

TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE
AGENDA - 6/1/10
Interlineations in blue summarize discussion

Open Forum (5 minutes)

Dick Rogers asked how much area was being set aside to serve the civic functions. The response was that the County owns about ½ of the site and how much they keep will be up to them. Consolidation of uses may allow for a smaller footprint to serve the same or expanded uses.

John Lovaas asked about other open space in addition to the “town green.” It was noted the draft report has a section devoted to “Additional Open Space” and several themes are mentioned (open space as traffic calming, pathways through individual lots, etc.).

Rob Whitfield reiterated the need for an existing conditions analysis in TC. Mark suggested he may be able to pull together some numbers and circulate.

Rob Hanna urged that TCN not be as dense as the urban core. His view is a more tiered approach: Metro the most dense; UC next; and finally TCN.

Administrative (0)

I. **Mark Up of TCN Draft Report** (40 minutes)

Joe Stowers again urged that language be added stating that there must be a balance between jobs and the resident labor force. This led to extended discussion about how a requirement like that could or should be enforced. Joe felt it could be, but the key is to state the principle. Others suggested one could not guaranty a resident work force, and the best way to address this is through the kind of mechanism now in the draft --- a trigger allowing increased non-res intensity based on number of residential units delivered on the ground. It was agreed Joe should prepare alternative language that the group could then weigh in on next week.

The Committee then reviewed the proposed trigger in the draft – Inova could develop up to the existing 0.7 FAR so long as the grid and open space were delivered; it could go to 0.9 FAR so long as in addition to the above at least 1,000 residential units were on the ground (a floor, not a ceiling). When the approved Spectrum concept is added to that and RAJ, this would result in +/- 2500 minimum res units in the extended TCN (and Oak Park and the low income housing would really be part of that, increasing the number further). As compared to the current extended Urban Core, the UC at 50 du/ac could build out to @ 4200 res units; it is now +/- 2500 (including Oak Park and the low income housing). So by using the 1,000 units as a trigger for a higher non-res FAR the extended TCN (including Spectrum, Oak Park, and the existing low income housing) would actually be higher than what is on the ground currently in the extended UC. There generally seemed to be a consensus that this represented a good-faith trigger subject to seeing Joe’s proposed language next week (which may or may not affect the trigger).

Mark expressed some concern that the 0.7 and 50 du/ac is language applicable to the PRC zoning district only and if the zoning designations for TCN changed this could create a disconnect. Mark and Bill Keefe were tasked with looking at whether additional or clarifying language in the draft is necessary, to report back next week.

On building heights, the group expressed broad support for the draft language that building height be varied across the parcel. There was a less easily defined consensus on a building height limitation. An initial consensus emerged that TCN should be allowed to build up to the urban core’s height limit of 275’. Robert expressed concern that this was beyond what he felt the developer was implicitly asking for (that it could live with the existing 185’ limit) and that moving this transitional space to a height equivalency with the

urban core would create needless political blow back (since the likelihood of developing to these kind of heights in TCN is highly unlikely). Mark Looney then suggested a compromise whereby there must be varied heights within the space with a target height limit of up to 185' but that one or two signature buildings (of especially strong design with clear benefits to the community) could be allowed up to 275'. This seemed to generate greater support and it was agreed new language reflecting that would be put to the group next week.

II. South Side background (40 minutes)

A representative of James Campbell (Evan) presented. JC owns the twin towers on the west portion of the E4 lot (average @ 180K sq. ft.). Brookfield owns the buildings on E5. JC is not in the redevelopment business; no plans to redevelop the twin towers. However, they are looking to work cooperatively with Tishman which may have ideas for the site. Would be open to working with them on a plan. Understands right now that Tishman is thinking about a 3.5 non-res FAR.

Then heard from Chris Walker who said he represents Penzance which owns the four buildings on the east edge of the USGS site. He built the buildings, Penzance now owns them, Chris retains a residual interest and said he is representing Penzance's interests at our meeting. He says there is no interest in redeveloping those buildings anytime soon. Chris's main concern is with the critical need of increased public access from the south side to the Metro Station. He talked about possibly a n-s road through E5; Bill Keefe noted that Edmund Haley (slightly more to the west) is planned as a public way. Chris also noted there are no sidewalks along Reston Parkway, which handles about 50,000 cars daily. Overall inadequate infrastructure providing access from the south.

III. Future schedule:

- a. June 8: Additional South side presentations; start to put together "straw man" for areas North and South of Metro Station
- b. June 15: Further discussion on "straw man" and identifying key concepts for pieces of Committee report related to same
- c. June 22: Presentation and discussion of section of Committee report dealing with Metro north and south
- d. June 29: up to 30 minutes for community comment on consolidated Committee report; remainder Committee discussion to try to finalize Committee report