VISION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Reston Master Plan Special Study

Date: Wednesday, November 10, 2010
Time: 7:30 to 9:00 p.m.
Place: Lake Anne Community Center

AGENDA

7:30 p.m. **Introduction**
- Purpose
- Participants

7:40 p.m. **Administration**
- Vision Statement
- Notes on Transportation
- Table of Street Classifications
- Public Open Space (Definition and Calculation)

8:00 p.m. **Fairfax County Urban Park Standards**

8:50 p.m. **Next Steps**
- Potential Land Use Scenarios
- Design - Streets, Open Space , Public Art and Buildings
- Public Facilities

9:00 p.m. **Adjourn**

VISION STATEMENT

Mockenhaupt Draft with Nicoson Edits 11/10/10
Follow-up to November 3, 2010 Meeting

Reston Town Center

Reston Town Center (TC) area is a dynamic, mixed used, urban place that is a signature regional destination and origination station. The transit-oriented development (TOD) area encompasses the area south of the original 80-acre TC District south to the Metrorail station. The TC area includes TC North (40 acres north of the TC district), and TC South (land bays south of the rail station and the Dulles Toll Road). All three areas emphasize a balanced and healthy residential: non-residential mix consistent with TOD with a jobs/housing balance of 4:1. The TC District within ¼ mile of the station has the highest density mix of residential, commercial and employment, civic and cultural uses. Moving away from the transit station and TC, the density and height of buildings tapers off to urban mixed-use development with strong residential presence, supportive retail including a grocery store, restaurants and nightlife in TC North and TC South. Both TC North and TC South have urban parks or "town greens of 5-8 acres each. TC North also includes a consolidated County government center with police, library, and performing arts facilities. Because of its proximity to major medical facilities TC will support convenient housing for an aging population, Development is built on an urban style grid of green streets that supports multiple transportation modes with the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and transit users having highest priority.

Distinctive, welcoming, safe open spaces connect buildings with pathways, plazas, and pocket parks augment the "Town Greens" and provide access to the TC station, which as an urban station has no parking facilities. The responsibility for maintaining the open space is shared by all property owners. Park facilities are provided for a variety of residential demographics including children.

Wiehle Avenue

The Wiehle Avenue Station area is a walkable and diverse mix of medium density residence, offices, hotel, supporting retail, restaurants, with an educational/cultural, medical and civic focus. The greater mix of residential development in this TOD village attracts people who can shop, meet friends, take classes and attend cultural events without needing a car. Open space is well distributed throughout the TOD with cohesive streetscapes and setbacks, connected pathways, pocket parks, plazas and public art. Indoor recreation facility or athletic fields are located nearby. A widened W&OD facility functions as a linear park while accommodating bicycle and pedestrian use.

Moderate to high-density development is focused with ¼ mile of the transit station tapering off to ½ mile. Several large parcels including those that abut golf courses and retail facilities may be suitable for higher densities even though they are more than ½ mile from the Wiehle rail station if they are part of a coordinated development or provide

desirable amenities, design features, and infrastructure contributions. Parking for 2300 vehicles and 100 bicycles and a bus drop off area is provided on the north side. A Kiss-and-Ride parking facility and bus drop off on the south side and a network of trails to adjacent properties helps reduce traffic impacts on the Wiehle Avenue and Reston Parkway bridges.

Herndon- Monroe

The Herndon Monroe TOD area benefits from comprehensive redevelopment at a lower density than the TC and Wiehle Avenue station areas. It is a major office destination with high quality mid rise office buildings, attractive frontage on the Dulles Toll Road, quick access to Dulles Airport and proximity to secure, underground fiber optic cable running along the Toll Road. The designated and protected wetland west of the station provides this area with a special amenity that enhances future redevelopment of surrounding areas as a residential neighborhood with pedestrian access to the rail station and the wetlands park.

The highest density is located along the Toll Road and tapers down along Sunrise Valley Drive across form the Polo Fields. The TOD area also includes moderately dense mixed use of residential development with destination retail amenities and hotels.

