

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JULY 26, 2018**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Chairman, Springfield District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District
John A. Carter, Hunter Mill District
Julie M. Strandlie, Mason District
Walter C. Clarke, Mount Vernon District
Phillip A. Niedzielski-Eichner, Providence District
Donté Tanner, Sully District
Mary D. Cortina, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: None

//

The meeting was called to order at 7:36 p.m., by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Chairman Murphy announced that tonight's meeting was the final Planning Commission meeting before the August recess. He then stated that the next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 2018.

//

On behalf of the Planning Commission, Chairman Murphy commended the work and dedication of the Commission's staff, which included Jill Cooper, Executive Director; Kimberly Bassarab, Assistant Director; Jacob Caporaletti, Deputy Clerk; Inna Kangarloo, Senior Deputy Clerk; Toni Denson, Planning Technician; and Samantha Lawrence, Deputy Clerk. In addition, he complimented the Commission staff for assisting newly-appointed Commissioners in their roles.

//

On behalf of the Planning Commission, Chairman Murphy commended the Channel 16 staff for their work on Commission meetings and the Planning Commission Roundtable programs.

//

Commissioner Clarke announced that a site visit had been scheduled for the subject property of PA 2018-IV-MV2, 8800 Richmond Highway, for Wednesday, August 1, 2018 at 11:00 a.m. for the Commissioners and County staff. He added that the visit open to the public.

//

Commissioner Migliaccio stated that the Planning Commission had been scheduled to approve the minutes for April 2018 and May 2018, but due to the departure of former Clerk to the Commission, John W. Cooper, he announced his intent to move approval of those minutes at the Commission's meeting scheduled for September 13, 2018. He then requested that Commissioners submit revisions to Jill G. Cooper, Executive Director to the Planning Commission, prior to that date.

//

Commissioner Migliaccio announced that the Planning Commission's Land Use Process Review Committee would meet on Wednesday, September 12, 2018 at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Conference Room of the Fairfax County and noted that the meeting was open to the public. He then stated that the Committee would discuss matters relating to ZMOD, the E-Plan, Public Facilities Manual flex project, and the sign ordinance.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that Tysons Corner had recently celebrated its 50th anniversary, having opened in 1968 with approximately 60 stores. He then noted the growth that the Tysons area had undergone over the past 50 years and commended the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for their role in assisting that growth.

//

RZ/FDP 2017-DR-026 – BENCHMARK ASSOCIATES, LP (Deferral)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Ulfelder: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We had a public hearing scheduled this evening on a zoning/rezoning FDP matter in McLean and we are going to be deferring the public hearing. Therefore, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR RZ/FDP 2017-DR-026 BENCHMARK ASSOCIATES, LP, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF OCTOBER 4TH, 2018.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer the application, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

2232-L17-18 – FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, Springfield Community Business Center Commuter Parking Garage, 7039 Old Keene Mill Road, Springfield, VA 22150

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Migliaccio: And I do have one other item I would like to move tonight. It's 2232 "features shown" application and it's for a commuter parking garage to replace a surface parking lot for, essentially, our slugging community. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF AND FIND 2232-L17-18, LOCATED AT 7039 OLD KEENE MILL ROAD TO BE A "FEATURE SHOWN," PURSUANT TO *VIRGINIA CODE* 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart and the Chair seconds the motion. Is there a discussion? I just have a little discussion. We've been after this kind of park-and-ride on Keene Mill Road for a long time. And it was a plan at one time to do a mixed-use development across the street. It didn't make it but, this made it and I'm very glad that Supervisor McKay and Mr. Migliaccio worked so hard to get this garage there because it is for slugs. I can tell you when you get to the first park-and-ride on Keene Mill Road and Rolling Valley Mall, we were told by WAMATA you couldn't use the slugs you had to get – park there just to use the bus. And we said, "Not in my lifetime." And now we had to put an addition on that park-and-ride. There's still a volume of traffic, even though the parkway runs in sync with Keene Mill Road – lot of cars coming out of Springfield every day going into D.C. and going down to Richmond. So it's a great asset to the community.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Just on that point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank staff and the slugging community because the original design went down the path of not making it slugging friendly. The slugging community very persistent and loud and they come out and said "no, that's not we wanted" and staff listened and changed the design. So that's what we have tonight.

Chairman Murphy: And that's – that's great. And still, when you're in D.C. and you try to pick up some of – you mean you're picking up someone from the slug line, they say Bob's Big Boy. Now Bob's has not been there for fifteen years...

Commissioner Migliaccio: Hold on I'm still...

Chairman Murphy: But it's still mentioned every day like the Washington Monument and that it's nonexistent, but the slugs go there. So thanks, look out for every – and further discussion?

Commissioner Cortina: Just as a long-time slugger, I thank you for working on this as well. I've slugged, I've taken people to the White House slugging before and I still slug, even with kids in the car, we need an extra one to go down the HOVs, so it – it's great. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: Very brief discussion. I think everybody in this room knows what a slug is, what slugging is, what a slugger is – for anybody from out of town, ask a local.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to concur with the "feature shown" determination in 2232-L17-18, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. And that may go down in history as the longest verbatim on a 2232 in the history of the Planning Commission, but it was well worth it.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

PCA 86-C-119-07/DPA 86-C-119-03/PRC 86-C-119-02/PCA 86-C-121-08/DPA 86-C-121-05 – BOSTON PROPERTIES, LP, LLC (Decisions Only) (The public hearing on these applications was held on July 12, 2018.)

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Carter: Okay, so this is – so this is known as Boston Properties. It's PCA 86-C-119-07 and I'll – so I'll just launch into my talk about these. So this is called Reston Gateway. It's located adjacent to the Reston Town Center Metro Station, north of the Dulles Toll Road. The development will create a lively mixed-use community that includes retail and hotel and a variety of residential buildings and office space, including the consolidation of the Fannie Mae offices – about over 800,000 square feet. During the public hearing, which was two weeks ago, several items were discussed and the applicant has revised the proffers to address these items. So in brief, I thought I would just go through these – 1 through 11 and 1 through 12.

- So number one was the full commitment to the road fund. The applicant has now decided that full commitment to the road fund, based on the total development, including WDUs, is now required. So they'll go ahead and do that.
- Second, commitment to the housing fund – a \$3 per square-foot contribution to the housing fund for all of the non-residential development, excluding the approved, but

unbuilt density will be provided. Sixteen percent of the total residential units will be for WDUs, as required, given their density. The income tiers will be reduced and they'll be 70, 80, and 90 percent of AMI, similar to the Crescent project we approved two weeks ago.

- Third, the athletic field. Timing for the provision of the athletic field has been adjusted to reflect the additional time granted to the Board of Supervisors to elect to accept Block J for the performing arts center.
- Four, the performing arts center – The applicant proposes to convey Block J to the Board of Supervisors or other entity for the performing arts center. The proffer for the performing arts center has been simplified, especially to eliminate the former obligations of the Board of Supervisors, such as cost and other things. The County could get Block J within one year of the tenant's departure, rather than only when the applicant is ready to proceed with the site plan. The provision will increase the time from the one year formerly proposed to four years for the Board of Supervisors to elect to accept Block J for the performing arts center. The applicant is also granted an increase in the square footage, which is a reduction in the office density for the performing arts center to fit to 60,000 square feet.
- Public streets. And those four were probably the most-discussed at the last hearing. These next ones are less discussed, but still important. Public streets. The perimeter streets of Sunset Hills Road, Town Center Parkway, Century Street, and the Library Street will be public streets. The internal streets will remain private, consistent with the streets approved in the existing Reston Town Center.
- Six, intersection and public road improvements. The intersection of Sunset Hills and Town Center Parkway will be improved. There will also be improvements along Sunset Hills Road and reflect the recent discussions by FDOT and VDOT.
- Traffic signal. A new traffic signal at the intersection of Founders Boulevard and Town Center Parkway will be provided. Pedestrian bridge – this connects this development to the Town Center across the W&OD Trail. More detail has been added to the pedestrian bridge over the W&OD Trail to ensure a minimum width and review by the DRB – I guess that would be the Town Center Review Board.
- Placemaking and streetscape. This is important, and you're going to see why a little bit later on when we talk about parking – but they have added a proffer to provide for closely-spaced street trees, pedestrian-oriented street lights, and street furniture along the sidewalk, subject to approval by VDOT.
- W&OD Trail improvements. So this is one of my thoughts. We're going to add references to a linear park along the W&OD Trail to reflect how the park fits into a vision of the future for the W&OD Trail. I hope, as we get applications along the W&OD Trail from the Town Center to Wiehle Avenue, we will begin to open up the trail and have more

open spaces along that trail so we have a long, linear park. But we have to work through that application by application to achieve that.

- Parking for WDUs. We went back and forth on this. My first thought was to replicate what we did on, if you remember, the 1801 where the parking was included with the unit and the combination of the unit plus the parking met the WDU requirement. And the last minute, after talking to staff and others, I decided to switch on this one. This one's a little different. The other one was more than a half-mile from the metro station and provided their full parking amount. This case is sitting right on top of Metro station and it has the parking reduction, not just for WDUs, but for everybody. So parking will be unbundled from the units in all cases. So, what we're proposing is – for WDUs, we'll have allocated at least one space at a price discounted at a rate based on the appropriate income tier. So if you're at the 80 percent, your price for the parking will be 80 percent of what the market rate units would pay. That's the difference. A couple other reasons might support this provision – again, because it's unlike the 1801. These are sitting right on top of Metro station. It discourages the use of a car. It has a 45-percent TDM goal, which is very aggressive from my experience. In some of the other areas – Bethesda barely gets to 32. We're up at 45 so that would be difficult to reach, but if you don't reach it, there's a penalty. On-street parking is provided and if you remember in 1801, there was no on-street parking. It was half-a-mile away. Wide sidewalks – and here, again, is my streetscape issue. If the walk isn't comfortable and the sidewalks aren't wide, if the trees aren't there, and the lighting isn't there, you're not going to be encouraged to walk. So for those reasons, I'm accepting – recommending acceptance of this proffer.
- Finally, loading spaces. In addition to the required full-size loading spaces in each building, at least one parking space near the front door of each building and two short-term parking spaces will be provided in the parking garage for service vehicles. So this unbundling and parking, whether you're a market rate unit or a WDU unit, if you're going to the grocery store and you're used to parking on the street, you'll be able to use the short-term loading spaces – take your groceries upstairs, come back down, and relocate your car. Same thing for Amazon and all these other services like that. So that's the gist of what we talked about last time.

Now, what does this project have, going a little farther? Several items I'm going to bring up

- The land use. The mix of uses is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. And this is important to a lot of people. It's a 3.22 FAR rather than the maximum 4.0 FAR. This is still a big project, as you remember from the public hearing. The total mix of low-rise and high-rise apartments will include, again, the 16 percent workforce units.
- Placemaking. Provision of the performing arts center on Block J with a backup provision for the athletic field with an early commitment to open space fund is needed. So, if the performing arts center doesn't work, they will fund earlier all at once the athletic field. So that's a change. A large central park will be the focus of the entire development. Linear open spaces – again, my W&OD Trail project. Spaces include in Phase One four urban parks. These are smaller in nature. In Phase Two, the large central park will be included

and three other parks. Public recreation facilities will include two volleyball courts, multi-age play spaces, bike stations, and flexible lawn area for practice along the W&OD Trail. Private recreation facilities will include dog parks, pool facilities, and a fitness center.

- Transportation and mobility. Number three. A full commitment to the road fund will – again, will be provided, improvement to the roads and the intersection of Sunset Hills Road and Town Center Parkway will be provided and operate when the Fairfax County – within the Fairfax County standards for a level of service. This has become more and more important to me to make sure that’s the case on these. Each of the four perimeter streets – we talked about this – will be public. Internal will be private. The project provides an extensive grid of streets that specifically allows for an alternative to the use of the intersection of Sunset Hill and Town Center Parkway, which is the most heavily-trafficked intersection in this area. Pedestrian bridge connection to – to both the Metro station and across the W&OD Trail. Traffic signal pre-emption devices will be provided for emergency vehicles. We talked about the short-term parking spaces. Bikeways on many of the streets. Traffic management plan, again, that reduces to 45 percent, compared to the more standard development streetscaping.
- And then lastly is environment and energy. It satisfies the stormwater management requirements, provides the required tree canopy, meets the LEED standards – in fact, they might be doing LEED Gold for the Fannie Mae portion of this, Silver for the other buildings, and LEED for residential buildings, vehicle charging stations and the – the buildings are positioned to be able to take care of this daylighting, especially when they’re in the north/south orientation of the grid of streets. So there’s discussion? Otherwise, I’ll go right into the motion. So Mr. Chairman, I request the applicant confirm, for the record, to the proposed PRC condition dated June 26 – we need a date on that.

Mark Looney, Applicant’s Agent, Cooley, LLP: Mark Looney with Cooley, on behalf of the applicant, we’re agreeable to the condition dated June 26, 2018.

Commissioner Carter: Okay, number one...

Chairman Murphy: Please.

Commissioner Carter: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF PCA 86-C-119-07 – have patience with me, there’s a lot of these – DPA 86-C-119-03, PRC 86-C-119-02, PCA 86-C-121-08, AND DPA 86-C-121-05, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JULY 26, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor – I’m sorry, Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: I was one of those who was concerned about the – ensuring that all housing units were – had a parking spot, including – included with their rent when they're on top a Metro station. We're trying to get away from cars. So I'm pleased to see that we're working towards a solution there that they'll be provided equally to everybody with a percentage discount for the workforce units – that we're getting – we're approaching something better. I still feel the whole purpose of having a building on top of Metro is we're trying to get cars off the road, but we're making progress there. However, I am concerned about the reduction of the workforce to 90/80/70 percent. We do have a County policy. And you've – I'm sorry, the Commissioner from Reston has had to negotiate these individually and I – I don't think it's fair to the Commissioner. I don't think it's fair to the staff or to the applicants if we – if the policy is not working, I – perhaps we should revise the policy. So for that reason – and for that reason alone – I plan to vote against this motion. Overall, it looks like a very good project.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion, as articulated by Mr. Carter, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hurley: Nay.

Commissioner Migliaccio: One.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Ms. Hurley's no.

Commissioner Strandlie: I'm abstaining on this. Not present.

Commissioner Cortina: Abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Strandlie abstains. Ms. Cortina abstains. And the Chair abstains, not present for the public hearing.

Commissioner Carter: Okay, number two, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF THE REQUESTED WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS CONTAINED IN THE HANDOUT DATED JULY 26, 2018, WHICH HAS BEEN DISTRIBUTED TO YOU THIS EVENING.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. You okay? Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same division.

Commissioner Carter: I'm being reminded by the – there was another number.

Chairman Murphy: Ms. Hurley changes her vote to aye on that one.

Commissioner Carter: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: Go ahead, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Carter: I need to – there – I WAS JUST REMINDED THERE IS ANOTHER NUMBER THAT IS NOT ON THIS MOTION. IT'S A PRC 86-C-119-02 DATED JUNE 26, 2018.

Chairman Murphy: WITHOUT OBJECTION, that will be added to the motion with the same division.

Commissioner Carter: Yeah, subject to development conditions.

