

**Spotsylvania County
Board of Supervisors Agenda
Executive Summary**

Meeting Date: **October 28, 2008**

Title: **CA06 – G: Commercial and Industrial Design Standards**

(Check Mark)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Consent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Closed Session
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Hearing
<input type="checkbox"/>	No Action (Information Only)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ordinance
<input type="checkbox"/>	Resolution (Appropriation)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Power Point Presentation

Recommendation: Staff is requesting the Board to authorize advertisement of proposed amendments to Article 8 of the Design Standards Manual for public hearing November 12, 2008. Staff recommends that the Board authorize the community group amended “alternate” document including staff’s additional recommendations as detailed in this Executive Summary. The recommended document is titled “Staff Recommended Revisions”.

Summary: On September 9, 2008 Spotsylvania County Planning Staff presented a draft amendment to Article 8 of the Spotsylvania Design Standards Manual as recommended by the Planning Commission. At the public hearing, an “alternate” document drafted by the development community and Committee of 500 was presented to the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors favored moving forward with the alternate draft document and as a result the Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors decided to re-advertise with the “alternate” version, of proposed amendments to Article 8 of the Spotsylvania Design Standards Manual and directed staff to bring the case back following additional meetings and review from staff and East Campus Community Group input, for public hearing on November 12, 2008.

Since the September 9, 2008 Board of Supervisors meeting, planning staff has incorporated the changes proposed in the “alternate” draft and held another community meeting at the East Campus to further review and refine the document. Details of notable differences between the draft document presented by staff on September 9, 2008 and that draft to be presented to you at the November 12, 2008 public hearing are summarized below in the Additional Background/ Other Considerations section of this Executive Summary. Changes to the draft document resulting from the “alternate” draft are reflected in underline/ strikethrough format.

Following the September 9th meeting, planning staff organized another community meeting with local stakeholders at the East Campus to discuss proposed amendments to the draft DSM identified in the “alternate” draft. Staff, local citizens, and members of the development community had a chance to “weigh in” during a line by line analysis of the proposal. Throughout the meeting and a number of separate comments received from local citizens a number of additional amendments were identified and appear for your consideration in the Additional Background/ Other Considerations section of this Executive Summary.

Board Committee/Other Committees: Planning Commission

Review Date:	Status:
June 21, 2006	Tabled (Requested a community meeting)
September 5, 2006	Community Meeting held
November 15, 2006	Approved 4-2 (Strother & Taylor voting nay)
November 7, 2007	Staff update
February 6, 2008	Work session
May 7, 2008	Tabled (Requesting a community meeting)
June 11, 2008	Community Meeting held
July 16, 2008	Public Hearing (new hearing initiated for August 20)
August 20, 2008	Approved (6-0 with recommendations)

Board Committee/Other Committees: Board of Supervisors

Review Date:	Status
October 23, 2007	BOS Work session
September 9, 2008	Public Hearing (new hearing initiated for November 12, 2008)

Financial Impact: N/A

Attachments:

- Chapter 8 – “Alternate with Community Group Changes”
- Chapter 8 – Clean copy of “Staff Recommended Revisions” (Red & Yellow)
- Illustrative Plates
- Strikethrough Design Matrix Scorecard with Analysis
- Powerpoint Presentation
- August 20, 2008 Planning Commission minutes
- DRAFT September 9, 2008 Board of Supervisors minutes

Staff Contacts: Patrick Mulhern, Planning Manager, AICP, Jacob L. Pastwik, Planner I

Additional Background/Other Considerations:

“ALTERNATE” DESIGN STANDARDS AMENDMENTS

Planning Staff created an underline/ strikethrough draft document that incorporates changes suggested in the “alternate” draft to that draft advertised for the September 9 BOS hearing. This draft was provided to the Board in a Thursday packet several weeks ago. Notable changes to the document are as follows:

1. Removal of the design matrix scorecard.
2. Removes all illustrative plates (plates 8-1 through 8-6).

3. Amended language to ensure greater clarity.
4. Removes Section 8-4: Design Matrix Narrative and images and/ or illustrations.
5. Applicable only to commercial, office, governmental, or institutional buildings.
6. Industrially zoned parcels not subject to the design standards.
7. Adds grandfather clause to exemptions for clarity.

Development which is otherwise vested pursuant to state law.

8. Adds exemption allowing requirements to be modified or waived by the Planning Director and County Administrator.

Upon request in writing by the Applicant, the Director of Planning and County Administrator or his designee may waive or modify the requirements of Article where such relief would nonetheless continue to implement the general goals and intent of this Article.

