

Agenda Reston Planning and Zoning Committee – Regular Meeting Minutes

Monday, February 25th, 2019 at 7:30 PM

Note location - RA Headquarters Conference Room, 12001 Sunrise Valley Drive

Committee Members Present: Walker; Oak; Petrine; Kauppila; Hovermale; Kennedy; Weber; Mastran; Vanell; Moran; Pegues; and Stevison. Also in attendance: Commissioner John Carter and Goldie Harrison

1. Administrative - Approved the meeting minutes for December 2018 and approved the meeting minutes for January 2019. *Unanimous.*

2. Application: Association Drive (First Visit for Information)
 - Applicant: Foulger-Pratt
 - Applicant Representative: Scott Adams and Michael Abrams
 - PC Hearing Date: TBD
 - BOS Hearing Date: TBD
 - Staff Report: TBD

Mr. Kennedy asked if the sponsors would consider a name change, noting that the project would eliminate Association Drive and asked if the historical nature of the buildings has been assessed. Sponsors said the name was chosen to acknowledge the site's heritage, and said that they have been checking on which properties are potentially listed in the National Register, as part of the Soapstone extension project. Applicant noted that they have reached out to the Architectural Review board to document history of buildings and to incorporate historical aspects in the project.

Mr. Kennedy said that was a good approach and inquired if there might be a way to save one of the existing buildings as a community center. He also asked about phasing and was told that the project would have an estimated 3 year building phase with 2/3 to 3/4 of the buildings to be built in the first year. Mr. Kennedy asked about project proximity to Sunrise Valley Drive and was told that buildings would be approximately 35 feet from SRV, although some may be closer and the Soapstone extension would have some elevation as it approaches the Toll Road.

Mr. Kennedy asked what the overall green space and park space dimensions would be. He was informed that there will be 3.66 acres for park, which exceeds the requirement, and the overall green space would be nearly 25% of project, which also exceeds the Comprehensive Plan target of 20%. He was also told that the applicants will ask for County approval of options 1 and 1A.Or (Office or TH/multi-family housing) options.

Mr. Pegues inquired about LEED and vegetated roofing plans, saying he'd like to see more discussion and more clarity. He applauded the inclusion of water retention measures and said he hopes to see more. Applicants said that at this planning stage, the options are very broad but noted that they do focus on using and retaining water on-Site. This includes bio-retention, green roofs and a large menu of methods, and is intended to help the Sunset Hills pond retention issue.

Mr. Stevison had a question on the overall massing for siting, stating that the townhouses were too close to the Toll Road. He asked about swapping the elderly housing to near Toll Road and building the townhouses nearer to Sunrise Valley Drive. He also mentioned sound walls, and said he was hopeful that is because none are planned. Finally, he welcomed more information on planned densities as this project moves forward, hoping the densities may be moved around. Applicants said they have been working with County staff on density and height issues.

Ms. Oak voiced her agreement with Mr. Stevison. She likes the plans for the parks but suggested that a bigger single park may be preferable (by consolidating smaller parks. She also asked to have a traffic study.

Mr. Hovermale stated that he also finds the townhouse plans to be dense and too centralized. He also suggested that the project may have too much road grid.

Mr. Kauppila asked on the status of the Soapstone overpass. Applicants said there are several options under consideration and will be guided by a mitigation analysis results. He expressed concern that the bridge may be too close to Block #7, and was told that the route will likely be further away from that Block. He also stated that the plan needs more green space and landscaping to give more feeling of space. He feels there is too much density and also said the impact on Fairfax County Public Schools needs to be addressed. Finally, he said residents need to be RA members and applicants need to talk with the DRB.

Mr. Weber criticized the price and 2 lane design of the Soapstone overpass. Applicants said this is the requested right of way per VDOT. Mr. Weber also stated that the project is too close to Sunrise Valley Drive; the parks are too small and no one will use them; and Block 1's design is ugly. In addition, he asked who will maintain the park, which applicants committed to maintain but said details have not yet been defined.

Mr. Vanell suggested that the project density be dialed back and be set back further from Sunrise

Valley Drive. He also said he is interested to see how the innovative ideas on parks rolls out. He also asked about the senior care plan and was told that it will include continuous care at 7-8 floors. He asked if the trees were too evenly spaced and was told that they are Bunche din the current design plans.

Ms. Mastran lamented that there would be a loss of trees and the lovely existing canopy, stating the space is highly frequented park space. She also reiterated the idea of preserving one of the buildings for an on-site community center and specifically mentioned the well-designed glass building as ideal.

Ms. Petrine said she is devastated to lose the Association Drive historically significant complex as it is. She criticized the design as too dense and said that the Soapstone extension will be a major north/south artery (and is too small for that function, as planned). She asked for a real park vs. every sidewalk with shrub landscaping being labeled a “park.” and said both the townhouses and the senior center are too close to the road, both Sunrise Valley and the Soapstone Overpass.

