



TO: Kinsey O'Shea, Town Planner for Current Development

From: Meredith Jones, P.E. V.P., Eden & Associates

Date: November 30, 2022

RE: Responses to email comments on 11/21/22 for Glade Spring Crossing rezoning application

Dear Kinsey,

Please accept this letter explaining the changes made to the Glade Spring Crossing rezoning application in the form of responses to your email on 11/21/22. Hopefully this will help guide you on changes we made. Thank you.

- Comment: The proffer should be a separate document, and not embedded in the application. Please separate and remove.
 - As a general rule, proffers cannot contain any obligation on the part of the Town, such as in proffers #9, 14, 15, and 16. These concepts are appropriate in a developer agreement, but not in a proffer.
 - Proffers must also be specific and measurable, and not contain aspirational language, or intent. Proffers 10 and 11 contain aspirational language "it is the goal of the development..." which should not be included. Proffer 13 contains language "the developer plans to..." which should not be included. Please review and revise any proffers for consistency.
 - Please remove proffer 17
 - *Additional language and revisions regarding specificity, enforceability, and clarity may be provided after further review by staff and the Town Attorney.*
 - ***Response: As discussed on 11/22/22 with Kinsey, the Proffers were altered for the above comments and moved to the front of the document just after the application proffer consent signature by the applicant. It was discussed that this needed to be outside of the description portion of the application and moved up front.***
- The application did not include a Town of Blacksburg TIA form. A copy is attached for your use.
 - ***Response: included***
- The application did not include the Traffic Impact Analysis in a form we would accept. The Town provided comments dated 11-04-2022, on your submittal dated 10-21-2022. A response/revised traffic analysis has not been included that addresses the comments. Please include the appropriate traffic impact analysis.
 - ***Response: The revised TIA for the Town has been sent on 11/28/22 digitally under a separate letterhead from RKA.***
- The application did not include a Stormwater Management Concept Plan. Please include the appropriate required SWM concept plan for the proposed development.
 - ***Response: The plan was sent on 11/28/22 to Kafi Howard with a revised narrative more appropriately suited to the calculations for the development.***
- The application did not include information on the proposed pump station regarding the actual size and construction of the pump. The building information must be submitted in order to



EDEN & ASSOCIATES

determine the impact on the floodplain and the CVO. Since the Town's consultant is currently performing a review of the viability of connecting to the Town's existing force main and a downstream capacity analysis, there may be additional information that needs to be provided upon the completion of the consultant's review. It will be helpful if you can provide any information you may have on preliminary pump sizes that can then be provided to the consultant.

- ***Response: at this stage there is no pump station design. They typical pump station in the sanitary sewer specifications is what will be constructed approximately 20x14 (Figure SPS-101), with a building and wet well and properly designed Smith and Loveless suction lift pumps. We know that it will likely need to be located in the CVO based on our mains and general building layout, but will be determined exactly where based on buildings, first floor elevations, sewer mains, and the trail. That is why we are requesting the ability to put it in the CVO per the memo request to Paul Patterson. We understand that the requirement in the zoning ordinance is that when designed, it should not increase the 100-year floodplain any. Until design, there is no way to know exactly the size and type of pumps, though the applicant is willing to provide preliminary information if the consultant needs it for downstream analysis.***
- The application did not include a separate request to modify the creek valley overlay boundary. ZO section 3231 specifically states that the boundary may be changed by ordinance, but you must submit information to substantiate the revision to the CVO. CVO has more criteria than just the floodplain. The application needs to include an official request to revise the CVO with documentation confirming that the revised CVO meets the criteria in the zoning ordinance in addition to the information on the relationship of the floodplain and CVO.
 - ***Response: A separate request is included as a memo. Discussion with Kafi on 11/23/22 revealed that the floodplain study is fine to include the 100-year calculations that are included in the CVO. Wetlands, 50' of creek, and steep slopes in excess are included in the new CVO request and in the sketch attached. It is understood that the actual mapping will be recorded during the preliminary plat process but the ability to make the modification has been requested in the memo as part of the rezoning process.***
- The application does not include how trash & recycle will be managed, including provisions for storing carts at the units, if carts are to be used
Response: Trash and recycling will be stored in the front of the units or to the side of the unit. For the few units that are tight in front or middle units, the porches in the front can contain the carts or they can be stored at the rear and walked around. This verbiage is added to the Other utilizes section on page 53.
- The application does not include information regarding location of group mailboxes. While it will be a requirement to provide group mailboxes for the development at the site plan/plat stage, the locations of these features will need to be determined now, and should be accessible to residents in cars or on foot.
 - ***Response: Groups of 12-16 mailboxes have been included and shown on the "pedestrian circulation and trails exhibit" and mentioned on page 46.***
- Please be consistent with display and orientation of drawings. Some drawings (p34 for example) are oriented incorrectly (south=top of page). None of the layout drawings have north arrows, but the development is referred to by north/south distinctions.