9. Requires a FRED stop for buildings in excess of 50,000 sq. ft., subject to FRED specifications and receipt of approvals.

For developments of 50,000 square feet or larger, a covered bus shelter with at least one trash receptacle and seating bench shall be provided for existing or proposed FRED stops, subject to FRED specifications and receipt of all applicable approvals.

10. Adds requirement for special paving materials along pedestrian crosswalks and corridors.

Crosswalks and pedestrian areas shall be signed and/ or accented using special paving materials such as brick or stamped paving materials which shall be coordinated to complement the primary building materials.

11. Removes rezoning notification distance requirements in consideration of nearby residential in favor of a 2000' area regardless of traffic impacts.

For developments that will generate less than 100 peak hour vehicle trips per hour, within 1000' of a residence, or generate greater than 100 peak hour vehicle trips per hour, buildings within 2000' of a residence, the following additional design features will be provided:

12. Requires landscaping of wetponds and dryponds visible from the highway corridor or adjacent residential.

All wetpond and drypond retention systems visible from the HCOD or from adjacent residential development areas must be effectively screened or designed as a landscaped feature.

13. Removes setback requirement altogether, leaving setbacks to the underlying zoning classification.

~~A. Building setback from the street right of way shall be as follows:~~

~~(1) Within the Primary Development HCOD, the building setback from the future right of way line for roads classified as minor collector or greater as identified in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan for the road corridor on which the project is located shall be consistent with underlying zoning.~~

~~(2) Within the Rural Development HCOD, when parking is placed to the rear or sides of buildings and an internal circulation system (both pedestrian and vehicular) is established with adjacent parcels, the setback may be reduced by the Director of Planning.~~

~~(3) Within the Rural Development HCOD, the building setback from the arterial road right of way shall be a minimum of eighty (80) feet.~~

14. Removes the minimum allowable distance standard between entrances, secondary streets or travel lanes.

~~(4) The minimum allowable distance between entrances, secondary streets or travel lanes that intersect with the corridor highway shall be as follows:~~

~~(5) Primary Development HCOD: 200 feet;~~

~~(6) Rural Development HCOD: 500 feet.~~

15. Establishes a minimum standard for roof pitch (4 inches to 12 inches).

Pitched roofs shall have a minimum pitch of 4 inches for every 12 linear inches.

16. Removes light pole height standard for poles within 50 feet of a residence (15 foot requirement).

~~Parking lot lighting poles within 50 feet of an adjacent residential property shall not exceed 15 feet in height.~~

17. Removes requirement for a landscape maintenance bond.

~~Landscape Maintenance Bond: A bond in the amount of 125% of the landscaping cost shall be provided to ensure that landscaping and shrubs remain in tact for twelve months from the date of issuance of an Occupancy Permit.~~

18. Adds chain linked fencing coating standard.

Chain-link fencing shall be coated so as to mitigate the visual impact.

19. Removes renovations and redevelopment projects. Limited to additions in excess of 3500 sq. ft. only not to exceed 30% of existing building footprint.

Section 8-2, Required Development Site and Building Design Standards, provides details on the requirements for all new non-residential, ~~or non- agricultural~~ and non- industrial development and ~~redevelopment for renovations and/or~~ additions of exceeding 3500 sq. ft. gross floor area or less and not exceeding 30% of an existing building footprint within an HCOD.

20. Removes parking space direct access restriction on travel ways.

~~Parking spaces shall be designed to minimize direct access on a primary travel lane, private street or public street that intersects with the corridor highway or provides interparcel access to off site properties.~~

EAST CAMPUS COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP AMENDMENTS TO “ALTERNATE” DOCUMENT (See Attachment titled “Alternate with Community Group Changes” that incorporates these changes in a strike-through and underline format)

Additional amendments were identified through citizen comment, and additional community meeting held at the East Campus following release of the “alternate” draft. Staff asks that you consider these revisions and recommend amending the document to include:

1. Adding an exemption for industrial type buildings on I-1, I-2 zoned parcels, leaving by-right commercial type buildings within the same zoning classification subject to the standards in Sec. 8-1.4.E. The exemption would appear as:

I-1, I-2 (Industrial) zoning uses not permitted by-right in C-1, C-2, C-3, O-1, O-2 Zoning districts.

2. Clearly dividing the document by section to address site design or building design standards separately. Section 8-2 would apply to site design and 8-3, buildings.
3. Revising the minimum standard in Section 8-3.1.C. for more appropriate roof pitch (6 inches to 12 inches instead of 4 inches to 12 inches).

Pitched roofs of the primary building shall have a minimum pitch of 6 inches for every 12 linear inches. This pitch shall not necessarily apply to porches, canopies, etc.

4. Amends the waiver request to include the Director of Planning only instead of the Director of Planning and County Administrator in Sec. 8-1.4.G.

The requirements of the Design Standards Manual may be waived or modified by the Director of Planning under the following circumstances:

It will further the intent of the Design Standards Manual and, if applicable, the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance.

It will be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

It will not adversely affect the use or development of neighboring properties.

The director of Planning may attach conditions to any waiver or modification

5. Removes landscape median standard for intersections, leaves requirement to VDOT in Sec. 8-2.1.D.

~~Commercial entrances, secondary streets and travel lanes that are expected to exceed 2000 15,000 VPD and intersect with the corridor highway shall be constructed with a landscaped median, minimum six (6) feet in width, to separate ingress and egress traffic and aid pedestrian movement (See Plates 8-1 and 8-2).~~

6. Reintroduces light pole height standard for poles within 50 feet of a residence and revises height requirement to 25 feet in Sec. 8-2.1.N.

Parking lot lighting poles within 50 feet of an adjacent residential property shall not exceed ~~15~~25 feet in height.

ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS RECOMMENDED BY PLANNING STAFF

Planning staff agrees with the majority of amendments proposed by the East Campus Community Working Group. However, staff notes that only 10 of 35 (approx. 30%) of the design matrix criteria were incorporated into the “alternate” draft, resulting in a less effective design standard. In addition, a number of important site design standards located within the document had been removed. Therefore, staff has identified a number of additional amendments to the documents and recommends inclusion of those listed below as well:

- 1) Apply the standards to renovations and redevelopment in addition to additions and new construction. Amendment would appear in Section 8-1.2.

Section 8-2, Required Standards Applicable to all ~~Development Site and Building Design Standards~~, provides details on the requirements for all redevelopment and/ or exterior renovation, and new commercial, office and non-exempt industrial development.

Section 8-3, Required Architectural/Design Standards, provide for the type and style of development related to ~~provides details on the requirements for all redevelopment and/ or exterior renovation, and new commercial, office and non-exempt industrial development.~~

- 2) Incorporate Plates 8-1- Rear Parking Access Plan, 8-2- Secondary Road/ Shared Entrance Access/ Interparcel Connections Plan, 8-3- Screening Options for Parking Lots at Front of Site, back into the document.
- 3) Add Rural HCOD setback language back into the document in Sec. 8-2.3.B.2.

Within the Primary Development HCOD, the building setback from the future right of way line for roads classified as minor collector or greater as identified in the Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan for the road corridor on which the project is located shall be consistent with underlying zoning.

Within the Rural Development HCOD, the building setback from the arterial road right of way shall be a minimum of eighty (80) feet.

- 4) Prohibit use of chain-link fencing in areas visible from the corridor highway in Sec. 8-3.1.S.

Chain-link fencing shall not be permitted in areas visible from the highway corridor.

- 5) Requires pitched roofs over gas dispensing islands in Sec. 8-3.1.F.

Gas pumps at gas stations and convenience stores have pitched roofs over gas dispensing islands.

- 6) Require shade trees to complement pedestrian sidewalks and/ or trails in Sec. 8-2.4.I.

Pedestrian sidewalks and/ or trails within the project area include shade trees located within 10' of the sidewalk/ trail set a maximum 30' apart.

- 9). As a result of legal review, staff recommends removing exemptions for previously approved rezonings and development otherwise vested pursuant to state law.

- a. ~~Previously approved development resulting from a rezoning that involved proffers.~~

- b. ~~Development which is otherwise vested pursuant to state law.~~

For clarity, staff has provided a DRAFT version of the proposed amendments to Article 8 of the Design Standards Manual entitled Chapter 8 – “Staff Recommended Revisions”. For ease of reading, the strike-through and underline format has been removed. This draft highlights in red and yellow the proposed changes staff recommends be incorporated into the final document and is the document staff recommends the Board authorize for public hearing November 12, 2008.

Consequence of Denial/Inaction: If not approved, general development plans and site plans within HCOD areas will continue to be reviewed using the current general criteria found in Chapter 8 of the Design Standards Manual.