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Carter: Okay. Last one, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THE APPROVAL OF A PARKING REDUCTION REQUEST FOR RESTON GATEWAY, NUMBER 5468-PKS-004-1, PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 5.A, SECTION 11-102 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, BASED ON THE PROXIMITY OF A MASS TRANSIT STATION, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF TO THE – DATED, AGAIN, JULY 26, 2018, WHICH WERE DISTRIBUTED TO YOU THIS EVENING.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, ...you have a discussion?

Commissioner Hurley: Very brief. A very brief discussion. Here, I have the opposite viewpoint on the parking. I just want to ensure we don't reduce the parking so much at these places that the rest of us in the County, like Braddock District, that have no metro stations can't get there – that we will – I want – we all want this to be a successful project and I don't want the restaurants and retail and all that to lose business because the rest of us can't park there.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Ms. Hurley votes aye. Same division, Ms. Cortina, Strandlie, and Murphy abstain, not present for the public hearing.

The first motion carried by a vote of 8-1-3. Commissioner Hurley voted in opposition. Commissioners Cortina, Murphy, and Strandlie abstained from the vote.

The second and third motion carried by a vote of 9-3. Commissioners Cortina, Murphy, and Strandlie abstained from the vote.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Migliaccio established the following order of the agenda:

1. 2232-M18-7 – FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
2. RZ/FDP 2016-HM-017 – JBG/RESTON EXECUTIVE CENTER, LLC
3. RZ/FDP 2017-HM-006 – RP 1111 SUNSET HILLS, LLC

This order was accepted without objection.

//

2232-M18-7 – FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES – Appl.
Under Sects. 15.2-2204 and 15.2-2232 of the *Code of Virginia* to consider the proposal by Fairfax County Department of Public Works and Environmental Services to develop a Temporary Fire Station for the Edsall Road Fire Station located at 5317 Carolina Place, Springfield, VA 22151. Tax Map: 80-2 ((1)) 38. Area I. MASON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

David Stinson, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended that the Planning Commission find that 2232-M18-7 satisfied the criteria of location, character, and extent, as specified in *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2232, as amended.

Commissioner Strandlie pointed out that there had been instances of flooding on the subject property. She then requested additional information regarding the impact that the flooding had incurred on the site and the provisions the applicant would utilize to mitigate the issue. Deepak Bhinge, Building Design and Construction Division, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services, explained that the proposal would not increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and indicated that the stormwater runoff would be directed to an existing drainage ditch located along Industrial Drive. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Strandlie and Mr. Bhinge regarding the past instances of flooding that had occurred on the site and the applicant's awareness of that issue wherein Mr. Bhinge stated that the existing ditch located long Industrial Drive could not be modified due to the presence of utility lines, but noted that the proposal included a swale that would mitigate the runoff generated by the site.

Mr. Bhinge gave a presentation wherein he explained the following:

- The existing Edsall Road Fire Station, which was located to the west of the site, had been constructed in 1974 and included 8,300 square feet of space with three apparatus bays;
- The existing Edsall Road Fire Station was operating with two of the three apparatus bays because one of the bays had been significantly damaged by a fire;
- The site of the existing Edsall Road Fire Station would be renovated with an updated facility that included approximately 14,000 square feet of space and four apparatus bays;
- The subject application would permit the construction of a temporary fire station on the site that would operate while the updated facility was constructed;
- The temporary fire station on the site would consist of three modular trailers that provided approximately 7,000 square feet of space;
- The service provided by Edsall Road Fire Station covered a significant portion of the Alexandria area;
- The existing condition of the subject property consisted primarily of impervious concrete and gravel;
- The subject property could accommodate the temporary fire station without requiring a significant amount of clearing and grading;
- The temporary fire station on the site would contain apparatus bays, living quarters, and offices;
- The construction of the temporary fire station was scheduled for Spring 2019 and would require approximately six months to complete; and
- The construction of the updated facility for the Edsall Road Fire Station would commence upon the completion of the temporary fire station on the site.

When Commissioner Ulfelder inquired as to whether the living quarters at the temporary fire station could accommodate female employees, Mr. Bhinge indicated that the facility would include such accommodations. He added that the updated Edsall Road Fire Station would also contain adequate living quarters for female employees.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that closing remarks from staff were not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Strandlie for action on this item.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a very straightforward application. The County did outreach to the community. The Mason District Land Use Committee has considered this application twice and made a recommendation for approval at the meeting held this Tuesday evening. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank David Stinson and the County staff and the fire department for working on this project. We look forward to having this online very soon. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I CONCUR WITH THE STAFF'S CONCLUSION THAT THE PROPOSAL BY THE FAIRFAX COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES TO CONSTRUCT A TEMPORARY FACILITY FOR THE EDSALL ROAD FIRE STATION AT 5317 CAROLINA PLACE, SPRINGFIELD, VIRGINIA, SATISFIES THE CRITERIA OF LOCATION, CHARACTER, AND EXTENT, AS SPECIFIED IN *VIRGINIA CODE* SECTION 15.2-2232, AS AMENDED. THEREFORE, MR. CHAIRMAN, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION FIND THE SUBJECT APPLICATION, 2232-M18-7, SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORD WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Ulfelder. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to approve 2232-M18-7, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

The motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ/FDP 2016-HM-017 – JBG/RESTON EXECUTIVE CENTER, LLC – Appls. to rezone from I-5 to PDC to permit mixed use development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 3.14 and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the N. side of Sunset Hills Rd. and W. side of Town Center Pkwy. on approx. 13.8 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Office/Transit Station Mixed-Use. Tax Map 17-3 ((1)) 28A, 28B and 28C. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Brian Winterhalter, Applicant's Agent, Cooley, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated July 16, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Mary Ann Tsai, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of applications RZ/FDP 2016-HM-017, but noted that there were outstanding concerns regarding the screening provisions for the parking garages.

In response to questions from Commissioner Hurley, Ms. Tsai stated the following:

- The percentage of dwelling units within the proposed development that were reserved as workforce housing units (WDU) was calculated by utilizing a formula consistent with the existing affordable housing policies prescribed by the County;
- The applicant's provisions permitted flexibility for providing parking to the WDUs, which included the possibility that parking for the development would be unbundled;
- The parking for WDUs would be provided at a discounted rate in the event that the parking for the proposed development was unbundled; and
- The applicant had committed to providing WDUs a designated parking if the parking provisions for the development was bundled with the units.

Referring to Proffer 39B in the revised set dated July 23, 2018, Parking for WDUs, Commissioner Hart pointed out that the applicant's parking provisions for WDUs included language that accounted for a scenario in which designated parking spaces would be provided. He then requested additional information regarding a scenario in which the applicant would not provide such spaces. Ms. Tsai deferred to the applicant for information on that issue. (A copy of the revised set is in the date file.)

Commissioner Hart expressed concern regarding the practice of unbundling the parking provisions from WDUs, noting that the issue had emerged at other developments in Reston. He then stated that such practices would generate scenarios in which the purchase of unbundled parking by residents of WDUs was prohibitively expensive. Commissioner Hart said he favored provisions that ensured a resident of a WDU had access to adequate parking. He also asked why such practices had emerged for WDUs. William Mayland, ZED, DPZ, explained that the proposed development differed from a similar development located near the site because the residential portion would utilize rental units. He then indicated that the County's WDU policy required that parking be provided for the for-sale units, but rental spaces did not include that requirement. In addition, Mr. Mayland stated that the process for determining parking provisions for WDUs in the development was consistent with the one utilized for market rate units. He added that every dwelling unit within the proposed development would have an opportunity to purchase a parking space, but noted that parking for WDU units would be provided at a discount. Michael Davis, Site Code Research and Development Branch, Department of Land Development Services, also explained that the subject property was located near a planned metrorail station, which supported a parking reduction for the proposed development. He then indicated that the unbundling of parking provisions from the dwelling units was intended to permit flexibility for residents who did not utilize a vehicle. Mr. Davis added that unbundling parking with the

dwelling units would create opportunities for residents to save money by removing the cost of a parking space from a unit. Commissioner Hart reiterated his concerns regarding the availability of parking for residents of the WDUs, noting that the types of residents that commonly utilized WDUs would likely require a parking space.

When Commissioner Hart asked about the availability of street parking on the subject property, Ms. Tsai indicated that there were limited opportunities for such parking. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Tsai, with input from Commissioner Carter, regarding the location of publicly accessible parking for residents of the proposed development and the restrictions for parking in those areas wherein Ms. Tsai pointed out nearby commercial developments that could accommodate parking, but reiterated that street parking was limited.

Commissioner Hurley expressed support for permitting parking reductions for developments located near metrorail stations to reduce the need for vehicles and encourage the use of mass transportation. She cited other urban areas in which ownership of a vehicle was not necessary and pointed out that the intent of mixed-use development near metrorail station was to accommodate residents that did not utilize a vehicle. Commissioner Carter added that parking provisions were still necessary for the proposed development, but noted that the proposal included significant transportation demand management provisions and there would be areas within the site that could accommodate street parking. He also noted the challenges associated with permitting a parking reduction and ensuring adequate streetscape features for facilitating pedestrian traffic. In addition, he cited other developments in the County, such as the Reston Town Center and the Mosaic development, that had been subject to similar challenges. Commissioner Carter then expressed support for the applicant's parking provisions.

Bailey Edelson, Applicant's Agent, JBG/Reston Executive Center, LLC, gave a presentation wherein she explained the following:

- The subject property was located within 0.5 miles of the planned Reston Town Center Station at the corner of Sunset Hills Road and Towne Center Parkway;
- The existing development on the site consisted of three office buildings with a total of approximately 420,000 square feet and approximately 40,000 square feet of retail space;
- The proposed development would utilize a floor/area ratio of 3.14, which was consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan;
- The proposed development would add approximately 665,000 square feet of office space, 662,000 square feet of residential space, and 50,000 square feet of additional retail space;
- The subject property was located near the existing Washington & Old Dominion (W&OD) Trail;
- The majority of the existing retail space on the site was occupied;

- The design of the proposed development had been subject to multiple constraints due to the proximity of the Old Dominion easement located to the north of the site and the presence of a stormwater pipe located along the east and south;
- The proposal would develop the central portion of the site with open space;
- The proposal would redevelop the existing office park into a mixed-use development that was consistent with the urban character planned for that area;
- The proposed development included connections to the neighboring mixed-use owned by Boston Properties, LP;
- The proposed development included a road grid that would provide connectivity through the private streets on the site, which had not been required by the Comprehensive Plan;
- The orientation of the proposed development would integrate the site with other neighboring developments;
- The design and architecture of the proposed development was consistent with an urban mixed-use development located near a metrorail station;
- The designs and architecture of the proposed development were intended to address the various need for office and residential use in the area, as determined by the market;
- The designs of Buildings 5 and 6, as identified in the conceptual development plan/final development plan (CDP/FDP), were office buildings intended to provide flexibility for a diverse assortment of commercial tenants;
- The streetscape along Buildings 5 and 6 included streetscape provisions to generate a positive visual impact for pedestrians;
- The designs for Buildings 5 and 6 were intended to complement open space within the site and facilitate pedestrian traffic;
- The building identified as Building 7 in the CDP/FDP would consist of residential development and would be visible along Town Center Parkway;
- The building identified as Building 9 in the CDP/FDP was constructed atop an existing parking garage and included a connection from the existing W&OD Trail;
- The building identified as Building 8 in the CDP/FDP consisted of residential development that would complement into the existing commercial development on the site;

- The open space included with the proposed development was consistent with the guidelines prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan and would provide additional connectivity throughout the site;
- The central area of the proposed development would include a common green and multiple pocket parks located around the perimeter of the subject property;
- The proposed development included linear recreation parks near the residential portions of the site, which also provided connections to the W&OD Trail;
- The common greens open space in the center of the site included flexible features that could accommodate various recreational activities;
- The common greens open space could also accommodate retail kiosks and other community activities, such as an amphitheater;
- The central open space would be surrounded by various retail development, some of which could accommodate outdoor seating areas;
- The central open space included pedestrian connectivity to the residential portions of the development;
- The central open space included areas that could be modified to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle traffic;
- The streets and pedestrian paths throughout the interior of the proposed development would accommodate multi-modal connectivity, but prioritized pedestrian traffic;
- The linear recreation park located near Building 9 would connect to W&OD Trail and the applicant would coordinate with the Fairfax County Park Authority to facilitate that connection;
- The linear recreation park located near Building 9 included flexible recreation areas and limited on-street parking that could also provide supplemental parking for the residential development;
- The pedestrian paths along the northern portion of the site would include bicycle paths with high-visibility markings to promote wayfinding;
- The design for Building 9 included an outdoor plaza to supplement the pedestrian connections throughout the site;
- The proposed development included a shared bicycle and pedestrian connection to Town Center Parkway;

- The bicycle and pedestrian connectivity from the W&OD Trail would include features to improve the visual impact and emphasize the pedestrian-friendly character of the development;
- The residential development on the subject property included through lobbies that provided additional pedestrian connections throughout the site;
- The park areas around the residential portion of the development included open lawn designs and step seating to provide passive recreation areas;
- The park areas around the residential portion of the development included streets that were restricted to emergency vehicles and could accommodate additional recreational features;
- The proposed development included pocket parks along Sunset Hills Road, which would function as a pedestrian entrance to the site and the primary pedestrian path for accessing the planned metrorail station;
- The pocket parks and pedestrian paths located along Sunset Hills Road included spaces for public art, which were intended to improve the visual impact for those accessing the subject property;
- The proposed development included a pocket park located along Town Center Parkway, which was located near the retail areas of the development and adjacent to the neighboring Boston Properties, LP site;
- The pocket parks that would be located along Town Center Parkway also included opportunities for public art;
- The applicant had coordinated with the neighboring development owned by Boston Properties, LP to implement appropriate landscaping and streetscaping provisions; and
- The applicant had conducted significant public outreach for the proposed development and had obtained a recommendation of support from the Reston Design and Review Board and the Reston Planning and Zoning Committee.

When Commissioner Carter requested additional information regarding the availability of on-street parking on the subject property, Ms. Edelson pointed out the multiple location of on-street parking areas, citing areas along the common greens and Sunset Hills Road.

Commissioner Carter pointed out that staff had expressed concern regarding the adequacy of the screening for the parking garage and asked for additional information regarding the applicant's efforts to resolve that issue. Ms. Edelson explained that that the applicant had intended the screening provisions for the parking garages for Buildings 1 and 2 to be consistent with the architectural intent for those buildings. She added that the applicant did not object to further coordination with staff to determine subsequent screening provisions to address those concerns.

Ms. Edelson also noted the functionality of green screen provisions for parking garages at other sites, but acknowledged the concerns that had been raised regarding such features. She indicated that the applicant would coordinate with appropriate organizations to ensure that the green screen provisions utilized on the site were functional. When Commissioner Carter asked whether the garage screening provisions were subject to further review by the Reston Design and Review Board, Ms. Edelson confirmed that there would be such a review during the site plan and permit process.

