

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD IN BUILDING A AT 4:00 P.M. ON THE 24th DAY OF FEBRUARY TWO THOUSAND SIXTEEN.

ROLL CALL

Present

Ms. Robin Bledsoe
Mr. Tim O'Connor
Mr. Chris Basic
Mr. John Wright III

STAFF

Mr. Jose Ribeiro
Ms. Ellen Cook
Mr. Paul Holt
Mr. Chris Johnson

OTHER

Mr. Tim Trant
Mr. Brian Staub
Mr. John Carnifax
Mr. Jason Grimes
Mr. Chris Haywood

Mr. Chris Basic called the meeting to order.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe moved to approve the minutes from the January 27, 2016 meeting. The minutes were approved 3-0-1 (Mr. Basic abstaining).

ITEMS FOR DRC ACTION

C-0008-2016, Williamsburg Indoor Sports Complex (WISC) Aquatic Center

Mr. Jose Ribeiro stated that Mr. Chris Haywood has submitted a conceptual plan proposing the addition of two indoor swimming pools and associated office/locker room facilities to the Williamsburg Indoor Sports Complex. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the application is being considered by the DRC for a master plan consistency determination in accordance with the adopted Special Use Permit and Master Plan for the Warhill Sports Complex. Mr. Ribeiro indicated that staff has evaluated this proposal and found the use to be compatible with the current use of the property and that it does not change the basic concept or character of the Warhill Sports Complex. Mr. Ribeiro recommended the DRC recommend approval of the request contingent on the proposed improvements being located outside resource protection areas and the 150 foot property line buffer.

Ms. Bledsoe asked staff to confirm that the proposed facilities would be used for swimming practice and meets.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that it would be used for swimming practice and meets but deferred the question to the applicant.

Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks & Recreation, stated that the facilities will be used by WISC members but it would also be open for competitive swim teams and that the three surrounding high schools would likely use the facility for practice and meets.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if there would be adequate seating capacity and space for families for the swim meets.

Mr. Carnifax indicating that they were working on a plan to provide space for at least 200 people to sit on bleachers. He stated that the bleachers would probably increase the total footprint of the proposed facility by an additional 16 feet in width.

Mr. John Wright expressed concern that the construction of the proposed facility could impact the exiting trail.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the construction of the facility would not have any impact on the trail use and that Parks and Recreation would be involved in the final design of the facility and that they would ensure that it was aesthetically pleasing on the outside and also screened in certain areas to protect viewsheds. Mr. Carnifax also stated that this project is a good private/public partnership and positive for the community and that it could allow the private sector to come in and keep the county from having to build a new swimming pool at least for the near future.

Mr. Wright asked if the proposed facility would be financed with revenue from user fees.

Mr. Carnifax answered that the new facility would operate under the WISC user fee format and that WISC also honors all Parks and Recreation financial assistance program to citizens; therefore, if someone currently on a Parks and Recreation program qualifies for a reduction in user fees, WISC would honor that reduction also.

Mr. Tim O'Connor asked where in the county a separate swimming pool could be located.

Mr. Carnifax stated that a feasibility study was prepared in 2001 and that Parks and Recreation investigated the possibility of a swimming pool at the Warhill site and the Rec Center site by turning the existing pool into a family leisure pool and adding a 25 or 50 meter pool. It was determined that adding a pool at the existing Rec Center would be the most cost effective approach for the County as no additional administrative staff would be required to be hired. The challenge with the location of the existing swimming pool in the Rec Center is that there is a generator and ball fields located in the back of the existing building. However, now that Parks and Recreation owns the water tower site, it provides more flexibility as to the potential location of another swimming pool.

Mr. O'Connor stated that plans for an additional swimming pool at the Rec Center were not in the near future.

Mr. Carnifax concurred and stated that part of the community desires a larger 50-meter pool and that the County completed a study a couple of years ago regarding the financial impacts of operating both a large gymnasium and a pool facility and that most aquatic centers do not generate enough revenue to support operating costs.

Ms. Bledsoe asked Mr. Paul Holt about the increase in traffic and impacts to Longhill.

Mr. Holt stated that if schools continue to offer swimming practices early in the morning there should not be an immediate conflict with the morning peak hour. The swim season is typically in the winter and it should not be expected to overlap with other recreational uses such as soccer and baseball. The proposed

swimming facility is not expected to generate a need for improvements either on Longhill or Opportunity Way Roads. The County will be completing a comprehensive update to the traffic impact study for the Warhill site and this proposal and any other future buildout of facilities on the Parks and Rec Master Plan which has not yet been constructed. This study was last updated in 2007 and 2009. Mr. Holt also stated that as part of the traffic study, questions such as does the connector road remain seasonal or does it become open full time to serve as a safety feature must be considered.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that traffic impacts were considered as part of the master plan for the Warhill Complex site and asked if the traffic impact analysis being updated will provide any surprising results.

