Reston Master Plan Special Study Task Force
Wiehle Avenue Sub-Committee
Meeting Summary for Wednesday September 1st, 2010

Subcommittee Members Attending:

Bill Penniman - chair
Rob Walker (note taker)
Richard Kennedy
Mark Looney
Arthur Murphy
Judith Pew
Mike Corrigan
Paul Thomas
Dave Gill

The meeting was held at Reston Association.

Minutes from the August 4th were approved.

Public Comment

1. Andrew Painter from Walsh Colucci commented as follows:

a. Made a recommendation regarding the point from the station the 1/4 and ½ mile should be measured. Bill commented that this point has already been defined by the County.
b. Andrew believes consideration should be given for density increases beyond the ½ mile.

Meeting Agenda Items

1. Discussion regarding the review of the "Outline of Wiehle Subcommittee Report" previously distributed to committee members for comment.
2. Mike C. does not agree that points not italicized have been agreed upon by the committee. Mike distributed written comments regarding the outline.
3. General discussion took place regarding the overall feeling by the committee towards the present make-up of the outline. Is this going in the direction we want it to go?
4. There was discussion regarding whether or not we should consider freezing the densities that are already presented in the Comprehensive Plan versus moving forward with the concept of offering increased density opportunities to entice development with the provisions that we believe are necessary for the area.
5. Mark Looney recommends we as a group should determine what our vision for the area would look like then figure –out how to achieve that (with numbers).
6. Rob commented that ideas promoting incentives for development do not automatically mean an increase in densities defined in the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, it is important that this group establish our priorities for the area that can later define requirements requested during future rezonings.
7. There was general discussion regarding the ½ mile delineation relative to the landbays and that there are a few landbays that bifurcated by the ½ mile line. Heidi stated she believed the committee previously endorsed the ½ mile demarcation as prioritizing higher densities.

However, general discussion regarding specific landbay densities may actually be confusing to some. Bill stated he believes the landbay sub-units help to address the density allocation/change within the landbays. Judy believes landbays 4 and 6 are the landbays that are most effected by the bifurcation and that we could refine the sub-units for those landbays.

8. Heidi recommends that residential uses should not simply be permitted anywhere. We should prioritize the locations where we believe residential will be successful.
9. Mark recommended that outline points A.i and A.ii be combined with A.i and A.iv. Dick believed that Mark's concerns were later addressed in other landbay sections of the outline.
10. There was general discussion regarding comments on the outline. Bill took detailed notes regarding the specific wording.
11. Heidi- regarding outline point A.iv and ii regarding an acceptable % of open space. Heidi informed the group for comparison. In the PDC district the minimum open space requirement is 15%. In the PRM district the minimum open space requirement is 20%. The present wording in the outline proposes a minimum open space requirement of 25%. Further discussion is needed.
12. Our presentation to the full committee is scheduled for Sept 28th, therefore, we should try and finish our comments on the outline at next week's meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday September 8th from 7:30a.m-9:30a.m.at this same location (Reston Association)

Meeting adjourned around 9:35a.m.