, and inquired about WDU (none) and Section 8 units (12%).

Mr. Murphy stated that the overall architectural design was ok but thinks the “knuckle” looks like Fairfax County Detention Center. He asked the Applicants to look at that part again.

Mr. Willcox recused himself but thanked Applicants for quick turnaround and responsiveness.

Mr. Walker also thanked the Applicants for the responsiveness and voiced his concerns about the “knuckle”. He also stated his understanding that the Comprehensive Plan is supposed to stop at Sunrise Valley Drive, so he is not sure why this Project is included.

Mr. Kauppila raised a question about the parking changes and was informed the new changes are more user-friendly. He also noted that the pendulum on materials had shifted too far on the latest design for his tastes, and asked about impacts on the FCPS local schools caused by more students. Ms. Harrison said that FCPS has determined that sufficient capacity exists for at least the next 5 years. Mr. Pegues indicated that a recent article stated that there is no need to build new schools at this time. Mr. Kauppila urged that residents be RA members, and Mr. Willcox said that is not within the P&Z Committee purview.

Ms. Oak said she is not keen on the architectural design and felt it has disparate ingredients.

Mr. Stevison asked about the structure type of construction and was informed that it would be wood frame for five stories. He also expressed that the design was lacking and a mish-mash of styles, especially on the “knuckle”. He inquired why there is no green roof and was informed that the condenser units on the roof limits the green space available.

Mr. Kennedy noted that he understood that the plans were to make the residential design more plain to fit with the existing building, but said that the Committee still wants a good design. Applicants agreed to discuss further, noting that they had modified the plans to adjust visibility from the street, and further noted that they are going to the DRB to resolve this issue. Mr. Kennedy said he likes the lower-income levels available in the first five years. He also indicated that the Sunrise Valley Drive entrance is too “hard” now and is concerned about impacts on what is already a very busy road. Applicants stated that the Project will actually reduce total vehicle trips and there will be reduced conflicts on time of use.

Mr. Penniman asked about traffic and parking commitments and raised the RA membership issue. Applicants said that residents will be RA members if the units are Condo. He stated that there need to more than 1 or 2 Electric Vehicle parking spots, given the increasing use of EVs, and asked who will get access to those spots, noting that it is not clear that the structure can be modified to increase EV access. He suggests building the conduits that will permit expansion of access for EV parking in future. Mr. Murphy suggested that this might be done by electrical panels that are adaptable. Applicants said it is up to the tenants for how this is adapted.

Mr. Moran asked for clarification on the proffers relating to the USGS adjacent property. Applicants noted where they would adapt for pedestrian and/or vehicle access.

Mr. Pegues asked why there are not more vegetated roof structures as part of the Plan, noting that they can be accommodated on wood framed buildings. Applicants agreed to look further. Mr. Pegues echoed the comments that the various designs clash, and suggested a more unified design.

Mr. Cupina opined that the space is a strangely-shaped lot but overall he thinks the design is fairly attractive. He also thanked Applicants for their responsiveness and urged that residents be RA members. He asked if there would be sufficient parking spaces @1.6/unit and hopes that there will be sharing off-site for overflows/visitors.

Ms. Mastran inquired about access through the property, e.g., walking through fences and woods to access and was told there would be access.

Mr. Looney assured the Committee that Applicants will be working further with the DRB on the design.

Mr. Murphy made a motion to approve, subject to the DRB’s continued refinement, maximizing green/vegetated roofs as practical, and the commitment to provide adequate infrastructure for EVs. Mr. Cupina seconded.

Motion passed with Willcox abstaining (For: Cupina, Kennedy, Mastran, Moran, Murphy, Oak, Pegues, Stevison, Straits, and Vanell,; Against: Petrine, Penniman, Kauppila and Walker)

4. Fellowship House – VOTE

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 multi-family 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 36 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 updated the Committee on the most recent plan for the Project. This included a description of the Limited Partnership for the Project: Lake Anne House LP, including 240 affordable senior housing units and 36 private townhouse housing units. Applicants also described such aspects as the bus turnaround and street access, as well as streetscapes, buffers and retaining walls.