Replying to questions from Commissioner Tanner, Ms. Edelson said the following:

- The proposed development would include approximately 30 to 35 street parking spaces;
- The street parking spaces within the development were intended to be free, but could be subsequently modified to function as paid or time-restricted spaces in accord with market demand;
- The provisions for the street parking on the site had not been finalized; and
- The applicant had not evaluated the potential for paid parking on the site and the issue of paid parking throughout the Reston area was subject to further study.

Commissioner Tanner requested additional information regarding the price and terms of parking provisions for residents of the proposed development. Ms. Edelson indicated that the market rate for a parking space within the proposed development was approximately \$75 a month, but was subject to fluctuate. In addition, she stated that parking spaces for residents would be provided through an annual lease program, which would be subject to rate increases.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Ms. Edelson regarding the location of on-street parking in relation to the residential buildings on the site wherein Ms. Edelson pointed out the location of the on-street parking in the area, noting that the majority of the on-street parking was on the western side and the northern edge of the site.

When Commissioner Migliaccio asked for additional information on how the WDUs would be distributed throughout the residential portion of the development, Ms. Edelson indicated that the applicant intended to distribute the WDUs throughout each building and the WDUs would not be concentrated within a specific building. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Ms. Edelson, with input from Ms. Tsai, regarding the extent to which that intent was reflected in the proffers wherein Ms. Edelson indicated that the applicant's WDU provisions were consistent with the guidelines prescribed by the County and Ms. Tsai indicated that staff did not object to those provisions.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner requested additional information regarding how the common greens space in the central area of the proposed development would be programmed. Ms. Edelson explained that the final condition of that space would be determined by the property management company on the site. She also described the various types of activities the space

could accommodate, which could include food trucks and live music. She added that the activities for that site would emphasize place-making and responding to the demands of tenants.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner and Ms. Edelson regarding the ability of the trail connection to the W&OD Trail to accommodate bicycle traffic, the markings that would be implemented on that connection, and the features of the linear park on the site that was adjacent to the W&OD Trail wherein Ms. Edelson described the paths that pedestrian and bicycle traffic would utilize to access the subject property, noting that the path to the W&OD Trail would connect with the plaza for Building 9 and the features for the linear park that abutted that trail were limited due to the significant grade in the area.

When Commissioner Carter requested additional information on the features that would be installed within the various open spaces throughout the proposed development, Ms. Edelson described the possible features for those spaces, which included volleyball courts, bocce ball courts, and flexible athletic spaces. She added that the proposed development included two basketball courts that would be publicly accessible and located atop one of the parking garages on the site during off-peak periods.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Edelson regarding the usage of bird-friendly glass for the buildings throughout the proposed development and the provisions utilized in other areas of the county to implement such features wherein Ms. Edelson indicated that applicant was aware of that issue and would coordinate with the architects to address it.

Commissioner Hurley suggested that the street parking provisions that had been cited by the applicant be converted from parallel spaces to perpendicular spaces to accommodate more vehicles. She stated that increasing the availability of parking on the site would address the concerns raised by staff and the Commission regarding the availability of parking throughout the proposed development.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Edelson regarding the accessibility of the lobbies for the residential buildings of the proposed development, the security provisions for those lobbies, and the provisions for restricting the accessibility of those areas during certain times of day wherein Ms. Edelson indicated that the lobbies of the residential areas would utilize 24/7 security services.

When Commissioner Hurley inquired as to whether the residential dwelling units would be for rent or purchase, Ms. Edelson indicated the proposed development would utilize rental units, but the applicant had reserved flexibility to permit the purchase of some units.

Commissioner Hurley requested additional information regarding the pet policies of the proposed development and the presence of pet-friendly features. Ms. Edelson stated that the proposed development would permit pet ownership within the residential buildings and the surrounding area provided multiple opportunities for dog walking, including amenities for dog washing.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Ms. Edelson regarding the number of residential dwelling units that included at least three bedrooms and the number of WDUs that

utilized three bedrooms wherein Ms. Edelson indicated that the number of bedrooms for both the market rate units and the WDUs had not been finalized, but noted that the applicant intended to utilize a variety of configurations, including three-bedroom units.

Commissioner Strandlie aligned herself with concerns from Commissioner Hart regarding the adequacy of the parking provisions for the residential portion of the proposed development, stating that the amount of street parking included with the proposal was insufficient. She also supported revising the applicant's WDU commitment to ensure that residents of WDUs had access to a parking space.

Commissioner Strandlie expressed support for the applicant's efforts to include a mix of recreational facilities for the proposed development. She then suggested that the applicant consider including a tennis court with the development.

Commissioner Cortina voiced support for the applicant's commitment to installing bicycle paths and trail connections with the proposed development. She cited other developments in areas such as Bethesda where such connections generated pedestrian-friendly features and recommended that the applicant pursue policies that adequately activated the plaza areas. Ms. Edelson did not object to those suggestions.

Commissioner Cortina echoed Commissioner Hurley's comments regarding the usage of bird-friendly glass for the buildings within the proposed development, noting the height of the tallest building on the site and the amount of glass that building utilized.

Commissioner Cortina expressed support for the usage of trees atop multiple buildings on the site and recommended that such features be retained. In addition, she said that she did not concur with staff's concerns regarding the feasibility of utilizing green features to screen the parking garage, noting that the orientation of the buildings ensured that such features were feasible. She added that she supported implementing green screening throughout the area and coordinating with prospective applicants to address the concerns of those features. Ms. Edelson added that the technology and maintenance for green screens had improved and were more feasible than previous cases.

Commissioner Cortina said that she supported the applicant's provision to retain portions of the existing vegetation throughout the area to preserve native species.

Commissioner Hart reiterated his concerns regarding the language of the applicant's parking provisions for WDUs, as articulated in Proffer Number 39B, and requested additional information on possible scenarios in which the applicant would not provide parking spaces for the dwelling units. Mr. Winterhalter explained that there was an error in the first sentence of that proffer and the correct version should read, "In the event that the applicant makes reserved parking spaces available for renters or owners of the market-rate units." He then indicated that the intent of the proffer was to account for the possibility that the residential portion of the development implemented a reserve parking system, noting that WDUs would be provided a parking space on the same terms as market rate units. He added that the parking spaces for WDUs would be provided at a discount. In addition, Mr. Winterhalter pointed out that the proposed development would provide 56 surface parking spaces, which was greater than the

amount articulated by Ms. Edelson. He also noted that the proposed development included parking garages for the office development on the site, which would provide supplemental parking provisions during nights and weekends. Commissioner Hart noted the importance of ensuring adequate parking for residents at the proposed development, noting that the cost of parking would incur a greater impact on the residents of WDUs and the usage of street parking was necessary to off-set that cost.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Edelson regarding the possibility that the residential portion of the proposed development would convert from rental units to owned units, the management policies of the development, the maintenance responsibilities for the development in the event that owned units were utilized, and the extent to which the maintenance responsibilities were articulated in the proffer wherein Ms. Edelson indicated that each building within the proposed development would utilize a master association that would be responsible for maintaining common areas and parking spaces.

Commissioner Hart concurred with Commissioner Cortina's remarks regarding the utilization of vegetative screening for the parking garage, stating that such features were feasible, provided the vegetation was maintained.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern regarding the effectiveness of the screening for the parking garages that utilized fins, pointing out that the effectiveness of such features was dependent on the orientation of the observer. He suggested that the applicant incorporate provisions that supplemented the screening for those garages, such as an additional layer behind the fins. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Edelson regarding the garages that utilized fins for screening and the portions of those garages that would be exposed by such features.

