



May 12, 2021

Ms. Megan Nedostup, AICP
Albemarle County Community Development
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902RE:

Re: ZMA2021-004 Breezy Hill

Dear Ms. Nedostup:

We have received your comments dated April 30, 2021 and you will find the individual responses below.

Community Meeting:

1. Please note that the community meeting will take place on May 10th, after the date of these comments. Additional comments may be added based upon that meeting.

Acknowledged.

Growth Capacity and Transportation:

2. The traffic impacts of the proposed development area minimal, although additional traffic will be added to the already congested corridor of US 250. Funded improvements such as the diverging diamond at Exit 124 and intersection improvements at US 250 and Rt 20 (Stony Point Road) will be complete by the time this development reaches buildout and should result in an overall improvement from current conditions in the corridor. Other recommended improvements will remain incomplete for the foreseeable future. This includes various capacity and safety improvements on US 250 between Charlottesville City Line and Black Cat Road which will be impacted by traffic generated by the proposed development. The VOR Master Plan is clear in its statement that "It is essential that all of the US 250 improvements be constructed before new development occurs." The Master Plan directive should continue to be considered even if the specific impact from this proposed development is minimal.

It is our position that several of the items on the recommended improvements are not constructible based upon physical constraints that will not change in the future. VDOT also concurs that those improvements will not be completed in the future. Therefore, if development is precluded at the suggestion of the master plan, this renders the Village of Rivanna Growth Area as undevelopable and no longer a growth area within the County.

Additionally, VDOT stipulates that the estimated traffic impacts of the proposed development are minimal and will not significantly influence the traffic on US 250. VDOT also agrees that the two improvement projects listed above (diverging diamond and

intersection improvements) will improve the US 250 corridor before the project's buildout.

Density:

3. The concept plan states a total of 79 lots, however when counting the lots there are 80. Please clarify and revise as necessary.

The number of lots has been recounted and as you noted, there are 80 lots. The plans and proffers have updated to reflect this.

4. The proposed number of dwelling units (80) and subsequent net density is 1.39 units/acre exceed the recommended density as articulated in the Village of Rivanna Master Plan and as discussed with the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission during the previous application for this property. Net density is recommended in the Development Areas chapter of the Comprehensive Plan for calculating density during the review of rezonings and has been consistently used in other applications.

The words "net density" is not mentioned within the Village of Rivanna Master Plan. The only indication for density is "units per acre". Breezy Hill has a gross density of 1.05 units/acre which meets the suggested density of the Village of Rivanna Master Plan.

5. In addition to the above, a commitment should be made to density proposed, as a major element in the concept plan.

The maximum number of lots will be added to the proffers.

Concept Plan:

6. Environmental Impact: While public roads are permitted under the preserved slope overlay, this is an impact of the development that will be identified in the staff report, as it appears that there is an alternative to provide access to the lots without disturbing the preserved slopes.

Throughout this process, it has been the stated desire of the County and the community to avoid adding traffic from Breezy Hill to Running Deer Drive. We also feel that it is important to minimize the traffic impact from Breezy Hill on Running Deer Drive.

Additionally, the private Hearn Lane does not meet VDOT's public road requirements.

We feel that the impact to the preserved steep slopes represents a smaller impact than the County's suggestion to impact the Hearn Lane and Running Deer neighborhoods which are outside of the growth area.

7. The Master Plan (page 41) recommends a pocket park in this area. Provide more details on the pocket park, what is provided within the park, and size within the plan and/or proffers. The guidelines for pocket parks are outlined in the Appendix of the Comprehensive Plan on page A.11.4 or page 787 when using the pdf (attached).

The location of the proposed pocket park has been added to Sheets 3 and 4. A description of what will be contained in the pocket park has been added to the Proposed Development Standards on the Cover Sheet.

Affordable Housing:

8. The proposed affordable housing policy that is going before the Board for public hearing on June 16th recommends a minimum of 20% affordable units for new development applications. Affordable housing is not being addressed with this proposal. Provide affordable units or a justification as to why affordable housing is not being provided with your application.

This plan was submitted prior to any established affordable house policy. Due to the decrease in the density of the project from 130 units to 80 units with the new application, the applicant is unable to financially support affordable housing in such a low density development. And as such, the applicant chooses to proceed under the policies in place at the time of application.

Virginia Department of Transportation:

1. According to 24 VAC 30-92-60 Paragraph C, the entrance onto Running Deer Drive will have to be full access.

Acknowledged.

2. Will there be an updated version of the previous Traffic Impact Analysis and Proffer Statement?

No. The traffic analysis is not required by the County and the previous versions covers the proposed development adequately.

3. Note that the final plan must show conformance with the VDOT Road Design Manual Appendix B(1) and F, as well as any other applicable standards, regulations or other requirements.

Acknowledged.

Albemarle County Schools:

The subject property is within the Southern Feeder Pattern, and residents of the proposed Breezy Hill neighborhood would attend Stone-Robinson Elementary School, Burley Middle School and Monticello High School. Burley Middle School and Monticello High School both have adequate capacity to accommodate additional students. However, Stone-Robinson Elementary is projected to approach building capacity with will make accommodating additional students difficult.

Acknowledged.

Proffers: Zoning Comments:

1. General Development Plan

- a. The grading plan is not overlayed with the streets and lots. It appears that they will be creating new steep slopes where they cross over the preserved slopes. None of the proposed lots should include newly graded steep slopes. The new steep slopes area should be included in their green space.

The proffers have been updated to indicate that any new steep slopes areas must located outside of the lots.

2. Proffers

- a. I understand that this is on the concept plan and think we should consider having them add the following as a major element "h) Lots must not encroach into any stream buffer, preserved slope and any proposed slopes of 25 percent or greater". I believe this will get to my point above and make sure the newly graded slopes are not on any proposed lots.

The proffers have been updated as requested.

Fire Rescue Comments:

1. Emergency/fire vehicles access road(s)/route(s) need to provide access to all buildings/structures to allow access to all sides of the ground level within 150 feet from the emergency apparatus.
Acknowledged.
2. An emergency/fire vehicle access road/route needs to provide a suitable service to sustain the weight of emergency apparatus up to 80,000 lbs.
Acknowledged.
3. An emergency/fire vehicle access road/route needs to provide an unobstructed travel way of 20 ft. if buildings/structures are under 30' tall and 26 ft. if over 30' tall.
These standards exceed the current VDOT requirements. We will work with Fire Rescue at the final design stage to ensure that current regulations are met.
4. Emergency/fire vehicles access roads need to be clear of overhead obstructions at 13 ft 6 in. and below.
Acknowledged.
5. To ensure that parking does not obstruct the emergency apparatus travel way as described above, no parking signs may be required in appropriate areas.
Acknowledged.
6. Any dead end longer than 150 ft. may require an approved turn around for emergency apparatus.
Acknowledged.
7. May need to provide note of the required ISO fire calculation for the buildings.
Acknowledged.
8. If within a water service area, may need to indicate the latest ACSW flow test to ensure adequate fire flow per calculation in comment #7.
Acknowledged.
9. If within a water service area, may need to provide the required fire hydrants as determined by calculations in #7.
Acknowledged.
10. If not within ACSA service area, may need to provide a note identifying location of closest water source suitable for emergency apparatus operations.

Acknowledged.

As you have discussed with Charlie Armstrong of Southern Development, we would like to move onto the Planning Commission with this resubmission of the plans. Please schedule the meeting in the time frame discussed with Charlie.

Sincerely,

Ammy George, PLA