

Planning Commission Meeting
February 17, 2016
Verbatim Excerpt

CSP B-846-03 – RESTON HEIGHTS RESIDENTIAL I, LLC

After Close of the Public Hearing

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I – as you know, I don't often go against staff recommendations when they are very – you know, very strong. And I want to make sure that the – what I will propose is in no way reflective of the quality of – you know, of the staff work. My major reason for what I will propose – and I will be proposing deletion of the proposed Development Condition Number 5, which prohibits, in effect, monument signs along Sunrise Valley Drive. My main – there are two reasons why I'm doing it. One is that, as – the Reston Association Design and Review Board actually has – to be kind, they're very picky as to how they look at these things with signs and lights and so on. And the other one, frankly for me, is a matter of equity in that as I drove here tonight along Sunrise Valley Drive and I went by this property – between – before I reach this property, there are a number of monument signs that were there already to – that exist. And I think placing two or – I don't know how much it – two or three monument signs to identify this property along Sunrise Valley Drive does not, in any way, detract from the quality of the pedestrian experience or the experience that people will have at this develop. So Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CSP B-846-03, subject to – wait – wait a minute – SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS – wait – wait a minute – DATED FEBRUARY 17TH, 2016, except for – WITH THE DELETION OF CONDITION NUMBER 5.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner de la Fe: And Mr. Tompkins, could you – Ben, could you come up and agree that you agree with these development conditions and the change that I just made?

Benjamin Tompkins, Applicant's Agent, Reed Smith, LLP: We agree with those development conditions with the deletion of Condition Number 5.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you.

Commissioner Flanagan: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Well, I think the public hearing is closed.

Commissioner de la Fe: Oh yeah, go ahead.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Yeah, if you-

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead. Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Yeah.

Chairman Murphy: Are you done?

Commissioner de la Fe: Yeah, we're done.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner de la Fe: We're done and I-

Chairman Murphy: Second the motion?

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes.

Chairman Murphy: All right. Mr. Flanagan seconded the motion. Is there a discussion?

Commissioner Lawrence: Mr. Chairman? Just a point of clarification – in voting to support this motion, we would not be in any sort of conflict with the sign ordinance. That is, with this level of specificity about what signs go on what streets is not in the sign ordinance, as I recall. Does staff agree with that recollection?

Nicholas Rogers, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: That's correct. By approving a Comprehensive Sign Plan, the particulars of the plan itself would supersede the typical governing elements of Article 12.

Commissioner Lawrence: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve CSP B-846-03, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

//

(The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.)

JLC