Mr. Moran agreed with Ms. Petrine that the Soapstone extension will be a primary road. He also expressed the hope that the project will attain a cohesive design integrating the green space, buildings and grid.

Mr. Walker opined that the residential housing on the Toll Road and Multi-family location is an “odd-duck.” He said he’d like to see some of TH’s converted into greener multifamily buildings with smaller footprints that would allow for more landscaping and specifically trees. He noted the applicant is proposing storm water quality measures in the VDOT Right of Way. Then he asked if VDOT has bought-in to the storm-water management approach. If not, then it is likely that the storm water quality features shown on the plan are likely not to be built in that fashion. He also noted the lack of any tree preservation and the proposed landscaping were at minimum percentages. Rob believed the density was ok but the plan should be more vertical. In addition, he suggested that, with the number of residential units, RA membership and DRB involvement is strongly encouraged.

Mr. Walker also stated that the DRB does not permit townhouses to front on a major road like Sunrise Valley Road.

Mr. Carter asked that all streets and sidewalks on parcels of land be owned by the project, so that they have their own set of rules and controls. He made same point regarding lighting and planning. Mr. Carter noted that buildings must be 50 feet or more off of Sunrise Valley Drive. He also asked that the project have variation between Sunrise Valley Drive and the internal roads for variety. In

addition, he confirmed that historic preservation on the site was a big issue, as was the need to comply with the Comprehensive Plan with respect to housing density. He also urged the applicants to looking into making the project a “green district”. Finally, he said that the need along Sunrise Valley Drive is to be mixed use and include WDU and affordable housing units.

Mr. Walker stated that the project would need to have details spelled out in future iterations and urged applicants to come back early, perhaps with other groups to discuss.

For Public Comments:

Larry Butler of RA stated that there is the need and the intention to plan for using and preserving the green space that exists on the project land. Mr. Butler specifically identified a knoll, the highest elevation on the property with “some of the most beautiful specimen trees in Reston” that should be preserved.

Art Murphy said that he does not like the residential units up along the Toll Road, and suggested that there be a flip of the office and the residential buildings. Applicants noted that having 7 to 8 property parcels presents differing needs and demands in planning.

3. Application: Reston Crescent (No Vote)

Application number: CDDPA/FDDPA/PCA 2016-HM-007

Applicant: Owner: One Reston Co LLC and Two Reston Co LLC / Developer: Brookfield Properties

Applicant Representative: Mark Looney and Jill Parks, Cooley LLP

PC Hearing Date: May 22, 2019

BOS Hearing Date: TBD

Staff Report: TBD

The P&Z Committee had approved the project on May 21, 2018, but now Applicants are proposing certain changes to the street grid and to uses of those streets. This will not change density or green space, but will involve reallocation of uses around Blocks C, D and E, including adding a pedestrian corridor, realigning a block into half-blocks to improve sightlines, adding traffic calming measures, and safety enhancements for pedestrian crossings.

Ms. Petrine asked if there were further discussions with Staff on a pedestrian crossing at Reston Parkway, as well as updated information on streetscaping on the Mews. Applicants said not yet, but will supply as part of the FDP. They also said the Mews would be structured akin to the pedestrian area near Mon Ami Gabi in the RTC.

Mr. Weber stated that he had been caught in the offramp going west and asked about plans for a third lane on Reston Parkway. Applicants said they are adding the third lane to help facilitate turnoffs and that the work will be accelerated.

Mr. Kauppila said he is recused.

Mr. Hovermale said that he likes the new alignment and said he would ideally like to eliminate the hotel at this site.

Ms. Oak said she would like a visual connection from the NW corner to the Park. Applicants said they will need to add signage to link to the Park.

Mr. Stevison asked about the feasibility of flipping Block B, saying he likes the Mews but would like even more if it were extended on both the north and the south end. Applicants noted that the north end is under County control and they want a crossing, whereas the southern crossing is under project control and so there may be more control on decision.

Mr. Pegues urged the applicants to pay early attention to utilities to avoid having to drop in transformers and other equipment at inappropriate locations. Applicants said they are paying attention early to this.

Mr. Carter said that all streets and sidewalks on parcels of land should be owned by the project, so that they have their own set of rules and controls. He said he is tired of having utilities drive decisions on tree removal and placements. Applicants noted that they have added parking on streets, and Mr. Carter queried whether Staff is correct on the crossing issues.

From the Public:

Art Murphy said he likes the consideration of realigning for the loading dock.

4. New Business. Next meeting will be held on March 18th, 2019 at 7:30 PM at The North County Government Center.

Adjourned.