Referring to the language in Proffer Number 39B that articulated the parking provisions for WDUs, Commissioner Ulfelder requested for additional information regarding the pricing structure for those spaces. Ms. Edelson indicated that the price for the parking spaces of WDUs would be discounted at a rate proportional to the spaces provided to the market rate units. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Ms. Edelson regarding the process for calculating the rate of a parking space for a WDU, the County policies that determined the cost of WDUs, the income tiers at which the WDUs would be provided, and the possible scenarios in which a parking space for a WDU would be higher than that of market rate units wherein Ms. Edelson stated that the amount by which the cost of a parking space would be reduced for a WDU was consistent with the County's affordable housing policy, adding that the cost for such spaces would not exceed that of market rate units.

Commissioner Ulfelder requested that the applicant provide the Commission with additional information on the method utilized for calculating the cost of a parking space for WDUs.

When Commissioner Tanner asked for additional information regarding the availability of free parking for residents of the WDUs, Ms. Edelson indicated that the parking provisions for the proposed development were higher than the ratio of 1.2 spaces per dwelling unit prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, she said that there would be a greater availability of parking

on weekends and evenings within the garages of the office development, adding that access to those garages was not restricted.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted a rebuttal statement was not necessary. He then called for closing remarks from Ms. Tsai, who declined.

Commissioner Tanner noted the importance of providing adequate parking for development located near metrorail stations while also pursuing the County's goals to reduce the number of vehicles on the roads, adding that such issues would impact similar developments. He also suggested further evaluation of the County's policies regarding parking provisions for development around metrorail stations and parking for WDUs.

Addressing Commissioner Ulfelder regarding the pricing policies for WDU parking spaces, Commissioner Carter indicated that it was the intent of the applicant to provide parking to residents of WDUs at a rate lower than the market rate units regardless of the WDU income tier.

Commissioner Carter expressed his intent to defer the decision only for the subject application.

Commissioner Carter reviewed the provisions, circumstances, and outstanding issues of the proposed development wherein he explained the following:

- The proposed development would be implemented on a site that contained an existing office development, which included structured parking;
- The applicant's commitments included contributions to the Reston Road Fund, the Reston Housing Fund, public facilities, athletic fields, schools, and recreational facilities without exceptions;
- The recreation facilities included with the proposed development included features to accommodate multiple age ranges;
- The dog park areas of the proposed development would be accessible to the public;
- The proposed development included an area for a rooftop basketball court, which could also possibly accommodate a tennis court;
- The applicant's transportation improvements, which included a street grid for the site, would improve the level of service for the overall area;
- The applicant's transportation improvements also included the installation of a new traffic signal at the entrance to the site along Sunset Hills Road;
- The proposed development included significant trails and pedestrian paths that included areas that accommodated bicycles;

- The applicant had reserved an area on the site to accommodate the planned Town Center underpass;
- The applicant's transportation management plan included a 40-percent trip reduction commitment;
- The proposed development included significant features to improve the visual impact of the buildings and establish a sense of place for pedestrians;
- The proposed development included loading spaces and short-term parking areas for the residential development;
- The proposed development included underground bioretention facilities to ensure adequate stormwater management on the site;
- The proposed development included various environmental features, such as preservation of tree canopy, electric vehicle charging stations, and implementation of LEED standards for the buildings; and
- The applicant had committed to coordinating with neighboring property owners to ensure the integration of the pedestrian paths that connected with the planned Metrorail station.

Commissioner Carter said that he favored increasing the amount of street parking to adequately accommodate the parking needs of the residential development, noting the importance of providing parking to residents of the WDUs. He also stated that he did not object to modifying the design of the street parking spaces from parallel to perpendicular to provide increased parking provisions.

Commissioner Carter aligned himself with Commissioner Hart's concerns regarding the adequacy of the fins for screening the parking garage and suggested that the applicant incorporate additional provisions for the garages that utilized fins.

Commissioner Carter requested that the applicant review the issues raised by the Commissioners during the public hearing and provide a response during the deferral period.

Addressing the concerns raised by Commissioners regarding the parking provisions for the WDUs, Mr. Winterhalter indicated that the applicant had coordinated with staff to determine the language of Proffer Number 39B. He then explained that the intent of that proffer was to provide parking for the WDUs on the same terms as those utilized by the market rate units. He also recommended that the County evaluate possible revisions to the existing policies regarding WDUs to articulate the parking standards for such units, adding that Proffer Number 39B required that the applicant comply with such standards. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Carter and Mr. Winterhalter, with input from Commissioner Ulfelder, regarding the appropriate recourse for determining the applicant's parking policy for the WDUs within the proposed development, the potential revisions to Proffer Number 39B, the possibility that the County's WDU policy would be revised, and the method by which the issue had been addressed

at other developments wherein Mr. Winterhalter said that the applicant would coordinate with staff and the Commission to finalize appropriate provisions to address the outstanding concerns for WDU parking.

Commissioner Ulfelder reiterated his concern regarding the process for determining the cost of a reserved parking space for a WDU and indicated that he favored provisions that ensured parking for WDUs would be provided a reduced rate compared to the market rate units. Ms. Edelson stated that providing parking to WDUs at a reduced rate was the intent of the applicant's parking provisions. She then stated that the applicant did not object to modifying the process for calculating the price of parking for WDUs, such as establishing provisions that permitted residents of WDUs to utilize credits to ensure that the cost of parking was below that of the market rate units. Commissioner Ulfelder recommended that the applicant finalize that provision during the deferral period. Commissioner Carter concurred with Commissioner Ulfelder's recommendation, adding that he supported provisions that provided equal opportunities for WDUs and market rate units to secure a parking space.

Commissioner Hurley reiterated her suggestion that the applicant include a commitment to utilizing bird-friendly glass for the proposed development.

Commissioner Hart reiterated his concerns regarding the parking provisions for WDUs, as articulated in Proffer Number 39B. He then pointed out that other similar developments had utilized provisions that specified the rate at which parking for WDUs would be provided and suggested that the applicant evaluate such options during the deferral period.

Commissioner Cortina pointed out the extent to which the need to provide parking provisions had impacted development throughout the County and stated that she did not support increasing the parking with the proposed development because it would negatively impact the pedestrian paths and streetscape features. She then stated that she favored the applicant's proposed parking provisions.

Commissioner Strandlie said that she endorsed efforts to reduce the number of vehicles on the roads, but noted the challenges associated with such efforts because portions of the County were not accessible without a vehicle. She also requested that the applicant provide additional information on how the parking provisions in the existing office development would be utilized.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Carter and Ms. Edelson, with input from Chariman Murphy, regarding the amount of time needed to address the outstanding concerns raised by the Commission, the timeframe for the Board of Supervisors' public hearing for the subject applications, and the methods for addressing the issues associated with parking for the WDUs wherein Ms. Edelson indicated that the Board's public hearing for the proposal had not been scheduled.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Carter for action on these cases.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Carter: I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER FOR DECISION ONLY, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENTS, FOR RZ/FDP 2016-HM-017 AND PARKING REDUCTION AND STUDY NUMBER 4417-PKS-001-01 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF SEPTEMBER 13TH.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of the motion? Mr. Ulfelder.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Yeah, we've loaded up September 13 pretty considerably.

Chairman Murphy: What do we have?

Commissioner Carter: Do we have 12 – is that the Thursday?

Commissioner Ulfelder: We have some deferrals that we're going to announce.

Chairman Murphy: Okay, what...

Commissioner Clarke: Two – one decision only and one for application review.

Chairman Murphy: Jill, what – we have – I'm sorry.

Jill Cooper, Executive Director, Planning Commission: It's okay for a decision.

Chairman Murphy: Decision only? Okay.

Commissioner Ulfelder: Okay.

Chairman Murphy: All those in favor to – of the motion to defer decision only on RZ/FDP 2016-HM-017 to a date certain of September 13th, with the record remaining open for comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The Commission went into recess at 9:53 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 10:05 p.m.

