

TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE
AGENDA - 6/8/10
Interlineations in blue summarize discussion

Open Forum (5 minutes)

Dick Rogers: What is status of the bus station once Metro arrives? Several reported hearing that the County has no plans to move the terminal. Robert will confirm with County.

Rob Hanna: Addressing Joe Stowers's e-mail, Rob thinks encouraging the ability to walk to work is a core Reston principle but he is wary of mandating or effectively mandating that in any way.

Administrative (0)

- Note link to County TC Committee web page:

http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz/projects/reston/sub-committee_town_center.htm

Robert praised the County effort in keeping the TC Committee web page current. Noted it is a rich archive of the Committee's work. General praise from Committee members.

I. Finalize TCN Draft Report (10 minutes)

- a. Should there be a goal or even requirement that the TC labor force (and by extension some part of TCN residential) be better balanced with TC jobs?

Robert started the discussion by suggesting we could probably stipulate that all agree there are important benefits to having a healthy balance between TC jobs and those who live in TC filling those jobs (reduced traffic/congestion etc.). The issue is not that but whether this should be required in some way and, if so, what language we should be suggesting for the Committee report. Joe then indicated that he is not talking about a "requirement," and that he is looking to the guiding principle on the subject contained in John Carter's draft of the guiding principles. Joe suggested we ought to track this issue, monitor the balance over time, and make corrections over time if this gets "out of balance." Periodic analysis should drive decision-making. The question was then raised: if you are talking about tracking this and making mid-term or periodic "adjustments" then that does sound like a requirement. What would one be tracking? Joe suggested the best ratio he has seen is the one set forth in his written analysis provided to the Committee. This again raised the implementation issue and Joe felt this should be left to the County. Mark Looney suggested that perhaps the proper forum to discuss this was the TF itself since if there is to be any such requirement it presumably would and should apply Reston-wide, so maybe this Committee is not the proper forum. There was also extended discussion that even creating this as a "goal" could be problematic – the County staff will try to figure out how to implement this "goal" and that will lead to exactly the kinds of concerns some on the Committee have. Joe emphasized again he is talking about criteria and analysis and not a requirement. Susan expressed the concern that this "goal" might actually compete with other goals (like the desirability of senior housing in TCN, mentioned in the draft report, given the health and other resources in the area). The question was called. Joe was asked what language he'd like put before the Committee. He said it should be a goal to ensure a balance between TC jobs and the resident workforce. Robert then asked the Committee which it favored: Joe's proposal or the language that already exists in the draft report (which talks about the need for mixed use, a strong residential component that serves a diverse demographic consistent with current County guiltiness, and has the 1,000 residential unit trigger). The Committee voted 5-2 against adding the Stowers proposal (Robert, Terri, Susan, Rae, and Mark in favor of the current draft language as is; Joe and Bill Keefe in favor of adding Joe's proposed language, and Phil and Pete absent).

- b. TCN building height: allowing one or two “signature” buildings up to 275’?
Robert offered two alternatives: one would compromise the issue by increasing the existing height limit to 200’ (from 185’) without exceptions while the other would set the limit at 185’ but allow for one or two exceptions up to 275’ for buildings of particular distinction or community benefit (per last week’s discussion). Inova confirmed that while it of course would prefer to have as much flexibility as possible it thought a 200’ limit would accommodate any realistic redevelopment plans they have for the next +/- 30 years. With that assurance, the group seemed to be gravitating to the 200’ compromise. Joe wanted clarification that this would apply throughout the parcel (yes) and that there would be no minimum height requirement (there is not). Some language originally suggested to that effect was determined not to be needed given the rest of the language. The Committee unanimously approved the 200’ compromise language and Robert agreed to try to incorporate that into the text.

II. **Review of TF Break-out Maps on Metro South** (15 minutes)

- a. Carter Group Map
- b. Walker Group Map
- c. RMAG graphic – TCP grade-separated extension over Toll Road (no ramps)
All three of these were shown (first two produced during the TF break out session on the TC Metro Station). The RMAG segment confirms the possible TCP extension is envisioned as an above-grade crossing (not a tunnel). Bill Keefe noted that there apparently are serious VDOT and engineering concerns with the TCP extension and that it may not be a realistic alternative. Agreed we should investigate and confirm status with County.

III. **Presentations from Brookfield, Tishman, and JBG** (60 minutes)

John Landry from Brookfield: Brookfield has the lot (@ 36 ½ acres) at the corner of Sunrise Valley and RP. Two buildings there were recently razed, leaving two currently and a large parking lot. It is zoned 0.7 FAR. There are two intersections off Sunrise Valley. Under the current plan, they are not permitted to put residential there. Current thinking is to put in 700,000 sq. ft. of new commercial with three buildings. They are allowing for flexibility to do some residential on the site assuming that limitation will be lifted. Key goal is to achieve inter-parcel connectivity with neighbors as part of an overall urban design. Have hired Urban Engineering to help think through alternatives. Discussion ensued on the proposed JBG skyway and an intersection along RP (between Sunrise and the Toll Road interchange) that VDOT is considering. The concern is increasing pressure on the existing Sunrise Valley/RP intersection. In terms of height limits, currently built at @ 85’ or 6 stories. Current Comp Plan allows up to 140’, but Brookfield thinks the 200’ limit they see we are talking about for TCN makes much more sense. They conceive of this being a mixed use site with residential in the northwest corner (closer to Metro) and more commercial to the south. If/as the limitations on the lot are changed this configuration could be rethought.

John Schlichting of JBG: JBG has @ 15 acres in F1, 15 in F2, and a small piece of F3. F1 includes the Reston International tower, @ 197’. For F1 JBG is looking for a PRC amendment. New plan: instead of 4 high-rise buildings it would be 4 mid-rise buildings with above-grade parking (mostly concealed) with an additional residential high-rise (up to the height of the Reston International tower). Retail at ground level with a grocery store and large fitness center. Main Street through the site. Talked with Brookfield about the possible intersection between the Toll Road and Sunrise Valley (the later being one of the worst intersections in Fairfax County). They would also like to see an at-grade crossing at the Toll Road interchange across RP. They would also like to see an additional bridge for the Metro to the east with an at-grade crossing. Goal: urbanize the south side; there is a concern VDOT still thinking of this as more suburban. Have an

approved 2.88 FAR with 500 residential units, @ 543,000 sq. ft. of retail.

Anthony Balestrieri and Rustom Cowasjee of Tishman Speyer: Own the Sprint/Nextel site (they are leased through 2014). Landing spot from Metro; 16 acres. Looking for more density and height as this is a small site. Current thinking (very preliminary): there is a 65' slope e-w on the site; @ 10' of bedrock that will materially hamper below-ground parking. They envision a mix of uses – currently about 60-40 office-residential but would like to go to 80-20. They would like to see some kind of e-w road along the southern edge of the site that connects with Edmund Haley. Feel 250' building heights would work – feeling that since they are the farthest from existing residential this could/should be more dense. They don't see this site as lending itself to high percentages of residential. They are looking at a podium concept with retail on the edge near the kiss and ride. The goal would be to use the slope to limit the visual effect of the parking. A concern was expressed about connectivity between this lot and Brookfield to the south. TS feels there will be ped connectivity between these sites.

John Bellaschi on behalf of Bernstein (with a Bernstein family rep): 5 acres in E3 and the pond property on the east edge of JBG's site on F3. No plans to redevelop right now.

Frederick Rothmeijer for MRP Realty: [my notes are less clear here]