

Planning Commission Meeting  
June 25, 2014  
Verbatim Excerpt

PCA 85-C-088-09/DPA 85-C-088-07/PRC 85-C-088-03 – BLOCK 4, LLC AND RESTON TOWN CENTER PROPERTY, LLC

Decision Only During Commission Matters  
(Public Hearing held on June 11, 2014)

Commissioner de la Fe: Now moving to my second decision, it was also heard on the 11<sup>th</sup> and we deferred decision on that because we had a number of speakers that seem to not have heard about it – the planned actions on this case, even though it had appeared – the case had been discussed at the Reston Land Use Planning and Zoning Committee a number of times. And, frankly, I thought all of the issues at that time had been resolved, but – if you will recall – at the public hearing we had a number of speakers, primarily from the condominium known as Stratford House across the street from the site application, that expressed concern about – you know, a number of things, but primarily the fact that some of the – what is called the linear park along Reston Parkway in front of Reston Town Center – and part of Reston Town Center was being encroached upon. As you will recall – and was brought up at the public hearing – the – there is an approved and site planned development for that site that – the site that was under consideration – which actually encroached on that park a lot further than this development that we are now considering. And after much discussion with the County arborist and the applicant, the – actually, the park will probably be much more useful to the folks that are – you know, because they will have amenities. If I recall, correctly, only one major tree that is in good condition will have to be removed for this development, as opposed to a number of other trees that are being – that are in not as good condition – but all of them will be replaced by almost three times as many trees as are being cut down – so that there is tremendous amount of green space that will be preserved and added to. The one other thing that, in effect, surprised me was that many of these folks said that they preferred the existing parking lot to remain rather than see anything built there. And I don't understand how a parking lot in an urban area so close to a metro station makes much sense. I think the development that is being proposed makes much more sense. It is mixed use. It brings more office space, retail – as well as residential into the last parking lot – surface parking lot at the Reston Urban Core. There were some other changes in the proffers in response to issues that were raised by Commissioners at the public hearing. And so there is a – Proffer 30B was changed to clarify and to – the size of the proposed vegetative roofs so that they would not, under any conditions, totally disappear. Proffer 44 is a new proffer related to bird-friendly design strategies. Proffer 45 is a new proffer related to electric vehicle charging infrastructure. And there is also Proffer 46, relating to recycling of construction and demolition debris waste. Overall, I believe that this is a welcome addition to the Reston Town Center – particularly the urban core. This will probably be the last new development in the urban core. Anything from now on will be redevelopment and I believe that it is in the best interests of everyone concerned to move ahead with this application – or several applications. And I might add that the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee considered this very carefully and recommended approval. And the two negative votes were related to the reduction of the existing green space in the park. And most of the other – or almost all of the other members – acknowledged that there was a reduction. However, the reduction is not as great as what could be

built by – in effect, by what had been approved already – and represented a good addition to it. One thing that I did mention, and commended the applicant on, is that this is the first set of applications that follow the new Reston Area Transit Station Guidelines. The applicant and staff and the Commissioner and, let's say, the County differed as to whether the new guidelines were applicable. Fortunately, the applicant agreed with the County that yes, they were applicable. Therefore, we have TDM strategies, we have 16 percent workforce housing, we have a variety of things that, under the old development, we would not be getting. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSIONER RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA 85-C-088-09, DPA 85-C-088-07, AND PRC 85-C-088-03; SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERED CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JUNE 24<sup>TH</sup>, AND SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS IN THE APPENDIX 2 OF THE REPORT.

Commissioners Hart and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hedetniemi – Ms. Hedetniemi and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Flanagan: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: Yes, I'd like to thank Commissioner de la Fe for including in the proffers – Proffer 46 – about recycling. That is going to be the fourth time an application coming before us will have this proffer language – and the first three having been the – started out with the adapted reuse of the Lorton Prison – the Alexandria Company. And I really think we should – I hope this will become standard operating procedure, actually, in the future, on the part of all of our applications for rezoning or Special Exception. So I'm going to be very pleased to support this motion.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve the three applications, as articulated by Mr. de la Fe, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A MODIFICATION OF SECTION 11-203 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE LOADING SPACE REQUIREMENTS AND A MODIFICATION OF SECTION 13-303 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE TRANSITIONAL SCREENING AND BARRIER REQUIREMENTS, IN FAVOR OF THAT SHOWN ON THE DPA/PRC PLAN.

Commissioners Hart and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: And finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF a waiver – of WAIVER 7067-WPFM-004-1 TO PERMIT UNDERGROUND WATER DETENTION FACILITIES WITHIN A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 6-0303.8 OF THE PUBLIC FACILITIES MANUAL, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN ATTACHMENT A OF APPENDIX 11 OF THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioners Hart and Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart and Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion –

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: - say –

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Sorry.

Chairman Murphy: Let's not get carried away. It's only a motion.

Commissioner de la Fe: You're in a hurry.

Chairman Murphy: Say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: You sure now? As opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank everyone, particularly Ms. Tsai, for working so hard on this application for so long. And I know that she

June 25, 2014

PCA 85-C-088-09/DPA 85-C-088-07/PRC 85-C-088-03

herself is a neighbor of this application site so – but I'm sure that did not, in any way, interfere with her judgment. Thank you.

//

(Each motion carried by a vote of 11-0. Commissioner Sargeant was absent from the meeting.)

JLC