Sunrise Valley Drive becomes a grand green boulevard with appropriate amenities for pedestrians bicycles, and vehicles. Emphasis is placed on inter parcel connectivity through landscaped trails and sidewalks that encourage walkability throughout the area with links to the transit station. The design of roads enhances transit access to the rail station.

All development mitigates noise to DNL 45 DBA in residential units and to DNL 65 DBA in outdoor recreational areas.

Elements in all Three Station Areas

- At each of the three transit station areas, circulator/shuttle buses link the transit stations with the rest of Reston.
- Special Streets: Sunset Hills Road, Sunrise Valley, Reston Parkway
- Open space treatment
- Highest densities near Dulles Toll Road

Notes on Transportation Section of Vision Committee Report

Follow-up to November 3, 2010 Meeting

Joe Stowers

Summary of Important Conclusions

One of the primary changes John Carter said he would like to see made in our draft transportation report is the addition of a summary of the intersections with severe congestion -- presumably both the current conditions and projected conditions as presented to the Task Force by County DOT staff.

Also at the November 3 meeting we had an extensive discussion of what the Task Force might recommend on how these projected conditions should be responded to, with emphasis given to mitigation measures including TDM, pricing and parking policies, balancing of planned uses, relief of congestion points by careful planning of grids of local streets, TSM measures such as real time signal system responses to congestion and use of smart priorities for buses in the most congested areas (e.g., signal pre-emption). The revised draft report should highlight a carefully prepared list of these responses.

Clarification of Key Analytical Issues

Much of the November 3 Vision Committee discussion of the County's analysis of responses to projected future congested conditions was not clearly understood, in my opinion. A large part of this problem may have been caused by my poor efforts to explain what is being done and what might be done moving forward. I should have explained the key limitations in the County staff's analytical capabilities. Currently the model they are using cannot be used to analyze how traffic would respond to most of the mitigation measures we discussed. It does not contain sufficient detail to permit representation of how local grids of streets could alleviate critical congestion points; nor does it permit the analysis of how improved balance of uses could create more walk-to-work trips and thus reduce auto congestion.

County staff do not have a post-processing model such as Montgomery County has been using for many years to deal with those and many other mitigation measures and thus demonstrate how TOD areas can be optimized. The development of, and the application of these post processing models like Montgomery County's requires years of skilled software and research effort.

Because of these limitations, our current Vision Committee draft report recommends that the County negotiate a contract with Cambridge Systematics (CS) to train County staff to use a post-processing model like Montgomery County's model during the next few months in a second round of analysis that could be used to analyze most or possibly all of the mitigation measures we discussed on November 3.

When Patty Nicoson and I last met with Heidi and County DOT staff on October 15, I told the staff about this recommendation. Tthe response from Leonard Wolfenstein was that this recommendation is consistent with what they have been trying to do for years. It may take substantial additional effort to approach the current capabilities has developed and refined over 20 or more years of state-of-the-art TOD planning work. Reston's current TOD planning challenge presents an opportunity to accomplish this objective.

Fortunately, since we first met with them on June 30, they have hired CS to assist them in applying the County's model to perform the analysis and evaluation of the Reston area's planned station areas. However, we do not know whether they are going to try to have CS perform the type of analysis we are recommending.
The discussion instead focused largely on what the County might do in working with the Task Force and Heidi's P & Z group to help develop and refine mitigation measures such as we discussed on November 3. But no commitment was made to use CS in this process, with or without use of the CS analytical capabilities, such as apparently was done extensively in the Tysons Corner plan development process.
The issue may be money.

Clarification of the Relationship between Forecasts and Plan Recommendations

On Tuesday we are expecting to have a presentation by County staff on preliminary forecasts of growth through 2030 based on regional forecasts of population and employment and Task Force recommendations for density and concentration of development around the three Reston station areas (actually the County's work program and modeling include a fourth station area – the Route 28-CIT area).
I think there is a fair bit of confusion about this and how it relates to what the Task Force has been doing. Some Task Force members have been focusing on the GMU forecasts and others have been focusing on the balance of residential and commercial uses being discussed by the Task Force committees. Neither of these will probably be very important in what County staff plan to present, as I understand what they are doing.