Mr. Holt stated that there should not be any surprises for this proposed facility. Most of that traffic demand comes when larger tournaments letting out vehicular traffic all at the same time.

Mr. Basic stated that he had concerns about traffic but that he understood that there would not be a direct conflict with the typical peak hour analysis. Mr. Basic stated that the proposed swimming pool facility is something that the community needs and that the issue for DRC consideration is whether or not this proposal is consistent with the approved master plan for the Warhill Complex. Mr. Basic stated that he thought that the proposed use is consistent with the adopted master plan. However, his main concern is traffic and based on his experience, there are existing traffic problems at the Warhill site outside of the peak hours. Mr. Basic was concerned regarding the impacts of 200 hundred or more cars associated with the proposed swimming facility would have on traffic.

Mr. Carnifax stated that they count traffic coming in and out of the site on both sides so they have traffic information at the different hours of the day and that the proposed swimming facility should have no impact to what is presently experienced at the site with traffic congestion. Mr. Carnifax stated that Parks and Rec has an operational agreement with WISC and other partner groups and they do have a say in operational issues such as the different starting times of certain recreational activities.

Mr. Basic stated that he agreed that the proposed swimming pool facility would not necessarily create traffic issues but that in conjunction with other recreational activities such as soccer, baseball, it could occasionally create traffic problems.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that there is a perception that the proposed swimming facility will add to traffic problems and that she shared Mr. Basic's concerns regarding traffic.

Mr. Carnifax stated that based on initial discussion with their consultant the only improvements to be made are on the Longhill Road. There have been discussions about a signalized intersection but that would not solve traffic problems on Saturdays or Sunday when the big sports events happen. Mr. Carnifax stated that it falls upon the operational aspects to provide solutions such as a police officer to control traffic at certain times.

Mr. O'Connor stated that his concern was less about traffic and more about speed limit. The speed limit on Longhill Road is 45 but many vehicles are driving at a faster pace.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the proposed swimming pool facility is necessary for the community and that it is not inconsistent with the adopted master plan and that there will be a traffic study for any future expansion on the site.

Mr. Holt confirmed that the traffic study is on-going.

Mr. Wright asked for the expected project conclusion date.

Mr. Carnifax indicated that they were expecting to conclude the project either Fall or Winter of next year.

Ms. Bledsoe made a motion to approve the master plan consistency request.

Mr. Wright second the motion and the request was approved 4-0.

Mr. Ribeiro clarified that the approval was for the master plan consistency contingent on the swimming pool facility being located outside the 150 buffer and the RPA.

The DRC members concurred.

ITEMS FOR DRC CONSIDERATION

C-0013-2016, 4450 Powhatan Parkway, Senior Housing

Ms. Ellen Cook stated that Mr. Tim Trant has submitted a conceptual plan which proposes 146 units of independent senior living on property located at 4450 Powhatan Parkway. The applicant has requested DRC comments on the proposed development concept.

Mr. Tim Trant introduced Mr. Brian Staub and provided a brief overview of the proposed project.

Mr. Brian Staub stated that Marlyn Development has developed seven similar communities in recent years, six in Hampton Roads. He stated that its model allows for affordability and that past projects have drawn 70% local residents.

Mr. Trant stated that the current proposal before the DRC is modeled on recent projects in Phoebus in Hampton, which have 136 units.

Mr. Staub indicated that the company's developments do provide a lot of amenities such as an arts and crafts room and a beauty salon. He noted that the buildings have secure access with interior hallways. These amenities are provided to support a high quality of life for the residents.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired how this proposal was similar or different from other senior housing communities, noting that it appeared to address a different demographic.

Mr. Trant concurred with Ms. Bledsoe, noting that compared to some other communities this would allow seniors to live in a building with many amenities but without some of the timeframe and financial commitments found elsewhere. This model could be a step between maintaining a separate individual household and a possible more supportive environment in the future.

Mr. Wright inquired if the community would be age-restricted, and if so, what would occur if an occupant became the guardian of a child.

Mr. Staub stated that it would be age restricted. Given the legal structure of these types of communities, a person would not be able to continue to reside there if they became a guardian.

Ms. Bledsoe asked what the ballpark cost of renting one of the units would be.

