

Reston Planning and Zoning Committee –

Regular Meeting Minutes

Monday, August 19, 2019 at 7:30 PM, North County Government Center

Committee Members Present: Walker; Cupina; Hovermale; Jennings; Kennedy; Mastran; Moran; Penniman; Pegues; Petrine; Stevison; and Straits. Also in attendance: Goldie Harrison, County Board of Supervisors.

Meeting was called to order at 7:30 pm.

1. Administrative –

Motion to approve the meeting minutes for July 2019 meeting was moved and seconded. Approved without objection.

2. **Application: Isaac Newton Square (For a vote)**

Application number: CDP (RZ 2018-HM-020)

Applicant: APA Properties/MRP Realty\

Applicant Representative: Andrew Painter from Walsh Colucci

PC Hearing: 9/18/2019

BOS Hearing Date: TBD

Staff Report: TBD

Applicants requested a vote on the Comprehensive Development Plan (CDP) for the Project and provided an update on several issues relating to the Project, including changes to the access points with the W&OD Trail, ongoing discussions about the athletic field, and noting that residents of the Project would be RA members. Applicants stated that they would continue to refine the Project going forward, and said that each block of the Project will be presented for FDP review/approval.

Mr. Walker noted that the draft RPC Staff Report recommends approval of the CDP. He also noted that the Fairfax County Park Authority has jurisdiction over the type of field surface for the proposed athletic field and that any concerns and points on that matter should be addressed to that Authority, indicating the Applicants' hands are tied on this question.

Ms. Petrine raised several concerns and issues, including relief that the "road to nowhere" will not be built because American Dream Way to the west is a private road whose owner will not allow access. She also suggested that Applicants exchange some of the blocks (e.g., move townhouses inside of the Project, and off of the Golf Course side) to permit more lightE/W road specimen trees. She expressed concern about a lack of retail and grocery, as well as the use of rubber crumb fill for the athletic field. In addition, she said that the Project should be the epitome of an environmentally friendly neighborhood, and that pet access and waste needs to

be considered. But her primary concern was of density of 2100 new DU's in a area already gridlocked and with other insufficient infrastructure especially schools to serve it properly. She suggested building less dense but highly marketable townhouses in lieu of tall multi-family buildings in this area.

Mr. Stevison sought to confirm that what the Committee might approve tonight will not apply to the adjacent parcels to the Project. Applicants confirmed that they had discussions with non-project parcel owners but there had not been agreement yet on how to align those parcels. Applicants did state that there would likely be grid confluence with the Project and that the parties would likely be able to work together.

Mr. Jennings noted that the Project does comply with the Reston Master Plan, and had no further comments.

Ms. Mastran asked to clarify that the Committee is being asked to approve the Project Concept and asked if heights of buildings and numbers of units could subsequently be changed. Applicants confirmed that, noting that the Plan does reflect the intention to reduce density in the northern parts of the Plan. She also expressed concern about further negative impacts on traffic flows.

Mr. Hovermale asked if the County would manage the athletic field, and was told that would be the case. He then asked if the space would be an athletic field if the County opts not to use it. Applicants said they would come back for open space approval, if that were to happen.

Mr. Kennedy said he had enjoyed working with Applicants on this, and hoped that they work as well with other parcel owners. He said the Project is very important to Reston.

Mr. Kauppila asked about the number of parking spaces allotted for the athletic fields. Applicants said there would be at least 50 spaces allotted to the County for this purpose. Mr. Kauppila mentioned his concern that there be some traffic controls for inevitable pass-through between Wiehle and Sunset Hills. All in all, he said it is a great plan.

Mr. Pegues voiced concern that Project has the lowest LEED certification and said he wants it higher. He also urged Applicants to use vegetated roofs more broadly, noting that townhouses should be included for this. He commended Applicants for the Project's conformity with the Master Plan and noted that vegetated roofs can be very effective for water retention and management. Applicants said they would look at each individual building for these types of systems.

Mr. Penniman asked if the current design will govern location, say, of townhouses, and Applicants said there will be flexibility to move blocks around (but thinks townhouses would be located adjacent to the golf course). He also asked if it is too early to show detail on Electric vehicle ports and sites. Applicants said it is. He asked if there will be netting around the athletic field to protect bike riders and pedestrians, which Applicants confirmed there will. That type of detail will be provided at the FDP stage, said Applicants. Mr. Penniman applauded the plan to

preserve the big willow trees and asked if there is the intent to have RA membership for residents. Applicants confirmed that is the plan. He also asked if there is a way to coordinate access through to Lake Fairfax Park (across Wiehle), and Applicants said they are willing to discuss.

