



TOWN OF WARRENTON

Department of Community Development

PO BOX 341
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20188
<http://www.warrentonva.gov>
TELEPHONE (540) 347-1101
FAX (540) 349-2414

July 19, 2024

John Foote/Jessica Pfeiffer
Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh
4310 Prince William Parkway, Suite 300
Prince William, VA 22192

Re: ZMA 2023-01 Zoning Map Amendment Application for R-PUD - Warrenton United Methodist Church/Hero's Bridge - Second Round Agency Comments

Dear Mr. Foote/Ms. Pfeiffer:

The attached comments are for the above referenced application that was officially accepted as of this date, December 21, 2023.

| REFERRAL AGENCY COMMENT SUMMARY | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|--|----------|
| Referral Agency | Date | Outstanding Issues | Attached |
| Planning | 7/19/24 | Multiple; incorporates Town Attorney | X |
| Zoning | 07/2/24 | Multiple | X |
| PW/PU | 7//24 | Offsite stormwater facility; hydrology and flooding; existing water/sewer lines; parking; water and sewer capacity | X |

General overall comment is the zoning request is a land use decision and, if approved, an entitlement to the property that runs with the land. The application should distinguish between the mission of the property owner and applicant vs the property entitlement in case there is a different property owner in the future.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at (540) 347-1101 X313 if you have any questions. Staff is available for post comment review meeting, if desired.

Respectfully,

Denise M. Harris, AICP
Planning Manager



TOWN OF WARRENTON

Department of Community Development

PO BOX 341
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20188
<http://www.warrentonva.gov>
TELEPHONE (540) 347-1101
FAX (540) 349-2414

PLANNING STAFF COMMENTS

DATE: July 15, 2024

SUBJECT: ZMA 2023-01 Zoning Map Amendment Application for R-PUD - Warrenton United Methodist Church/Hero's Bridge – Second Submission Agency Comments

General

Va. Code section 57-8 et seq. pertains to any encumbrance or conveyance of a church property requires the execution of a deed by all trustees appointed by the Circuit Court at the request of church authorities. The submission includes the signed affidavit's from two trustees; however, the a copy of the latest appointment order is needed to ensure the rezoning application is authorized. Please provide.

The Statement of Justification states that residents are screened for barrier crimes, sex offenses, and active drug use (page 4 of 6, #7), however those restrictions are not enforceable unless proffered.

The Applicant clarified the unit type in Proffer 2.a.i and the cover letter at page 4, stating that the units are duplexes, however R-PUD doesn't allow duplexes. The Council can craft a waiver for this provision, but it adds to the impression that this proposal is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan. This impression is increased by the failure to include any residential uses permitted in the underlying base zoning district and by the failure to provide more than one dwelling type.

As worded, Proffers 2.b. and 2.c. make no commitments, merely referencing what the small office/community center and the multipurpose recreational center "may include."

In the cover letter, at pages 5-6, the Applicant disclaims any ability under applicable law to limit residency to veterans. Despite this, the Application contains many references to services to veterans – even though the Applicant admits that it has no ability to limit its services to that population. The Applicant has offered no age-restricted covenant to be recorded as a property restriction. Virginia Code § 36-96.7 (A) provides for three different ways to lawfully limit housing for older persons, and the Applicant has not indicated which it seeks to use. There is a reference to age 65, but § 36-96.7 does not offer that as an option. One provision of Section 36-96.7, namely (A) (iii), merely requires one person 55 or older to occupy a unit, and the other occupants can be of any age.

Please call out the bicycle rack identified in the proffers in the plans. Or revise proffer 14 to remove the reference to the plans.

There is no commitment to build Phase II in the proffers. In the cover letter on page 3, Hero's Bridge proposes but does not commit to any staffing levels, rendering any discussion about services irrelevant to consideration of the rezoning.

The Statement of Justification at page 3 says that "few of Hero's residents will have cars," but offers no support for such a statement. Other such observations could be made, such as the limited amenities, the failure to proffer against spillover lighting, and the lack of a commitment to screening for illegal drug use, and all these observations lead to one key question. The Application speaks to the mission of the applicants; however, please keep in mind this is a land use entitlement request that runs with the land. If approved, what would happen to the residential units should the church or non-profit cease to be involved in the land?

Please clarify the "portion" of GPIN 6984-16-5101 being proposed to be rezoned. Will this create a split zone parcel or is the Applicant proposing a different solution. Staff recommends the entirety of a parcel be contained in a rezoning request.