Mr. Staub stated it could be a range, but cited a figure of approximately \$1,200.

Mr. Trant stated that following the model of the company's development in Hampton, the project would likely include 20% affordable housing.

Ms. Bledsoe recommended viewing the information and video regarding the recently completed James City County 2016 Housing Condition Study.

Mr. Staub stated that the Hampton project included units affordable to households at 50% of Area Median Income (AMI), which equates to rents in the \$600s. He noted that these units had similar finishes and were very comparable with the market rate units.

Mr. Wright asked how many cars the community was likely to have.

Mr. Trant provided some background information about the history of the site and project. He noted that current proposal for 146 units was less than the 165 units that had been initially been indicated by the pro forma given the large parcel size and central location. This would have resulted in a gross density above four units per acre, and a concurrent Comprehensive Plan designation change had been considered. However, after further reflection and adjustments, the unit number was lowered so the density could be within the range recommended by the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Trant noted that a change to Planned Unit Development – Residential (PUD-R) was being considered, and that the concept provided to the DRC shows the footprint of the Phoebus building on this property. Mr. Trant explained that the property had previously been intended for a school which ultimately located elsewhere, so the access road, Powhatan Parkway, had been designed and built to accommodate this level of traffic. Mr. Trant indicated that the trip generation per ITE was 40 trips in the peak hour.

Mr. Staub stated that in their other communities, they generally had less than 1 car per unit. He indicated that the residents often don't drive during the peak hour and often take the van service.

Mr. Trant stated that they will have community outreach, and expects that residents will have some concerns about traffic.

Mr. Chris Basic indicated that he was glad they recognized that traffic may be an issue. He asked how many employees there would be and how that affected traffic.

Mr. Trant stated that the employee trips were included in the ITE figure.

Mr. Basic asked if there would be food service.

Mr. Staub replied that the residents would cook for themselves.

Mr. Trant stated that they have looked at trip generation from Shorewood Cove and found trips to be somewhat lower than the ITE. Shorewood Cove is located in a similar location to this site in terms of likely use of vehicles versus pedestrian trips.

Mr. O'Connor commented on this property being the subject of a land use designation change application during the recently completed Comprehensive Plan, and that the application was denied.

Mr. Trant stated that this developer had not been involved in that application, and noted that this proposal would fall within the density range recommended for Low Density Residential.

Mr. Basic inquired about the possibility of using Jester's Lane for access.

Mr. Chris Johnson stated that Jester's Lane does not meet current VDOT standards and did not appear feasible for access.

Mr. Trant noted that this property is in the heart of a commercial center, and is an infill property. This proposal would be an efficient use of this land. Mr. Trant noted that the property has a buffer from Ford's Colony given the Resource Protection Area and an existing Conservation Easement. Given the proposed placement of the building on the parcel, it would also be buffered from lots in Powhatan Secondary.

Mr. Wright asked how long the project would be under construction.

Mr. Staub indicated an approximately timeframe of 12-13 months.

Mr. O'Connor asked about how much buffer there would be from WindsorMeade, given that community's past concern with adjacent development.

Mr. Trant stated that he was not sure of the exact amount, but that they would look at this issue.

Mr. O'Connor asked about the location of the parking.

Mr. Staub replied that the parking location had not yet been determined.

The DRC members and applicant discussed the topography of the site, the location of the existing berm, and the effect on visual impacts to WindsorMeade.

Mr. Trant stated that they will be seeking community outreach, including with WindsorMeade. He indicated that they hope to address any possible concerns to the best of their ability.

Mr. O'Connor asked how much land disturbance there would be on the site.

Mr. Staub replied that it would be approximately one seventh of the site. Mr. Staub and the DRC members discussed how the location of the building put it on the most central portion of the site where the most developable land is located.

Mr. O'Connor asked what outside amenities would be provided.

Mr. Staub indicated that garden plots were very popular in their other communities, and that there might be other features such as a dog park. He stated that walking paths around the perimeter of the building would likely be popular in good weather.

Mr. O'Connor asked if this site was included in the Powhatan Secondary master plan.

Mr. Johnson stated that it was likely not, given the R-8 zoning, but that the vision had been for a school.

The DRC members and applicant discussed the possible location of an access road into the property, and its avoidance of wetland features.

Mr. Staub noted that one of their other developments was the centerpiece of a single family housing community and complemented the neighborhood very well.

Mr. Staub and Mr. Trant invited the DRC members to visit the Woodlands project.

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion by Ms. Bledsoe and a second by Mr. Wright, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:30 p.m.



Mr. Chris Basic, Chairman



Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary