Bundoran Farm

February 13, 2023

Albemarle County Department of Community Development
Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner II, Planning Division
Lea Brumfield, Senior Planner II, Planning Division
Kevin McDermott, Planning Manager
Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager
Karen Firehock, Chair, Planning Commission, Samuel Miller District
Jim Andrews, Board of Supervisors, Samuel Miller District

Dear County Officials,

We, the newly elected Board members of The Bundoran Farm Community Association ("BFCA") would like to state our **unanimous opposition** to SP2022-000002 related to the expansion project at the Inn and Crossroad's Tavern ("SUP-02"). This unanimous opposition is in line with the prior Board's unanimous opposition dated October 3, 2022. (attached)

The BFCA is the governing body for a community of 76 landowner households comprising a residential development set on 2300 acres in North Garden. Under our community charter, the BFCA Board of Directors has the authority and responsibility to represent the interests of its owners and administer the general affairs of the Bundoran Farm community.

The BFCA was founded in 2006 with the consent and support of Albemarle County as an agricultural preservation development. The preamble of our community charter makes this mission clear:

"Bundoran Farm is a residential community located in the Albemarle County, Virginia, founded on the principles of sustainability and preserving the rural, agricultural character and scenic value of the land through environmentally sensitive land use and stewardship of farmland, forest, and other natural resources."

Our commitment to this conservation ethic is exemplified by our partnerships with the Thomas Jefferson Soil and Water Conservation District and the James River Association. We recently completed projects on the farm that included installing fencing to create eight distinct pastures to promote rotational grazing of cattle, the planting of several hundred of tree saplings, and various fencing projects to create and protect stream buffers.

Bundoran Farm

Given BFCA's 15-year commitment to preserving the rural, agricultural character of North Garden, we believe we are uniquely qualified to render the following opinions:

1) The Inn expansion project is completely at odds with our mandate to preserve the rural, agricultural character and scenic value of the land and we strongly reject the claim that SUP-02 is consistent with the agricultural mission of the surrounding area.

2) We strongly disagree with the recent PLANNING STAFF REPORT SUMMARY which concluded that the proposed Inn expansion "...will increase the scale of activity, However, it would be less intense use than Pippin Hill Winery." Both the current BFCA Board and prior BFCA Board have notified the County Officials that lighting, noise, and traffic concerns have been an ongoing issue for Bundoran Farm residents for 10+ years. The County should NOT use the current "scale of activity" at Pippin Hill as an acceptable benchmark metric.

3) We believe EPG is improperly using its small, 6-acre vineyard at Pippin Hill to bolster its claim for an expanded luxury lodging complex. This double-dip practice of citing an adjacent lot's agricultural practices sets another dangerous precedent as it will allow developers to purchase a large tract of divisible land, set up a "show winery", then file for the Agritourism exemption of all the remaining lots. As such, we urge the County to ignore any agricultural attributes that cannot be performed solely on Lot 87-3B. It is clear from the drawings, that once the structures, roads, parking areas, and drain fields are built on this 4-acre lot, there is no land left for any agricultural activity.

4) A proposal that purportedly "preserves" a small, historical Inn by building a luxury lodging complex that is 7-8 times wider and has 3-4 times the square footage than the Inn itself seems inconsistent with what's necessary for a sincere historic preservation effort. Worse, the precedent of allowing such an exception would be a windfall for future developers: find any historical structure, promise vague preservation efforts, then bypass established zoning laws to develop the lot as desired.

5) Given the size and scope of the Crossroads Inn Project, the BFCA has serious concerns regarding the local impact on the water supply. The Water Works Operation Permit (#2003653) for Pippin Hill, adjacent to the Crossroads Inn, states that "No information on the well pump capacity or well yield is known." The County cannot, then, assess the impact an estimated 50,000+ annual visitors is having on our community's water table. Since 1) the well that currently serves the Inn will be significantly taxed with the addition of 12-13 more bathrooms as well as other increased water demands; and 2) the well with Permit #2003653 is only a few hundred yards away, we strongly encourage the County to pause this project until actual capacity and well yield data are provided.

6) Despite the public assurances from EPG about their ability to regulate guest behavior at the Inn, EPG is presently unable to routinely regulate the operations at Pippin Hill in regard to lighting, traffic, and noise. We strongly believe that greater numbers of overnight guests at Crossroads would only exacerbate this set of problems.

Bundoran Farm

7) EPG announced, just days before the County's February 14th meeting, that its simplistic site plan drawing is for "illustrative purposes only". The size, scope, and water demand of this new project are too uncertain to warrant approval. It is notable that the Fauquier County Planners faced with an identical EPG luxury lodging project, the Blackthorne Project, had the same concerns:

"There are numerous discrepancies in the application materials which make it difficult to fully evaluate such items as traffic, parking, adaptive reuse, level of activity, square footage, water usage, and use of some structures."

The Fauquier County Planners rejected EPG's Blackthorne Project, also framed as an "historic preservation", and we encourage the Albemarle County planners to do the same.

In Summary, the BFCA calls upon the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to reject the SUP request from the Easton Porter Group allowing the construction of any guest cottages/structures on Parcel ID Lot 87-3B, known as the Inn at the Crossroads property.