Mr. Cupina thanked Applicants for being responsive and said the Plan and the answers had been thorough. He likes the integration with the Park Authority and also lauded the commitment to RA membership.

Ms. Straits agreed with Mr. Cupina's comments. She also stressed the importance of maintaining a focus on higher educational facilities in the Wiehle Corridor, and said the athletic field is a very important part of the Project.

Mr. Walker followed up on Mr. Carter's previous question about having on-street parking near the field. Applicants said there would not be much on-street parking, because it would risk losing the tree area north of the field, noting they are following County transportation guidelines. Mr. Walker said he likes the Project and looks forward to seeing FDPs in the future.

Public Comments:

Earl Flashman (sp) was the spokesman for the Environmental Advisory Committee and read a statement on the responses and replies to questions on climate impacts, EV access, and water management. He will send to the Applicants.

Mr. Dam raised strong concerns about possible use of tire rubber crumb for the athletic field and said there is the reality of having approved a tire dump in the middle of the Project. Ms. Straits asked to see particular evidence, and Mr. Dam is seeking to provide. Mr. Walker said the Committee does not have jurisdiction over this question, i.e., it is not the appropriate forum to consider arguments or make recommendations on this particular issue.

Two other comments related to support for the Project's plan to save trees but voiced concern about the traffic impacts and encouraged the Applicants to invite retail development to come.

Sue Bethel also spoke on the environmental issues and said that the recent storm and rain history now means that Applicants should exceed old guidelines (which are "a joke"). She also voiced concerns about traffic impacts, care of trees, and urged that construction process be conducted carefully to avoid damage.

Mr. Kennedy made a Motion to approve the Project as conceptual approval, and Mr. Cupina seconded. Ms. Petrine restated her concerns about trees, light access, and the huge density of the concept. Motion approved with Petrine opposed.

Mr. Stevison discussed how there might be an amendment or other statement by the Committee on the choice of athletic field surface. Mr. Penniman suggested that there could be two different motions considered. Mr. Kennedy said it would be important to have legitimate

concerns considered and balanced as the Project moves forward. Mr. Moran mentioned that the Committee might urge that the County consider safe alternatives for turf field fill (other than tire crumb) for this and other field projects relating to the Committee's review. Mr. Walker made a Motion to urge the Supervisors, Planning Commission and the County to choose the field surface that is safest, consistent with recognized best practice, and is environmentally-friendly. The Motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

3. Application: Reston Crescent Block D (FDPA 2016-HM-007-02) and Block G (FDPA 2016-HM-007-03) (For a vote)

Application number: Block D (FDPA 2016-HM-007-02) and Block G (FDPA 2016-HM-007-03)

Applicant: Brookfield

Applicant Representative: Cooley

PC Hearing Date: October 2019

BOS Hearing Date: TBD

Staff Report: TBD

Applicants provided an overview on the plans to develop Blocks D and G of the Reston Crescent project. This presentation seeks a vote on those two Blocks.

Ms. Petrine asked if there would be a bowling alley, and was informed that the Project would have one. She said that the design showed very busy "too detailed" windows, and asked if there was a breakout yet of how many Studio, 1 BR and 2 BR units there would be. Applicants said that about 50% would be Studio and 1 BR units and the remainder would be 2 or 3 BR. They also said the units would be rentals, not condo, and parking rates would be reduced for WDU units per proffer.

Mr. Stevison asked if the Project's cinema would be near to other cinemas and whether it would be a traditional cinema. Applicants said it would not be near or a traditional-type cinema. He also said he would like to see more detail on the architectural details for the Project.

Mr. Jennings said it was good to see the details of the Blocks, including the plans for the cinema.

Ms. Mastran asked if there was any planning for access to green, vegetated roof areas, and Applicants said that was not part of the plan.

Mr. Kennedy wanted to make sure that the park area slides showing large tree branches did not indicate that dead tree trunk pieces, not manufactured park materials, would be used. Applicants said they would be manufactured park materials.

Mr. Pegues discussed vegetated roof use and equipment for water retention. Applicants said they have not yet selected the models or types but are open to using the newest proven

innovations. Mr. Pegues mentioned that there are European models available that include local insects and plant species.

Mr. Penniman said he found the Applicants' sketches and information hard to read, and asked about the view of the D Block buildings and what type of retail would be located in those areas. Applicants said they expected it to include food/beverage and in-line retail, as well as the cinema and bowling alley. Mr. Penniman said he thinks it is necessary to have something to activate the restaurant and retail areas, noting something is needed to connect to the open areas.

Mr. Cupina asked why the decision on not requiring RA membership was final, and Applicants said that the proffer already has been submitted for the 36 acre site where the Project will have a management structure to provide facilities other than RA's. Mr. Cupina said that the residents will still use the RA paths and other facilities and so non-membership is a glaring omission.

Ms. Straits said that she likes the naturalistic setting and open areas for play. She asked to have the plan checked regarding orientation of the areas to the sun.

Public:

Ms. Bethel said she loves the trees in the play areas and asked the Applicants to try to plan trees as mature as possible for tree canopy cover. She asked about LEED Certifications, and was informed that residential areas would be LEED Silver. She urged them to deploy as high as possible. Finally, she asked about stormwater management, and Applicants said that the current ponds are adequate to handle new buildings.

Mr. Linster (???) asked when the Project is expected to be completed, and was told "2022-23".

Mr. Penniman and Ms. Petrine asked about storm water management, how to sit near water ponds, and public art plans. Applicants said they planned to use elements like benches near water and also will work with Public Art Reston.

Mr. Jennings made a Motion for approval of the FDP for this Block D, and it was seconded. Motion passed with Mr. Penniman opposed and Mr. Kauppila recused.

For Block G, there were relatively few questions or comments.

Mr. Stevison said he would want to see more detail.

Ms. Mastran asked if the roof areas would be garden accessible and was told they would be.

Mr. Pegues suggested consideration of rain gardens and Applicants agreed to do so. He also said that main roof could be used with good storm water retention devices, and Applicants also said they could look.

Mr. Penniman inquired as to why the outdoor amenity space was in the south part of project. Applicants said they wanted to cater to the work crowd with this. Mr. Penniman asked them to consider catering to the residential folks.

Ms. Straits said she would like to see a garden amenity located near to Wegmans, and Applicants said they would consider.

Ms. Petrine asked if Applicants could add a roof on the parking deck. Applicants said that would cost another \$1M.

Mr. Stevison asked if there might be retail added near the back of the parking areas. Applicants said that would depend on the adjacent Tishman site, noting concern that there not be “orphaned/widowed” retail back there. They said they could consider some retail space as a placeholder there.

4. Application: Comstock – Reston Station Promenade (Development Plan Amendment) (For a vote)

Application number: CDPA/FDPA/PCA 2016-HM-035

Applicant:

Applicant Representative: Cooley

PC Hearing Date: September TBD

BOS Hearing Date: TBD

Staff Report: TBD

Applicants noted that Planning Commission is scheduled for October to consider changes proposed.

Mr. Cupina asked about traffic impacts, specifically whether a lane would be lost at the corner or Wiehle and Sunset Hills? Applicants said the traffic flow/lanes will remain the same on the traffic from the north to the Toll Road.

Mr. Penniman asked how wide the change of the road increase would be from Isaac Newton Square. Applicants said it would only include the new bike lane. There would be no change to midline. He said the Aperture-sized building was kind of weird and he likes taller buildings. He also asked Applicants to think about putting in more residential, e.g., 50/50. And he said that Applicants should present better passageway examples next time.

Mr. Pegues said that the Project should use more vegetated roofs, the more the merrier (the “new normal”.)

Mr. Kauppila raised the concerns about dealing with drop-off and pick-up issues and asked if applicants would want a traffic light at the western side of the Project and Sunset Hills. Applicants said it was too close to other lights and also depended on VDOT.

Ms. Mastran asked where the Project would begin. Applicants said the hotel/condo building would likely be first as they have a signed lease for hotel.

Mr. Steverson said he was not sold on the pedestrian pathway as the primary way to travel through the Project. He suggested that there could be a stronger, more pedestrian-attractive way to situate the pathway, e.g., like a grand staircase. Applicants said that part of the challenge is to finesse the pathway with the parking structures and the intention was to be simple and not cause the pedestrian to think too much about how to navigate path.

Ms. Petrine confirmed that the Woonerf is now history (yes). She also asked why not widen Sunset Hills now, if it will happen later. Applicants said that the road will be dividend but there is no place to transition now and the ultimate location and timing will depend on the Soapstone Connector. She also suggested that there is a Wiehle Reston station bulge at the SE corner that should be eliminated. Applicants countered that the bulge is a traffic-calming measure. She then asked about onsite recreational facilities beyond the cinema. Applicants said there will be a health club, parks, condo recreation facilities, citing p3 of the proffer statement.

Mr. Penniman urged Applicants to address power lines issues early on.

Mr. Walker noted that there is a little bit of work left. Applicants agreed, but noted that they are working in the right direction and will respond to some of the comments next time.

4. New Business. None

Meeting adjourned at 10:59 pm