

Planning Commission Meeting  
July 28, 2011  
Verbatim Excerpt

PRC A-502-02 - FAIRWAYS I & II RESIDENTIAL, LLC

Decision Only During Commission Matters  
(Public Hearing held on July 7, 2011)

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a decision to make – to propose tonight on PRC A-502-02, Fairways I & II Residential, LLC. Mr. Chairman, the first public hearing for this case was held on July 15, 2010. At that public hearing, the staff recommended denial primarily based on its findings that the proposed development was not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood and that the proposed density was at the highest end of the allowed zoning. Although the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee had recommended approval, its endorsement came with a degree of division not usually seen on its recommendations. Of the eight speakers testifying at that time, the majority were opposed. After that public hearing, the Planning Commission deferred its decision in order for the applicant to address the issues raised. In the year since the original public hearing, the applicant worked to redesign its development in order to address the issues raised. The second public hearing on this application was held on July 7, 2011. The revised application reduced the density and changed the configuration of the site design by increasing the number of single-family attached units, eliminating high-rise structures, and one mid-rise – one of the mid-rise buildings. The changes have satisfied staff's major original reasons for recommending denial and it is now recommending approval. The Reston Planning and Zoning Committee again recommends approval on a vote of 11 to 1 and 1 abstention, reflecting its traditional high level of consensus on project recommendations. At that public hearing, the majority of the nine speakers were opposed. Most of the speakers at the second public hearing were the same ones appearing or representing the same organization and at the first public hearing, raising many of the same objections. In addition to the individuals appearing at the public hearings, numerous communications from interested neighbors have been received, mainly in opposition. The issues raised during this second public hearing were similar to the ones raised a year earlier, relating to density, design, and traffic. The redevelopment proposed affects a part of what is traditionally referred to as "Original Reston." The site was developed 40 – over 40 years ago – 40 years ago at a lower density and character than envisioned and zoned. It is totally residential, although part of it – it is zoned to permit commercial. The original proposal included both residential and neighborhood serving retail. The commercial part of the proposal disappeared very quickly in response to community reaction. In keeping with what was developed, it is now recommended to be purely residential. There were requests that this redevelopment await the results of the ongoing study to revise Reston's Master Plan as contained in the County's Comprehensive Plan. We, of course, must base our actions on the current provisions of the Comprehensive Plan, not on what may be in the future. The proposed development is in keeping with the current Plan. Although much has been said about traffic, the principal roads serving this development can handle the additional traffic. The major problem spots relate to the arrival and dismissal times of the elementary school across the street and at the intersection with Temporary Road. The applicant has agreed to provide a traffic signal warrant study and contribute its pro rata share of the cost of the signal if deemed necessary. The issue of site design has been the one

that has raised the most comments. Under Reston's covenants, the Reston Design Review Board has final say on the design of properties, subject to the Reston Association. The DRB has raised numerous concerns and will have final say on what the final redevelopment will look like. However, we have a distinct governmental responsibility – responsibilities and guides. Because of the DRB's ultimate say, we have imposed a development condition that will give us the opportunity to review and approve the final design. The issue of affordable housing has been raised with respect to the redevelopment. Although many refer to the current development as affordable, the fact is that none of the units are under any kind of governmental control. They are all market rate. As part of the redevelopment, the applicant will provide the required number of units for the townhouse portion and the 12-percent workforce units for the rest of the development. I could go on and address a number of other issues. However, as a final point, I would like to remind my fellow residents of Reston of Bob Simon's seventh goal for the community, which to paraphrase is: "Since Reston is being developed by the private sector, it must be financially successful." Here, we are presented with an opportunity to redevelop an aging residential complex by the private sector that meets the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan. I realize that this is not a perfect development. I doubt that there is such a thing. But I believe that it is time to move on. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE PRC A-502-02, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JULY 27, 2011.

Commissioners Hart and Litzenberger: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I further MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A MODIFICATION OF THE LOADING SPACE REQUIREMENT TO ALLOW A TOTAL OF 9 LOADING SPACES INSTEAD OF 10.

Commissioners Hart and Litzenberger: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Litzenberger and Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner de la Fe: Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE PFM TO ALLOW USE OF AN UNDERGROUND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT VAULT IN A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, SUBJECT TO THE DPWES WAIVER CONDITIONS DATED APRIL 21, 2011.

Commissioners Hart and Litzenberger: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart and Mr. Litzenberger. Discussion? All those in favor, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Harsel: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Harsel abstains.

Commissioner de la Fe: And finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE A WAIVER OF THE PFM TO ALLOW PERVIOUS PAVEMENTS FOR PARKING SPACES, WALKWAYS, AND PEDESTRIAN PLAZAS WITHIN A SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD.

Commissioners Hart and Litzenberger: Second.

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

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

//

(The first, second, and fourth motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn and Donahue absent from the meeting from the meeting.)

(The third motion carried by a vote of 9-0-1 with Commissioner Harsel abstaining; Commissioners Alcorn and Donahue absent from the meeting.)

JLC