//

RZ/FDP 2017-HM-006 – RP 1111 SUNSET HILLS, LLC –

Appls. to rezone from I-4 to PDC to permit mixed use development with an overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.50 and approval of the conceptual and final development plan. Located on the S. side of Sunset Hills Dr., approx. 980 ft. E. of its intersection with Michael Faraday Dr., on approx. 9.72 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Office. Tax Map 18-3 ((6)) 8. HUNTER MILL DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Scott Adams, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP, reaffirmed the affidavit dated July 13, 2018.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

William Mayland, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of applications RZ/FDP 2017-HM-006.

Mr. Adams gave a presentation on the subject applications wherein he explained the following:

- The proposal would permit a mixed-use development on the site, which was located in close proximity to the Wiehle-Reston East Metrorail Station;
- The proposed mixed-use development included transportation improvements and publicly accessible amenities;
- The applicant had coordinated with neighboring sites to ensure that the development and the road network was sufficiently integrated with the surrounding area;
- The proposal included transportation improvements that would complete the planned grid of streets for the area and would connect Reston Station Boulevard with Sunset Hills Road;
- The implementation of a street grid on the site would improve the operation of the existing office development on the site, which was fully leased and heavily dependent on vehicles for access;
- The proposed mixed-use development would be consistent with the character of a transit-oriented development located near a metrorail station;
- The proposed development included a pedestrian path with streetscaping features that connected with the Wiehle-Reston East Metrorail Station;

- The proposal included a right-of-way dedication to accommodate the planned South Lakes overpass;
- The proposed development included a one-acre area of publicly-accessible open space that complemented the neighboring development;
- The open space included with the proposed development would accommodate a variety of uses, such as a tot lot play area, a publicly-accessible dog park, a fitness station, seating areas, and an unprogrammed rectangular grass field;
- The proposal included a commitment to providing workforce housing units (WDU) consistent with those prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan;
- The applicant's WDUs would be provided at income tiers of 70, 80, and 100 percent of area median income (AMI) with an emphasis on providing units at the lower income tiers;
- The applicant had reserved 25 percent of the WDUs within the proposed development as 2 to 3 bedroom units;
- The applicant's affordable housing commitment included a provision to provide parking for WDUs at a discounted rate;
- The parking provisions for the proposed development would be unbundled, which was intended to provide flexibility for residents that did not own a vehicle; and
- The WDU's in the proposed development would be provided a parking space at a reduced cost commensurate with the percentage of reduction in rent or sale price of the unit.

Commissioner Carter expressed support for the language the applicant had utilized for determining the cost of a parking space for a WDU, which was articulated in Proffer Number 8, Vehicle Parking, in the revised set dated July 26, 2018. (A copy of the revised set is in the date file.) Commissioner Ulfelder also endorsed the language the applicant had utilized and recommended utilizing similar language in other developments.

Continuing his presentation, Mr. Adams stated the following:

- The applicant's provisions for providing parking to WDUs was consistent with the County's affordable housing policy and the County's goals to reduce the demand for vehicles within transit-station areas;
- The proposed development would improve the overall character of the surrounding area; and

- The Board of Supervisors' public hearing for the subject applications was scheduled for Tuesday, July 31, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner asked whether the screening provisions for the parking garage on the site had been finalized, noting that there were multiple versions of the screening included within the conceptual development plan/final development plan in the staff report. Mr. Adams explained that the applicant would consider multiple options for screening the parking garages in the proposed development. He then stated the applicant's commitments to screening the garages was articulated in Proffer Number 23, Architectural Design, which included provisions to accommodate the inclusion of public art that would improve the visual impact for pedestrians along Reston Station Boulevard. In addition, Mr. Adams said that the applicant would coordinate with the Office of Community Revitalization to determine the final design of the screening features for the parking garages. He added that the applicant favored the usage of vegetative screening features for the garages, pointing out that such features included materials that could accommodate an irrigation system to support the vegetation.

Commissioner Hurley expressed support for the inclusion of a publicly-accessible dog park with the proposed development. She then requested additional information on the maintenance responsibilities of that dog park. Mr. Adams indicated that a private maintenance service would be utilized for the dog park and the cost of that service would be shared among the various buildings throughout the area. He added that the commitment for such services was articulated in Proffer Number 5, Declarations/Owners Associations.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hurley and Mr. Adams regarding the portion of the dwelling units that would be reserved as WDUs, the portion of the WDUs that would utilize 2 to 3 bedrooms, and the income tiers at which the WDUs would be available wherein Mr. Adams said that 25 percent of the WDUs would be reserved as 2 to 3 bedroom units.

Commissioner Hart pointed out a typographical error in the second paragraph of Proffer Number 8, Vehicle Parking, noting that it should read, "Prior to site plan approval for Land Bay A, the Applicant shall request designation by VDOT of one (1) on-street parking space on Reston Station Boulevard as short term or loading parking." Mr. Adams acknowledged the error and did not object to the correction.

When Commissioner Hart asked for additional information regarding the applicant's recourse if the Virginia Department of Transportation denied the request to designate one on-street parking space on Reston Station Boulevard as short term or loading parking, Mr. Adams indicated that the space would be utilized as a standard on-street parking space. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Adams regarding the operation of short-term parking compared loading spaces and the extent to which the County had defined such spaces wherein Mr. Adams indicated that the spaces would function in a similar manner.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that the proposed development included an option to implement a senior housing use with a majority independent living component, subject to the approval of a single-issue proffered condition amendment (PCA), as articulated in Proffer Number 6b, sub-section ii, number 7. He described the differences between independent living facilities for seniors and assisted living facilities, noting that there was a greater need for parking with

independent living facilities. Commissioner Hart then stated that the language Proffer Number 8, Vehicle Parking, specified that the applicant reserved the right to pursue further parking reductions and shared parking arrangements without obtaining a final development plan amendment (FDPA). He asked whether an FDPA would be necessary if additional parking were required for an independent living facility. Mr. Adams explained that the criteria for requiring an FDPA were articulated in Proffer Number 2, Elements of CDP, and the applicant was required to provide parking for whatever use was determined for the proposed development at the rate prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance. He then indicated that approval of a single-issue PCA would only be required if the applicant pursued a continuum of care project that utilized a significant independent living component, which would exceed the 50-percent cap on residential uses in a Planned Development Commercial District (PDC). Mr. Adams confirmed that an FDPA would be included with such a PCA to ensure adequate parking provisions.

Responding to questions from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Adams stated that the WDUs would be distributed evenly throughout the multi-family residential building within the proposed development.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Migliaccio and Mr. Mayland, with input from Mr. Adams, regarding the timeframe for the Board of Supervisors' public hearing for the subject applications and the extent to which the Commission's public hearing for the proposal had been deferred wherein Mr. Mayland said that the Board's public hearing for the proposal was scheduled for July 31, 2018.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the applicant's method for calculating the cost of a parking space for a WDU was determined by utilizing a progressive tier that was proportional to the AMI range for the units. He then noted that such a method ensured that the cost of parking for residents of WDUs at 70 percent AMI was lower than the cost for residents at 100 percent AMI. Mr. Adams concurred with that statement, indicating that the intent was to provide parking at a rate consistent with the income tier of the WDU.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Ulfelder and Mr. Adams regarding the location of the planned South Lakes bridge wherein Mr. Adams noted that the bridge would be located on the eastern side of the property line and adequate space for that bridge had been reserved, adding that the applicant would implement streetscaping on the portion of the bridge that connected with the site.