Ms. Mastran asked if there will be play areas for children at the site, and was informed that there will be a crosswalk from the new townhouses to play areas for children to access them. She asked if Hickory Cluster neighbors are happy with the plan and was told that the Cluster President, Michael Hickey, is very upbeat on the Plan. Applicants explained that there had been concerted efforts to get more interaction and engagement between the Project and the neighbors.

Mr. Cupina complimented the Project, noting that Lake Anne needs a shot in the arm. He hopes this will be a catalyst. He asked about parking proffers. Applicants said that there will be the same number of parking spaces as now, and noted that the townhouses will have two-car garages (and only attributing one parking space in the planning). Applicants also confirmed that there will be a tree buffer along Baron Cameron and the Project site.

Mr. Pegues was told there will be HVAC units on the roofs and made a pitch for more vegetated roofs.

Mr. Penniman confirmed that all Fellowship units will be independent living. He asked- and Applicants explained – the integral commitment by HUD and VHCA subsidies and tax credits. Mr. Penniman also asked about the trails and pedestrian access points to Lake Anne Center. In addition, he urged the Applicants to provide access and adaptability for Electric Vehicles and for rooftop solar connections on the townhouses. Applicants agreed to consider.

Mr. Kennedy thanked the Applicants for hard work, innovative approach and willingness to compromise to achieve a positive results. He applauded the reorientation of the Fellowship building. He also noted that the subsidy levels are significant and necessary. He believes that the crossing locations and location of the pedestrian access points are quite narrow and harder to access. Applicants said they will be working with RA on trails and access improvements.

Mr. Stevison complimented the new designs and improvements. He also suggested possible design modification on cornice lines, and urged Applicants to work with others on highlighting the presence and accessibility of Lake Anne.

Ms. Oak asked about the choice of materials. Applicants stated that there are two different types of brick, one of which is matched to Heron House for continuity and the other to be lighter. Applicants described in further detail the townhouses design.

Mr. Kauppila also lauded the Applicants and the Project. He asked about the planned removal of three trees (and why?). Applicants said those trees are dead/dying and need to be removed. He also likes the proposed pocket parks and asked about possibly elevating the signage for the Project when possible.

Mr. Murphy asked several questions about design including the use of flat or gabled designs for hallways. Applicants said the DRB will have a design idea on that. He also inquired about whether it is possible to have a lower level lobby (street level) to leave, and asked why the townhouses will include painted brick.

Mr. Walker said he likes the Project even more now, and suggested that the canopy at entrance could be embellished a bit more.

Mr. Willcox applauded the Applicants for the changes and responsiveness. He asked about the height of the retaining wall and drive ways. He was told that these are intended to allow adequate space to backup fire department vehicles.

Ms. Petrine thanked the Applicants for the responsiveness. She also asked if 2 loading points are sufficient. Applicants said that the turnover for the Fellowship House is sufficiently limited to ensure that two loading points are sufficient, noting that a waiver was required (for less than 3). She asked if it was possible to widen or make the approach lane one-way, and was informed that County staff suggested two-way approach. They also stated that buses will be able to circulate. She voiced approval of the concept of play areas where kids and residents could play together, and voiced concern that there might be too few parking places for the seniors at Fellowship House.

Ms. Mastran also applauded the Applicants. She suggested increased integration of art with the Project.

Mr. Vanell asked if RIBS/FFX Connector would still be servicing the Fellowship House entrance. Applicants said they don't control that, but hope it continues.

Mr. Carter expressed his ongoing concern regarding proximity to North Shore.

The Public asked if the townhouses would have an individual/distinct name (e.g., as a Cluster). Applicants said they are not yet certain, but would try to select a good name.

Motion to Approve, subject to the DRB's continued refinement, maximizing green/vegetated roofs as practical, and the commitment to provide adequate infrastructure for EVs, was offered and seconded. Approval was unanimous.

5. New Business: No new business

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

- Next meeting scheduled to be held on October 15th at 7:30 PM at North County Government Center.