The Applicant should carefully review the Zoning Ordinance to ensure all waivers and modifications requests are captured.

Please provide information regarding the existing Special Use Permit for the Planning Commission and how it relates to the current proposal.

Plan Warrenton 2040

The subject parcel is located outside of the Character Districts and is designated as Medium Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map. Below are excerpts from the comprehensive plan that relate to this designation.

"This designation includes single family detached residential dwellings at densities up to five dwellings per net acre, contingent upon pedestrian and vehicular access, compatibility with surrounding properties and mitigation of potential impacts."

"The designation of medium density residential is also applied to established residential neighborhoods which should be conserved and/or expanded in a manner similar to, and compatible with, the existing surroundings. Many neighborhoods in these areas have older homes and are characterized by mature vegetation and social interaction between neighbors. Medium density areas are intended to permit densities of up to five dwelling units per net acre, and new lots within established subdivisions should contain an area that approximates the size and configuration of existing lots in the neighborhood. The higher densities should be considered as more appropriate near major thoroughfares and commercial areas. Recreational facilities and other neighborhood amenities should be provided in developments when densities exceed three units per net acre."

"New subdivisions and lots within this designation should complement and enhance the area in which it occurs. Residential infill areas should be compatible in density, lot size, and placement of structures on the lots with existing neighboring structures and lots. The exterior elevations of the structures should complement and respect the surrounding neighborhood's existing design and architectural elements."

“Retaining the high quality of established neighborhoods is a continual challenge. Since the low density and the medium density areas are a desirable place to live, they are becoming attractive for infill development. The medium density residential areas are located so as to protect the character of existing neighborhoods and to provide quiet residential area attractive for single family housing. Where site characteristics permit and where negative impact to adjacent properties is minimal, non-residential, home occupations and businesses may be permitted as provided for in the Zoning Ordinance. Mature vegetation should be retained.”

“In order to support the goals and objectives of medium density residential areas, the Plan seeks to preserve the integrity of existing residential neighborhoods; limit and discourage incompatible uses into established residential neighborhoods; and maintain and improve neighborhood qualities by eliminating substandard housing and improving its physical features that include streets, sidewalks, street lights, and other public improvements.”

For existing zoning districts, the comprehensive plan states for R-10 zoning “Single-family, detached homes and limited groups are allowed. Limited service uses are allowed with a special use permit. This zone allows for smaller lot sizes and setbacks than R-15.” It goes on to recommend “Bungalow Court to be allowed by-right and ADUs by special permit.”

Bungalow Court is defined in the Housing Section under goal H-1.1 as “a series of small, detached structures providing multiple units arranged to define a shared court that is typically perpendicular to the street. The shared court takes the place of a private rear yard and is an important community-enhancing element.”

Staff Comment:

Please update the Statement of Justification to address these components of the comprehensive plan and address how the Concept Development Plan and elevations meet the comprehensive plan goals. Of particular concern is the varying descriptions of the rezoning proposal makes it is impossible at this time to determine if the application is in conformance with the Future Land Use Map Medium Density designation that states up to 5 dwelling units per acre. Please advise as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment may be required with the rezoning application.

Update: The resubmission states the Application meets the medium density identified in the Comprehensive Plan. There are no elevations included in the Concept Development Plan resubmission to assess if the proposal meets attractive infill development that protects the existing character if the neighborhood.

Transportation and Circulation Goals

Sullivan and Church Street are designated as Neighborhood Streets in the Warrenton Street Typology. Desired multi-modal improvements of the Complete Street in Plan Warrenton 2040. Include sidewalks as the highest priority element with street trees, slow design speeds, bicycle facilities, and traffic calming.

Transportation goals include:

T-1: Improve multi-modal capacity and safety that encourages trips by walking, bicycling, and transit.

T-2 Enhance the Traveling Experience by Creating Great Streets.

T-3 Promote livability in the Town by creating great places for residents and visitors to feel welcome and safe.

T-4 Provide an Equitable and Connected Multi-Modal Network.

Moser Road to Frazier Road is listed as a priority project segment requiring improvement with "Significant Benefit."