Commissioner Ulfelder pointed out that the County had been evaluating possible revisions to policies regarding continuing care communities to discern when a facility was classified residential or commercial. He then asked whether such revisions would impact staff's evaluation of the subject applications. Mr. Mayland acknowledged that such revisions to the County's policy were under review, noting that such revisions would identify continuing care communities as a commercial use. He then said that such a use was appropriate within a PDC District. Mr. Mayland explained that the language of Proffer 27d established that medical care facilities were considered commercial uses whereas independent living facilities were considered residential uses, noting that such determinations were consistent with the existing policies prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the applicant could pursue a minor variation application to permit a continuing care facility if those policies were modified,

which would also require an FDPA to determine whether a continuing care facility was a commercial or residential use under those revised policies.

Commissioner Cortina recommended that the open space of the proposed development be integrated with an independent living or senior care facility if the applicant pursued such an option. She then noted the importance of providing senior residents with opportunities to remain active.

Commissioner Cortina pointed out the importance of including connectivity between the proposed development and the Washington & Old Dominion Trail (W&OD). She then requested additional information regarding the applicant's provisions for providing such connectivity. Mr. Adams said that the proposal included bicycle lanes, which would be present on Reston Station Boulevard and the planned overpass. He then stated that the lanes would connect with those located on Sunset Hills Road. Mr. Adams also pointed out that there were pending redevelopment efforts to the west of the subject property that included the installation of bicycle lanes along Michael Faraday Drive, which would provide additional connections to the W&OD Trail.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response; therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Carter for action on these cases.

(Start Verbatim Transcript)

//

Commissioner Carter: Okay, I'm going to go over some of the things we didn't see. I guess we don't have a graphic that shows...

Commissioner Hart: Is your mic on?

Commissioner Carter: ...shows all of these projects together. Do we have that? Well, there are four projects along here. Two of them have been approved and you're going to see the last one in September 13th. So this – they're all together and I've been impressed with my fellow Commissioners, if I can say that as part of the verbatim here. The amount of work to improve these projects is – is really good and one project kind of builds off another so – so even though the ones that went earlier, they're not compromised in any way. So – and they're – well, I'll just go on. Let's see. So contributions, I'll do that again – full commitment to the road fund, full commitment to the housing fund, despite the reduction in the tiers – full commitment to the park fund. The closest park is – if you remember the Crescent, there is a purchase of property down there at Hunter Mill and Sunset Hills. That probably is one possible place to spend the money. Full commitment to the school payment. The open spaces – while this applicant is showing a certain space, but those spaces are shared and there are other ones. They're shared across all four of these, so they're not duplicated necessarily. Again, my famous – favorite thing, active sidewalk along Reston Station Boulevard. You have the large park on the south side, which is good for similar access, and then the pathway that it – that extends from Reston Station

Boulevard to the large park. Reston Station Boulevard will be a public street, two moving lanes and two parking lanes for its full length, except where it meets Wiehle Avenue. It'll be three lanes there from Wiehle Avenue to Sunset Hills. So the question about the bike and the bikeways – it will be continuous along there. Once you get, at least, to Sunset Hills, you'll be able to move down and across to the W&OD Trail. There then is a parallel private street along the whole length, parallel to Reston Station Boulevard and close to the W&OD Trail there. Traffic signal pre-emption devices for emergency vehicles are – what's becoming a standard condition – the two short-term parking spaces in the garage, the space in front of the building as well as the normal loading docks. Transportation management plan – although at 30 percent, this time. Again, the streetscaping and placemaking comments. We asked for a bump-out in front of the parking garage that the – this – there's only about 9 or 10 feet there so far. And that's in the proffer, so they will extend that out for a short distance and some on-street parking will go. And then you'll be able to get the trees and the lights. That parking garage there is 180-feet long. I'm sure we all realize this, but these projects are not like moving living room furniture around. These are big, big projects, so the spaces are quite large. Let's see – WDU parking, I think we've gone over that. Environment and energy, there's bioretention areas and underground facilities. The tree canopy is provided. LEED standard for the residential buildings – and the green wall plants, particularity on the southern side of the parking garage. Solar access – again, that open space is on the south side – charging stations. And then my last comment, Proffer 27 and 34 requires coordination with adjacent properties for construction on Reston Station Boulevard – Boulevard from Wiehle Avenue to Sunset Hills. And also, there's a sound wall – a pretty extensive sound wall along this whole length. Again, we want the width of the street to be consistent – on-street parking, bike lanes, sidewalk areas, and the design of the streetscape elements. So that concludes my thoughts and I'm ready to make a motion. I request the applicant confirm, for the record, their agreement to proceed to what the proposed FDP conditions.

Scott Adams, Applicant's Agent, McGuireWoods, LLP: We agree to the conditions. I'm assuming you're referencing the ones dated July 26th, 2018 [sic].

Commissioner Carter: Okay, number one, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE RZ 2017-HM-006 AND THE CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED JULY 26, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Migliaccio: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Mr. Migliaccio.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Just, very briefly, because we don't get this very often, I want it on verbatim – just to commend the applicant for the 25 percent of the WDUs for 2 to 3 bedroom because if we don't point this out, we may not get it in the future. So I just want to make certain that if you did it on this one, you can do it again. Thank you.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Since we're making comments, I also wanted to commend the applicant and all the applicants in this set of developments. The – for the – for working together to optimize the quality of the development along Sunset Hills here. I would love to have you convince our Tysons developers to engage in the same type of activity, so that, you know, they would all benefit, as I think you benefit, from having this coordination of – trying to provide a quality of a development that we really want to have in Tysons. I commend you for what you've accomplished here.

Chairman Murphy: And I want to compliment the applicant for not having a 40-minute slide presentation.

Commissioner Migliaccio: That's on the verbatim.

Chairman Murphy: On the verbatim. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve RZ 2017-HM-006, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Carter: Okay, next I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDP 2017-HM-006, SUBJECT TO THE PROPOSED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 2 AND DATED JULY 10TH, 2018, WITH A CORRECTION TO CONDITION NUMBER 1 TO REFLECT 41 SHEETS INSTEAD OF 28 SHEETS IN THE CDP/FDP.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDP 2017-HM-006, subject to the Board's approval of the rezoning and the conceptual development plan, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Carter: INCLUDED IN THOSE MOTIONS WAS THE TYPO CHANGE THAT COMMISSIONER HART TALKED ABOUT.

Chairman Murphy: Right.

Commissioner Carter: And finally – well, not finally. We have, still, two more. I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO THE BOARD OF

SUPERVISORS – APPROVAL OF THE WAIVERS AND MODIFICATIONS CONTAINED IN THE HANDOUT DATED JULY 25TH, 2018.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner. Is there a discussion? All those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Carter: Okay, then – separate from taking action on the RZ/FDP – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH STAFF AND RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF A PARKING REDUCTION REQUEST FOR 11111 SUNSET HILLS ROAD NUMBER 9867-PKS-001-1, PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 5A, SECTION 11-102 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, BASED ON THE PROXIMITY OF A MASS TRANSIT STATION, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF, AS OUTLINED IN THE MEMORANDUM FROM STAFF OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DATED MAY 25TH, 2018 AND REVISED MAY 29TH, 2018 AND CONTAINED IN APPENDIX 17 OF THE STAFF REPORT FOR RZ 2017-HM-006.

Commissioner Niedzielski-Eichner: Second.

Commissioner Carter: Is that enough?

Chairman Murphy: What? Seconded by Mr. Niedzielski-Eichner, whether he likes it or not. Forgive me if I don't repeat the motion. All those in favor of all that, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Each motion carried by a vote of 12-0.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:53 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman
James T. Migliaccio, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office,
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: February 6, 2019

Jacob Caporaletti

Jacob L. Caporaletti, Clerk to the
Fairfax County Planning Commission

