

**VIII. LOUDOUN COUNTY HOUSING SERVICES**

*(Dated August 2, 2004)*

1. **Comment:** It has been determined that no ADU should be immediately adjacent to or across from another ADU. No more than 3 ADU units should be located in a row of six or more townhouses. No more than 2 units should be located in a row of three to five townhouses. In order to achieve ordinance compliance, the required ADUs should be offered, appropriately located, and marked if the applicant desires to build the Ninety-five (95) units as proposed. The record plat should also clearly provide ADU information in table form.

On a case by case basis, the County is open to reviewing alternative interspersion options that result from creative alternative product types (such as duplexes, "Great House" design etc.), as long as the intent of the Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance is achieved.

**Response:** The Applicant has proposed courtyard-style patio homes in order to provide ADUs while responding the Town of Round Hill's request that no townhouses or attached housing be included in the project. These patio homes have been more thoroughly interspersed throughout the development, as shown on the revised Concept Plan.

**IX. LOUDOUN COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

*(Dated August 12, 2004)*

1. **Comment:** School Board staff has reviewed the second submission documents for the Woodgrove Village rezoning application. With the exception of providing updated student generation data, staff offers no additional comments.

**Response:** This comment is acknowledged.

**X. LOUDOUN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**

*(Dated August 19, 2004)*

1. **Comment:** Staff recommends further discussion with the applicant, the Town regarding the open space easement policies contained in RHAMP. Staff defers to the Town of Round Hill to assess whether public utilities are sufficient to

serve the proposed development and to emergency service agencies and volunteers regarding the suitability of the fire and rescue safety site.

Response: This comment is acknowledged.

2. **Comment:** Staff recommends that the applicant commit to doing a survey of existing trees and development of a Tree Conservation Plan in consultation with the County forester prior to the first record plat.

Response: Tree Save Areas have been depicted on Sheets 4 and 5 of the Concept Plan. The Applicant will develop a Tree Conservation Plan if required to satisfy tree canopy requirements at the time of Site Plan.

3. **Comment:** Staff recommends that basements not be constructed with houses on Lots 20 -25. Further, staff recommends that LID techniques be incorporated into the stormwater management plans for the proposed development in an effort to reduce the size of stormwater management facilities on site.

Response: The Applicant will waterproof any basements constructed on Lots 20-25 and will incorporated LID techniques as appropriate and approvable.

4. **Comment:** Staff recommends that a description of the traffic calming technique for the intersection of Greenwood Drive and Route 719 be provided and proffered.

Response: Concrete paver crosswalks will be used at the intersection of Greenwood Drive and Route 719. This has been added to the Proffer Statement at IV.B.1.e.

5. **Staff recommends that the applicant provide 5-foot trail sections along Route 719 and Greenwood Drive.**

Response: The Applicant will construct eight foot wide trails through the Creekside Preserve along Greenwood Drive, and trails that are consistent with the proffered trail to the north along the Property's frontage on Route 719. The Applicant has further agreed to cooperate with the Town in the design of these features and to depict the agreed design on an illustrative Exhibit to the Proffer Statement.

6. **Comment:** Staff notes that the draft proffers address the capital facilities contribution recommendations. No further discussion of this issue is recommended.

Response: This comment is acknowledged.

7. **Comment:** Staff recommends approval of the referenced modification requests subject to clarification of the following regarding the lotted open space easement:

- identification of who will hold the easement
- timing and conditions of conveyance
- specifications about what may or may not be located in the easement
- means by which the lot purchasers will be made aware of the easement

Staff also recommends that the CDP be revised to specify the lots for which the front and rear yard modifications apply.

**Response:** The Applicant no longer proposes lotted open space easements. The Concept Plan has been revised to more clearly specify the lots for which the front and rear yard modifications apply.

8. **Comment:** Staff generally supports the proposed modification request as a means of insuring that the streetscape along Route 719 is continued. Staff requests that the applicant provide setback information for the existing buildings along the east side of Route 719 and especially those which are adjacent to these three lots and provide a setback that is consistent with these lots. Staff supports the modification request to allow direct access onto Route 719.

**Response:** The Concept Plan has been revised to show setback information for the existing buildings along Route 719 that abut lots 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in the development. These existing houses are set from 21 feet to 24 feet back from a dedication line located 30 feet from the center line of Route 719.