Staff Comment:

The Applicant should review these goals and address them in the resubmission. In addition, the Applicant should further explain the provided bus/van service, how it will be utilized, and if infrastructure (shelters, etc) will be provided for it. Likewise, the Statement of Justification indicates "daily visits from social workers, assistance with veterans' benefits, visitors. The Applicant states there will be a total of 947 vehicle trips per day, an increase from the estimated current volume of 182 trips per day generated by the church. This is a substantial increase on neighborhood streets with no proposed improvements.

Update: The Town has a goal of walkability. While the resubmission addresses sidewalks to the west of the property, it does not include sidewalks around the entire proposed R-PUD. There remains concerns about the amount of new traffic this site may generate. Although the Applicant states few residents will drive, there is nothing to substantiate this statement leaving staff to use the ITE Trip Generation manual to determine potential outcomes. Assuming the Applicant will guarantee in some fashion the age restriction, the following is an example from the 9th Edition of the ITE Trip Generation Manual (there are newer editions of the ITE Manual that should be utilized):

- Senior Adult Housing – Attached Average Rate 3.44 Per Dwelling Unit
- Church 1000 square feet Average Rate 9.11
- Private School (K-8) for the SUP Approved Private Pre-School Needs to be Calculated on number of students and employees.
- Office General/Medical/Community Center needs to be developed on number of employees and square footage.
- Recreational Community Center please determine appropriate category and trip generations for proposed use.

Please reference how the vehicle trips were developed and the break down of proposed uses with peak hours in more specificity to be reviewed.

Community Facilities Goals

The Community Facilities chapter of the comprehensive plan speaks to both public and private investments to ensure a high quality of life.

CF-1: Serve as the central, inviting public service center for Town and County residents with a proportionate share of community services provided by other governments, including a fair and reasonable balance in funding sources for community facilities.

CF-2: Public safety services and policies are viewed as amongst the best in similar Virginia towns for the responsiveness, community trust, and effectiveness.

CF-3: Green infrastructure and sustainability are incorporated into community facilities to promote energy efficiency and environmental protections.

CF-4: Ensure healthy, safe, adequate water and wastewater services.

Staff Comment:

The Applicant seeks to locate a residential development near community facilities. Specific to the site, the Applicant needs to assess how emergency service vehicles will access the units, the existing infrastructure and water pressure requirements for fire suppression, and the, as proposed, off-site stormwater facility. The Applicant should consider bringing all associated parcels into the proposal for a proper PUD. Please address.

Update: The Applicant widened the trail to 20' to accommodate emergency services. The water and sewer capacity remains a key issue that needs to be addressed at this time. Public Utilities needs an assessment of the impacts this proposal may have above the by-right capacity.

Housing Goals

The Housing Chapter's vision states *"In 2040, Warrenton will have inclusive and attainable housing for all ages, incomes, and needs that is compatible with existing Town character to create walkable communities with shared open space and a sense of place."*

Existing housing stock is improved and maintained to preserve established residential neighborhoods, while expanding housing options in Character Districts to ensure that the Town supports infill development that contributes to the Town's small town feeling where neighbors know their neighbors."

The Housing Chapter goals state:

H-1.1: Encourage development of the "Missing Middle" housing types beyond traditional single family homes, townhouses, and apartments by updating the Zoning Ordinance to create a beneficial mix.

H-2: Character Districts will accommodate a balance of available housing typologies that are compatible to existing neighborhoods in scale, character, and transition.

H-3: Preserve existing neighborhoods and promote infill that supports the character and heritage of Warrenton.

H-3: Preserve existing neighborhoods and promote infill that supports the character and heritage of Warrenton.

H-4: Create regional partnerships to address and enhance attainable housing supply.

Staff Comment:

As stated above, bungalow courts, as defined in the Housing Chapter, are recommended as a potentially appropriate land use in R-10. However, the Zoning Ordinance has not yet been updated to incorporate this. The Applicant is proposing a form of goal H-4; however, it is unclear who will maintain control of the property the residential units will be built upon. Likewise, it is unclear who is responsible for the building and maintaining of the community building or where the proposed senior services will be provided on site (e.g. the offices, the community building, the church, etc). Finally, the Applicant should take into account the existing character of the neighborhood and consider if the proposed elevations are in keeping with the scale, character, and heritage.

Update: As mentioned above, comment remains. Concerns about the land use entitlement, elevations, and long term use need to be further detailed.



TOWN OF WARRENTON

Department of Community Development

PO BOX 341
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20188
<http://www.warrentonva.gov>
LandDevelopment@warrentonva.gov
(540) 347-2405

STAFF COMMENTS

TO: Denise Harris, AICP, Planning Manager
FROM: Heather Jenkins, PLA, CZA, Zoning Administrator
DATE: July 2, 2024
SUBJECT: Warrenton United Methodist Church/ Hero's Bridge (6984-16-7013-000, 6984-16-5101-000)
ZMA 2023-1
Submission 6/20/2024; 2nd Review

I. Zoning Ordinance Review

The application contains a Land Development Application, Statement of Justification, Zoning Map Amendment checklist, proffer statement, and a rezoning plan. The following analysis is based on the relevant Articles of the Zoning Ordinance/Town Code.

In General

Staff comment: **Advisory Comment remains:** Aerial imagery and topography show a significant drainage feature running across the width of the 3.9-acre portion of the property; Soil Survey maps show that soil type 17B, described as having potential hydric inclusions and an elevated ground water table, are located in a broad swath following the general location of this drainage feature.

- a. Staff notes that should any hydric soils be found, that a Jurisdictional Determination by the USACE will be required as a part of any future Site Development Plan application, to include required permits for wetland/stream channel disturbance from the USACE and DEQ.

Clarification: A Jurisdictional Determination will be required at the time of Site Development Plan. This comment remains advisory.

Staff comment: **Advisory Comment remains:** The application does not provide sufficient information to show that adequate stormwater management can be provided for the property.

- c. Staff notes that the existing outfall on PIN 6984-15-1967 is known to have issues with adequate conveyance of storm flows; the proposed development will add a significant amount of new impervious area leading to an increase in runoff volume that could negatively impact neighboring properties and existing drainage facilities. Ensuring the

adequacy of the off-site receiving facilities and structures must be considered.

Clarification: Staff acknowledges the drainage plan provided by the engineer shows no increase in post-development flows. However, the submitted materials do not appear to show adequacy of the existing downstream drainage facilities.

Staff comment: **Advisory Comment remains:** The plan does not address the current conditions of Church Street, Moser Road, or the intersection of Church Street with Sullivan Street/Broadview Ave.; address. The existing edge of pavement, pavement markings, signage, curb/gutter and sidewalk, existing drainage features, etc. should be shown so that the proposed impacts to area roadways can be evaluated.

Clarification: Staff notes that the proposal does not provide continuing sidewalk and curb and gutter along the Moser Road and Church Street road frontages. (10-6.10 ZO)

Staff comment: **Advisory comment remains:** The application does not address how mail service and package deliveries will be accommodated; address.

Clarification: The applicant has acknowledged staff's concern, and this issue will be addressed at the time of site plan. This comment remains advisory.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The property currently exists as two separate parcels, however the statement of justification speaks to cross-use of facilities and services; either show the separating parcel line as "To be Vacated" or revise the plan and application materials to show that the residential/office component are stand-alone facilities that are completely separate from the church and recreational facility.

Clarification: The uses must operate independently of one another if the parcels cannot be consolidated. All amenities and open space must be provided on each individual lot. If the church lot were to sell in the future, the residential component risks losing access to all amenities provided on the adjacent parcel.

Proffer Statement

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The proffer statement provided for review includes multiple statements that repeat minimum zoning ordinance requirements that must be addressed by all development projects and are not proffers as such.

Clarification: The revised proffer statement continues to state that the project will provide items as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Revise.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The elevation drawings that were submitted as a part of the application materials are not addressed as a part of the proffer statement, in terms of proffered materials, color palette, architectural

treatments, or style. Either remove the elevations from the application as extraneous or include the elevations as a part of the plan set and address the elevations as a part of the proffer statement in defined, enforceable terms.

Clarification: The "Architecture" proffer (#6) states that the quality of the proposed duplex units shall be in general conformance with the elevations prepared by Design Concepts, but the elevations were not provided for review. Define "Quality" as used in the proffers and statement of justification.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Staff notes that the statement of justification speaks to the intent to serve older and/or disabled veterans, however nothing in the proffer statement speaks to this intent, nor to how the church use is an integral part of the services to be provided to the residents.

Clarification: Partially addressed via proffer 2.a.iv. The church appears to no longer be utilized as an integral part of the project; However, the land area of the church is used to provide justification for the proposed density and a future phase II multipurpose recreational center. The multipurpose recreational center appears to be an expansion of the existing church use; justify. An expansion of the church use in the R-10 Zoning District requires the approval of a Special Use Permit.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The statement of justification includes the provision of bus service, and nursing, physical and mental health services, however the proffer statement does not include any of these services. Either amend the statement of justification to remove these items or revise the proffer statement to include these services as integral to the intent and function of the project.