EDEN & ASSOCIATES

- **Response: All drawings were originally oriented for best viewing ability as they were excerpts from the drawings included in the Appendices and some did not have north arrows; however they have all now been oriented the same way and north arrows added. As a result, some are smaller but can be viewed from the Appendix if desired.**
- The layout used on the Concept Plan 1: Through-Road Option 06/10/2022 is not consistent with the rest of the lot and street layout. Please ensure that all graphics used in the application are consistent with the proposed layout.
 - **Response: The summary of the TIA has been removed from the application entirely and is included as a separate submittal, similar to the stormwater calculations.**
- On Page 40 of the application, the graphics depict accessory structures located in a PUE. This is not approvable. Please revise the graphics to show that there are no structures in the PUEs.
 - **Response: This has been changed.**
- A specific variance is required to Subdivision Ordinance section 5-317 regarding block lengths: “Where streets are approximately parallel, connecting streets shall be provided between the parallel streets at reasonable intervals...” This variance request would apply to not proposing connections in the following locations: Between Shadowlake Road and Street B; between Street B and Street C; and between Street A and Street E.
 - **Response: added**
- A specific variance is required to Subdivision Ordinance section 5-303 regarding connections to adjacent properties: “Where it is necessary for the orderly extension of the town’s transportation system to provide for street access to adjoining property, proposed streets shall be extended by dedication to the boundary line of such property. Half streets along the boundary of land proposed for subdivision are not permitted.” A connection is required to be provided to the Quinones and/or Fabricky properties west of the subject property. Please show the dedication to the property line, or request a variance.
 - **Response: added**
- Subdivision ordinance requires a bulb cul-de-sac to be constructed, or a specific alternative approval may be requested through the public process per subdivision ordinance section 5-310. The proposed lot and street layout at the end of Street D does not meet town standards. The bulb, or the t-turnaround must occur at the terminus of the street, to serve the function of turning around. Neither terminus of Street D serves the purpose of turning around. These would be considered short street stubs, as opposed to the legs of a T. Please revise the layout to include appropriate turnaround space at the terminus of the streets.
 - **Response: added**
- Please include the variance requests as a separate document, not embedded at the end of the application. These variances are pertinent to the discussion of the layout of the development.
 - **Response: these have been pulled out.**
- Please remove Variance #11: Disturbance in the CVO. This is not a variance, it is simply its own separate request that runs parallel to the rezoning per section 3230 of the zoning ordinance.
 - **Response: Done. A memo is included to Paul Patterson for the CVO disturbance and request to modify.**
- Please remove Variance #12: Utility separation. This is not a variance request to a Zoning or Subdivision ordinance standard, but a standard/specification that is reviewed administratively by PW and EGIS staff. This request should be made administratively in writing citing the spec,



EDEN & ASSOCIATES

and is more typically handled at the site plan or plat stage. Staff is unlikely to grant a blanket approval to this request, but if you can identify specific areas where this is necessary, we can review the request.

- ***Response: it has been removed and a separate memo is provided.***
- Please remove Variance #13: Toms Creek Basin Unsewered area. This is not a variance request, but rather a separate parallel request that can be reviewed and altered by the ordinance if the rezoning is approved, similar to the Retreat development.
 - ***Response: it has been removed and the applicant will rely on Town staff to carry this out post-rezoning.***