

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 28<sup>th</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER TWO THOUSAND TWELVE.

ROLL CALL

Mr. Rich Krapf  
Mr. George Drummond  
Mr. Mike Maddocks  
Mr. Chris Basic

STAFF

Mr. Paul Holt  
Ms. Leanne Reidenbach  
Mr. Chris Johnson

MINUTES

Following a motion by Mr. Mike Maddocks, the DRC approved the minutes from the October 31<sup>st</sup> meeting by a vote of 4-0 subject to correcting the spelling of Maddocks on page one.

C-0041-2012 White Hall Section 3 Alley

Ms. Leanne Reidenbach presented the staff report stating that Brendan Clisso of AES Consulting Engineers has requested DRC review for the recreational amenities in White Hall Section 3 in accordance with proffer 11 and master plan consistency review for the removal of an alley that is shown on the approved master plan. Ms. Reidenbach noted that Planning and Parks and Recreation recommended approval of the locations of the recreational amenities. Ms. Reidenbach explained that the master plan for White Hall was initially approved by the Board of Supervisors and then administratively amended in 2007. She said that the development also received a density bonus, in part for superior design, when it was initially approved. When the master plan was amended, the use of an alley in this area so that residential units near Rochambeau Road could face out towards the road and access garages from the rear was identified as a positive element that contributed to approval of the master plan. As a result, staff recommended that the DRC find the alley removal not consistent with the master plan.

The DRC discussed where alleys were located within the development and noted that it was a mix of both front and rear loading garages.

Mr. Maddocks asked why the alley was proposed to be removed. Mr. Brendan Clisso noted that they thought it was not a major change and it was largely driven by concern that the alley did not meet VDOT sight distance specifications and so would not be able to be approved. He said it would decrease impervious area and that the houses would not be able to be seen from Rochambeau Rd. due to a proffered forested buffer. He noted that sight distance was deficient by about 100 feet.

Mr. Rich Krapf noted that the administrative change to the master plan was reviewed while he was on the DRC. He noted that seemingly minor changes over time could add up to a major design change that may not have been approved initially. He was particularly concerned with the fact that design aesthetics contributed to the original density bonus. Even with the reforestation plan, he was concerned with the proximity to Rochambeau Rd. He noted he supported the recreational amenities but not the master plan consistency.

Ms. Reidenbach discussed conversations and the subsequent letter of support for the alley from VDOT. While the alley would be a private street, VDOT would review its intersection with the public street

Sheldon Branch Place. Mr. Clisso said that the developer still had concerns that the alley would not be permitted and that the VDOT support letter was vague on this issue.

Mr. Maddocks asked about the number of units and how many were rear-loading. Mr. Clisso said that there would be 415 units total and about 100 would have rear-loading garages.

Mr. Krapf asked if there were other reasons for why the alley was proposed to be removed. Mr. Clisso said that VDOT was the main reason but that it also reduced impervious cover and that a variety of housing products is seen as attractive to potential buyers. Mr. Maddocks confirmed that finances were not driving the request.

Mr. Krapf noted that he did not see a hardship at this time and did not want to see the promised alley removed. He noted that the DRC could possibly reconsider if the applicant encounters difficulties with VDOT. Mr. Paul Holt indicated that staff would serve as an advocate for the applicant in this circumstance.

Mr. Chris Basic noted that he felt this consideration was premature and that it was too early to approve this change. He noted that removing the alley would make these lots more consistent with the rest of Section 3 but also agreed with Mr. Krapf's points. He said he was not supportive at this time but could be agreeable if VDOT denies the alley. Mr. Maddocks concurred.

Mr. George Drummond asked if there would be any additional setbacks if the alley was removed. Mr. Clisso said no but that there would be additional greenspace in the back of the units. The DRC began to discuss alternatives in the event VDOT denied the alley.


Mr. Clisso requested a vote only on the locations of the recreational amenities and asked to withdraw the master plan consistency request.

Following a motion by Mr. Krapf, the DRC voted 4-0 to approve the recreational amenities.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

  
Mr. Chris Basic, Chairman

  
Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary