
From: Looney, Mark
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 3:37 PM
To: Lambert, Richard; Darab, Faheem
Cc: Selden, Fred; Patricia Nicoson;
Subject: RMP Comments

Below are some suggested edits for your consideration. A few are things we have discussed before, while a few are new. See you tomorrow night.

Mark C. Looney

Cooley LLP • One Freedom Square • Reston Town Center
11951 Freedom Drive • Reston, VA 20190-5656
Direct: 703 456 8652 Fax: 703 456 8100 Cell: 703 475 3555

Cooley's Reston Real Estate Team has been recognized with a #1 Ranking in Northern Virginia by Chambers USA in 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012 & 2013
<http://www.chambersandpartners.com/usa/Editorial/99204>

Stormwater Management (Page 69-70):

1. Consider removing the specific guidance in items 1 – 3 in the fifth paragraph on Page 69 and instead articulate the goals for stormwater management with references to the pending Virginia Stormwater Management Regulations. Although I understand they are generally consistent, there would be considerable issues if the Comp Plan conflicted with the Virginia regulations as they are ultimately approved. Further, the new policy essentially suggests that we are foregoing any SWM benefits offered by Reston's 5 lakes – which were built for just that purpose – and instead converting them to amenities. Millions have been invested in the lakes as SWM facilities only to now say property owners must address everything on site.
2. Modify the fifth paragraph on Page 69 to remove the reference to minimum guidelines for any application proposing a 1.0 FAR or higher intensity. Stormwater volumes and qualities are independent of FAR. It appears the recommendations assume that development at higher FARs can absorb more expensive stormwater management measures, however, the stormwater impacts and cost of stormwater management measures are not driven by FAR. For example, if a development site currently has no SWM controls in place or the existing systems are inadequate, then any amount of new facilities will be an improvement, regardless of the development intensity.
3. Include in the fifth paragraph on Page 69 or elsewhere in the Stormwater Management section a statement that the new stormwater management guidance is to be applied and implemented only for the redevelopment portions of parcels and not areas where existing buildings are to remain. The application of these new guidelines to existing development is unlikely to be feasible without being cost prohibitive.
4. I think the Plan (Page 89) should acknowledge the County's ownership of the Sunset Hills Road SWM pond near the Wiehle-Reston East station and spell out an expectation or requirement for the County to fix that pond. The extension of Reston Station Boulevard and the Soapstone crossing will certainly impact that pond, and the expense for remedying that situation (it floods because, as I understand it,

the culverts under Sunset Hills Road were closed when VDOT built the park-and-ride lot across the street) should not fall solely to property owners in that area.

Publicly Accessible Open Space (Page 54):

1. Remove the reference to a specific percentage requirement (20%) for publicly accessible open space in each development project. The goal of quality, usable, publicly accessible open space is a good one, but the specific percentage is too prescriptive and too high. Instead, consider setting a target for each TOD area, rather than site specific expectations. Greater flexibility should be provided with open space evaluated on a case-by-case basis, in recognition of other benefits an application may offer.

Urban Design and Placemaking (Page 29):

1. In the first full paragraph on Page 29, eliminate the recommendation for all development in the TSAs (outside Reston Town Center) to be reviewed by the Reston Association Design Review Board. Given the architectural design and site planning review by Fairfax County, the P&Z Committee and adjacent communities, it is unnecessary for an additional layer of review by the RA DRB. Further, the RA DRB has significantly less experience dealing with large-scale, mixed-use developments than does the RTCA DRB.

Urban Parks Implementation (Page 82):

1. In the section regarding Integrating the TSAs, the reference to encouraging member in Reston Association should be removed. The County cannot, and should not give the appearance that it can, deny a rezoning application due to an applicant's unwillingness to join the Reston Association or the RTCA. The County is not authorized to compel membership in a private association as part of a zoning application. The Comprehensive Plan should at most recommend consultation with the Reston Association or RTCA regarding membership without establishing any policy position by the County.