Clarification: Not addressed.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Should the project be intended to serve the elderly, disabled persons, veterans, or other groups with identifiable needs, then the proffers and plan drawing should include facilities that cater to the needs of persons that meet these demographic characteristics such as accessible/universal design features for both outdoor facilities and interior building design.

Clarification: Not addressed. No elevations have been provided to show the interior/exterior building design or accessibility features.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Section 1, proffer 1.6 does not provide a defined trigger for when the office or recreation center will be constructed in relation to construction of the residential units; either address by including a defined, enforceable trigger, or remove the office and recreation center from the application materials altogether.

Clarification: Not addressed. The enforceable trigger for the construction of the recreation center is not defined. (How many duplexes will be built

prior to the recreation center?) In addition, the square footage of the facility is broadly defined. Provide separate square footage for the portion of the building used for each use (office and recreation center).

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Section 2, proffers 2.1 and 2.2 are unclear, lacking detail or an explanation of intent; address.

Clarification: Proffers have been revised to be "5a and 5b". The proposed proffers are unclear in their intent, and do not appear to be proffers but rather, a waiver request of the requirements of the referenced articles of the Zoning Ordinance. Revise.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Section 4, proffer 4.1 does not address any buffering or screening beyond the minimum requirements of the zoning ordinance that must be met by all projects, and the landscaping shown on the plan does not meet minimum ordinance requirements; address.

Clarification: Proffer has now been revised to be number "7", but the original comment remains. The landscaping shown within the proposed buffer areas (C, D,E,G) do not meet minimum Zoning Ordinance requirements. Staff is unable to determine that minimum Zoning Ordinance requirements have been met. Revise. (8-8.5 ZO)

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Section 4, proffer 4.2 does not specify a minimum number or type of amenities to be provided, nor are any such shown on the plan drawing; revise.

Clarification: Proffer has now been revised to be number "8", but the original comment remains. Outdoor amenities are not defined, and are not shown/labeled on the plan. Revise. In addition, "senior appropriate fitness trail signage" is not an amenity. Revise.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Section 5, proffer 5.1 is a minimum zoning ordinance requirement and not a proffer.

Clarification: Proffer has now been revised to be number "9", but the original comment remains. The "proffer" is stating minimum Zoning Ordinance requirements, and as such, is not a proffer.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Section 6, proffers 6.1 and 6.2 are minimum requirements that all developments must provide, and not a proffer.

Clarification: Not addressed.

Article 3-5.2.3.1 – General Planning Considerations (R-PUD)

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The plan does not clearly illustrate the use of open space required, but the statement of justification does not address the use of open space by the residents.

Clarification: An open space calculation has been provided on the plan, but labels are not indicated showing the open space areas and the amenities within these areas for use by the residents. Revise.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The application does not address pedestrian connectivity; resolve.

a. Provide crosswalk connections from the residential area to the church and recreational center across the internal accessway.

a. **Clarification:** One crosswalk does not appear sufficient.

b. Provide sidewalk connections from the proposed development areas to the outer perimeter of the site.

a. **Clarification:** Curb cuts and crosswalks are not provided at the sidewalk connections for Church Street and Moser Road. Revise.

c. Provide sidewalk along all street frontages.

a. **Clarification:** Not addressed.

d. Address how residents will access the larger pedestrian network outside of the project boundaries.

a. **Clarification:** Not addressed.

Article 3-5.2.4.1 – Standards and Criteria for Planned Unit Developments

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Staff is unable to determine that open space requirements are met at this time. The 25% minimum required open space is not delineated on the plan nor is the use of the open space for amenities for the residents.

Clarification: Unaddressed.

Article 3-5.2.4.2 – Other Criteria for Residential Planned Unit Developments

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The proposal exceeds the maximum allowable 50% multi-family units.

Clarification: A detailed list of all requested waivers of Zoning Ordinance standards is required.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The required open space is not delineated on the plan.

Clarification: Unaddressed.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The applicants have indicated that the proposed recreational facility may or may not be constructed in phase II dependent

on funding; However, applicable recreational facilities must be constructed prior to construction of the next phase.

Clarification: Proffer #4, phasing, does not tie construction of the recreational facilities to a specific number of dwelling units or other enforceable trigger.

Article 3-5.2.5 – Use Regulations- Residential Planned Unit Developments (R-PUD)

Staff comment: **Advisory Comment remains:** The Zoning Ordinance does not specifically allow the proposed use. The applicant is requesting consideration from the Town Council to allow the use within the R-PUD district. Similar by-right uses are an apartment building, Senior/disability housing, and two, three, and four-family dwelling units. In comparison, a similar use that would require approval of a special use permit is affordable dwelling units (ADU) within areas designated for multifamily development.

Article 3-5.2.7 – Density/Intensity and Area Regulations

Staff comment: **Advisory comment remains:** Ingress/egress easements will be required to utilize the emergency access areas shown on adjacent property belonging to the church.

Clarification: Applicant has acknowledged this requirement and will address at the time of Site Development Plan.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Interior side yard setback adjacent to the church is not provided. This must be a minimum of 15' unless a waiver of setback is requested from the Town Council.

Clarification: Add setback line labels throughout the plan to aid review.

Article 6 – Signs

Staff comment: **Advisory comment remains:** No signs included as part of the application. Any proposed signs will need to meet the regulations noted under Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 7 – Parking

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Staff is unable to verify that parking requirements are met with this submission. The plan mentions a parking demand study, but staff did not receive a copy of this. Parking requirements must be met at the time of site development plan.

Clarification: The parking calculations depicted on sheet C.05 of the plan do not show the minimum required parking for one-bedroom units let alone the parking needed for the office use. If a waiver of parking requirements is desired, the request must be made to the Town Council.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The parking calculations provided as based on the unprovided parking demand study; Staff is unable to verify.

Clarification: Unaddressed.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The application documents include a description of a bus service; however, the plan sheets do not indicate how this will be accommodated on site with adequate loading spaces and facilities.

Clarification: Only one loading area is designated on site. Staff suggests adding at least one additional area on site. Staff is also unable to determine that the size of the loading area will meet minimum requirements per article 7-18 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Article 8 – Landscaping

Staff comment: **Advisory comment remains:** Staff is unable to verify landscaping requirements are met and the statement of justification does not adequately address this requirement. No landscaping details have been provided at this time. Conformance with Landscaping requirements will be required as part of the site development plan.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Landscaping for parking area calculations is not provided but will be required at time of SDP submission.

Clarification: Landscaping calculations are provided but are incorrect based on the number of required parking spaces. A minimum of one space per one-bedroom unit must be provided, equivalent to 44 spaces for this development.

Staff comment: **Advisory Comment remains:** The project area abuts two existing single-family homes off of Moser Road, PIN 6984-16-8079 (Thompson) and PIN 6984-16-8042 (McLaughlin), but does not address how any impacts to these two property owners will be addressed. As a recommendation, the applicant should consider enhanced screening and buffering between the two uses.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The project area abuts four single family homes to the north, PIN 6984-16-7459 (Hunt), PIN 6984-16-8433 (Southard), PIN 6984-16-9430 (Fransella), and PIN 6984-26-0337 (Church), but does not address how any impacts to these property owners will be addressed. As a recommendation, the applicant should consider enhanced screening and buffering between the access road and the property boundary.

Clarification: A stronger buffer in this area is advisable, such as a double-staggered row of evergreen trees to provide adequate screening.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The application does not clearly describe how refuse will be addressed on site for all uses. Refuse facilities but must be screened from view of adjacent properties, the public right-of-way, and from within the lot per Article 8-8.2. See Public Utilities Public Works for when refuse pick-up is provided by the Town.

- a. Provide adequate dumpster areas that are convenient to the differing uses.

- b. Address refuse area screening via landscaping, solid walls or fencing, and gates.
 - a. **Clarification:** The potential dumpster area labeled on sheet C.03 does not show a parking area/loading zone for a trash service. Provide dimensions and turn radius for a trash truck to service the dumpster.

Article 9-8 – Lighting

Staff comment: **Advisory comment remains:** The Statement of Justification acknowledges all lighting must meet requirements of Article 9 of the Zoning Ordinance, but overall does not address site lighting. All fixtures on site will require conformance to current lighting standards. Staff suggests that the applicant should consider how sidewalk/trail lighting and parking area lighting will be provided, the general type and height of outdoor lighting fixtures, and the potential for glare, light trespass, and light pollution affecting surrounding properties.

Article 9-3 – Affordable Dwelling Unit Provisions

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The proposal does not meet the eligibility requirements as stated under Article 9-3.1 of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has suggested a "proffer" for offering these ADU to qualifying individuals based on Hero's Bridge rules and regulations. This may be considered as a waiver, but not a proffer.

Clarification: Not addressed. Revise proffer statement and include waiver request for consideration by the Planning Commission and Town Council.

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** The plans do not indicate how many bedrooms the units are intended to have, and staff is not able to determine the parking reduction allowance as provided for in Article 9-3.6.

Clarification: The proposed parking on site does not meet the minimum required for 44 one-bedroom units. Advise if a waiver of parking requirements is requested from the Town Council.

Article 9-12 – Open Space

Staff comment: **Comment remains:** Open space must be used for the benefit of the residents. The plan does not indicate what recreational facilities will be used within the open space for the enjoyment of the residents. The applicant should ensure that adequate facilities will be provided to support intended outdoor recreation uses.

Clarification: The open space calculation has been provided, but the areas have not been labeled on the plan. Revise.



TOWN OF WARRENTON

Department of Public Works and Utilities

PO BOX 341
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20188
<http://www.warrentonva.gov>
(540) 347-1101

STAFF COMMENTS

TO: Denise Harris, Planning Manager
THROUGH: John Ward, Director of Public Works *JW 7-15-24*
Steven Friend, Director of Public Utilities (SF)
FROM: Paul Bernard, PE, Town Engineer
Kerry Wharton, Stormwater Administrator
DATE: July 11, 2024
SUBJECT: ZMA 2023-01 Warrenton United Methodist Church/Hero's Bridge – 2nd Submission

Grading, E&S and Stormwater Management- Kerry Wharton, Stormwater Administrator

- SW1. Conformance with erosion and stormwater requirements is required at the time of SDP submission. No calculations were provided with the concept plan. They will need to meet the requirements of the Erosion and Stormwater Management Ordinance, 9VAC25-875-210, and the Virginia Erosion and Stormwater Management Regulation for erosion control and new development. This will be critical to ensure the size and area of the two SWM locations will be adequate to meet the regulations for both quantity and quality of surface water runoff.
- SW2. The existing Stormwater Management Facility located on PIN#:6984-15-1967-000 will need to be upgraded to meet the stormwater requirements for quality and quantity. A new Stormwater Management Agreement will be required.
- SW3. There are existing flooding and drainage concerns at the intersection of Sullivan and Church Street that could be exacerbated. Hydrology and hydraulics grade line calculations will need to be provided to ensure adequacy and prevent further flooding and drainage issues.
- SW4. The project is being shown to be built over an existing channel. How will water conveyance be addressed with this project since it is taking flow from the neighborhood? The existing channel will need to be evaluated to determine if any additional federal or state permitting is required.
- SW5. A portion of this project is shown to be in the 500year floodplain. While this does not inhibit the potential for developing and making improvements to the property, it creates the need for special considerations in the design of any building foundations under the ground surface and the infrastructure to convey drainage through and off the site.

Public Utilities - Paul Bernard, Town Engineer

- PU1. The site proposes 44 Senior Living rental units, a recreational building, and the existing church remaining in place. At this time, the existing church uses about 29,000 gallons a month which equates to approximately 960 gallons a day. The application indicates the total site land area is 9.14 acres and is zoned R-10. Based on this, the by-right water and wastewater use for up to 39 residential units would be around 11,700 gallons per day. Under the proposed use, maintaining the existing church, 44 elderly/age restricted apartment units, and a 2-story 19,000 square foot Recreational Center with a non-defined water demand, is estimated to require a water demand between 10,000 and 13,000 gallons per day.
- PU2. The proposed plan would be reviewed in more detail when final plans are submitted should this permit be approved.

Public Utilities – Steven Friend, Director of Public Utilities

1. It is my recommendation that council take careful consideration in approving any increase to density that results in the increase of water demand that is above what the current by-right amount is. See above comment PU1 for reference to overage of existing by-right amount, which is an approximation using the industries 300 gallons per day per home for an amount of 1,300 gallons per day, or an extra 4.3 -5 homes.

Public Works- Paul Bernard, Town Engineer

- PW1. Parking for units 13 through 24 and 37 through 44 is questionable as currently shown. Based on this layout, it would appear there would be strong motivation for routine parking along Moser Road, which the current street design would not support.
- PW2. Storm drainage will be a major concern during design development.