County staff is using the COG forecasts, rather than the GMU forecasts, for very sound reasons, I think. First, the COG forecasts are based on regional forecasts that are widely accepted among local governments and have been updated regularly and used in almost all local planning studies. Secondly, the forecasts for both larger areas, such as Fairfax County and for small areas like our rail station areas, are made by very transparent analytical procedures (in contrast to GMU's use of proprietary black boxes not subject to local review and critique). Finally, the COG forecasts are based on careful attention to local plans and policies with the active participation of all local planning staffs (which are apparently not involved at all in GMU's forecasts). Much more detailed analysis of fine-grained information on comprehensive plans, zoning, and land characteristics are involved in the cooperative COG forecasting process (almost none of which is apparently used in GMU's local area forecasts).

For much of the same reasons, the COG forecasts can be expected to provide local staffs with more confidence between the 2030 balance of population and employment, which in turn provides more confidence in the resulting balances between the expected number of jobs and housing in 2030.

Given all the above considerations, we can expect to have more confidence that the forecasts to be developed by County staff are not likely to be distorted to any serious extent by factors that might occur in the work of the Task Force, such as poor professional analysis of balance of uses or biases due to the special interests of participating property owners or residents who may have personal biases relating to particular types of land uses.

Streets and Arterials

All Reston area streets are currently functionally classified – e.g., urban or rural, arterial, collector, or local, and more detailed breakdowns of some classes into major or minor.

All of these should be reviewed during Phase 2 of the RMPSS process, and recommendations should be developed for design guidelines for these functional classifications. In developing these recommendations, emphasis should be placed on furthering the visions for each of Reston's TODs and for other parts of Reston and for achieving the objectives of the "complete streets" concepts that have been developed. Consideration should be given to appropriate street and sidewalk cross sections, urban design objectives, and pedestrian and bicycle priorities in relation to motor vehicle traffic service.

Table of Street Classifications

Functional Classification	Lanes	Character
Principle Arterials		
1. Dulles Toll Road	8	Highway
2. Fairfax County Parkway	6	Parkway
Minor Arterials (Type A)		
1. Reston Parkway	6	Parkway
Minor Arterials (Type B)		
1. Monroe Street	4	Urban Street
2. Sunset Hills Road	4	Boulevard
3. Sunrise Valley Drive	4	Boulevard
4. Wiehle Avenue	4	Urban Street
Other Streets		
1. New Dominion Parkway	4	Urban Street
2. Town Center Drive	4	Urban Street
3. Bowman Towne Drive	4	Urban Street
4. Fountain Drive	4	Urban Street
5. Soapstone Bridge	4	Urban street
5. Main Streets: - Market Street - Other Main Streets: (Wiehle/Herndon Monroe)	 2 2	 Business Street Business Street
6. Business Streets (Type A)	2 w/parking both sides	Business Street
7. Business Streets (Type B)	2 w/parking one side	Business Street

Public Open Space

The following definition and method of calculation for public open space was discussed and approved with modifications by the Vision Sub-committee on October 6, 2010.

Definition of Public Open Space: Space for public enjoyment either publicly or privately owned, such as:

- **Environmentally sensitive areas** - Resource Protection Areas including wetlands, streams and stream buffers, and priority forest areas
- **Active recreation areas** - active play fields and large indoor recreation areas
- **Designated public open spaces** - areas such as gardens, plazas, walkways, pathways, trails, urban parks, through block connections, civic spaces, and town squares
- **Other public open spaces** - small urban parks and civic spaces

Public open spaces must not include streets, parking and driveways or areas for vehicles, and roof top areas not readily accessible to the public. Active recreation areas, designated open spaces, and undesignated public space all should be encouraged to include public art. Public open space must be easily and readily accessible to the public and be identified by a sign placed in public view.

Calculation of Public Open Space:

- 20 percent minimum of the net lot not including areas for public or private streets and the minimum adjacent sidewalk area of 15 feet
- The minimum public open space requirement for each parcel can also be located off-site and combined with other properties within the transit station area to create larger public spaces (e.g. 5-7 acre civic green in the Town Center)

Required public open space can be substituted for other public space such as a public performance space, a children's science museum, an interior recreation center, a memorial sculpture garden and other interior public spaces if easily and readily accessible to the public