Respectfully submitted,

The Bundoran Farm Community Association Board of Directors

The Bundoran Farm Community Association Board of Directors

BFCA Board Members:

Christopher Hendy, President (901 Carpenter Drive, North Garden VA)
Dorothy Tompkins, Vice-President (585 High Top Drive, North Garden VA)
Diane Forastè, Secretary (670 Hightop Drive, North Garden VA)
Michael Greer, (390 Hightop Drive, North Garden, VA)
Carter Leake (3111 Sutherland Road, North Garden VA)

FAUQUIER COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
10 HOTEL STREET
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20186
(540) 422-8210
FAUQUIER COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
10 HOTEL STREET
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20186
(540) 422-8210
FAX (540) 422-8231

REVIEW COMMENTS

DATE:	April 12, 2017
TO:	Dean Andrews, Owner Jim Carson, Consultant Lisa Moran, Consultant
FROM:	Holly Meade, Chief of Planning – Fauquier County
APPLICATION:	SPEX-16-006207
PIN:	6044-67-8620-000, 6044-57-6929-000, 6044-67-0476-000, 6044-67-0871-000
ZONING DISTRICT:	Rural Agricultural
ACREAGE:	50.66
PROPOSAL:	Special Exception for the following uses: (1) Category 7 Adaptive Re-use of a historic structure for restaurant, (2) Category 9 for a Resort, (3) Category 9 for Class C events, (4) Category 20 for an above ground water and sewer pumping storage facilities, and (5) Category 20 for a sewage treatment system.

Planning

1. Staff has concerns about the scope of the project in an area designated as rural in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan includes goals aimed at enhancing and preserving the rural character of the County. The Plan seeks to provide strict controls over new development in the rural areas. The Applicant has stated the level of activity and expansion requested are required to make the project successful. The Board will ultimately have to determine the balance between the rural lands and the proposed uses. Typically the rural

atmosphere can best be maintained with non-impervious parking surfaces, minimum signage, minimum grading, and landscaping that would buffer uses and vehicles from view.

2. There are numerous discrepancies in the application materials which make it difficult to fully evaluate such items as traffic, parking, adaptive reuse, level of activity, square footage, water usage, and use of some structures. Those items are outlined throughout these comments.
3. All structures need to be located 100 feet from all property lines. This includes the structures on the 7 acre parcel as well as the proposed storage structure proposed with the renovation of the historic structure. Staff believes the setback should apply to parking and travelways as well.

4. Staff is unclear how the flow of traffic will function. The plat shows two VDOT approved entrances, one at the eastern end of the property and one on the newly acquired 7 acre parcel at the western end of the project as well as an entrance to the historic structure. Staff was under the impression the western access point was to be used as an exit only. This access point is currently serving other residential uses to the south. Staff is interested in the intended design, maintenance, viewshed and operation of this access point.

5. As discussed throughout the application process, staff suggests moving the event structure, ceremony lawn, road and parking as far as possible from the rear property line to lessen the impact to the neighboring properties. This will be the location of the most intense activity, thus staff is concerned about sound, traffic and lighting impacts.

6. No details have been provided for the proposed buffer, screening fence, or new road. Knowing what is proposed in the buffer, type and height of fence and width and materials of the new road and other parking areas will help staff to provide a complete assessment of the proposal.

7. Since the property is located in the RA zoning district, the sliding scale with the requirement for 85% open space applies. Research shows that the non-common open space requirement for the parent parcel was never triggered. In this case there is theoretically enough land for another division (1.5 acres) before triggering the open space requirement. Staff will be suggesting a condition of approval that says the land cannot be divided again while the use is operating and that no dwellings be constructed on the lot unless specifically approved as part of the Special Exception. Because the lots will be required to be consolidated so that drainfields will be located on the lots they serve, only a tenant home could be approved because there is an existing dwelling on the 7 acre lot.

8. Staff is unsure how the limitations in the noise ordinance can be met with the close proximity of the event building and ceremony lawn to the rear property line. Please address.

9. It is likely the event building will need fire suppression. Please address how this will be addressed.

10. If any components of the water or septic systems are to be above ground please provide details of the location, height and appearance.

11. Please provide details as to number of golf carts for the resort and where they will be stored when not in use.

Zoning

1. The application includes four parcels:

   a. PIN 6044-67-8620 contains 44.5505 acres and is zoned RA-Rural Agriculture. The lot is developed with multiple structures associated with the former Blackthorne Inn. The history of the Blackthorne Inn approvals are set forth below.

   b. PIN 6044-57-6929 contains 7.5692 acres and is zoned RA-Rural Agriculture. The lot is currently developed with a single family home and three outbuildings.

   c. PIN 6044-67-0871 contains 2.214 acres and is zoned RA Rural Agriculture. The lot was created by the former owner (Kirchner) as a family division in July 2007 and is subject to a ten year sales restriction, which expires in July 2017. The property is currently vacant.

   d. PIN 6044-67-0476 contains 3.2306 acres and is zoned RA Rural Agriculture. The lot was created by the former owner (Kirchner) as an administrative division in July 2007. The property is currently vacant.

2. This property has been approved since the 1980s as a resort and restaurant and, more recently, for events (after a structure was built for events without approvals). The record of these multiple approvals on the property over the years are not entirely clear, and it appears that while the uses were properly approved by Special Exception that not all construction received the required site plan and building permit approvals. Rather than do an extensive analysis of this issue, staff is recommending that a new site plan and occupancy permits for all existing buildings, even if not renovated, be required. The expanded use requires the new site plan approval, and based on the SOJ it appears that all buildings will be renovated and/or repurposed, triggering this requirement in any case.

3. The adjoining properties to the south and west are within the Upperville Agricultural and Forestal District.

4. The Conceptual Development Plan does not show the property lines for the properties referenced in #c and #d, above. These lines should be added for reference, as issues associated with these property lines have been identified as noted in other comments.

5. Structure #9 on the Conceptual Development Plan (*"Cottage to remain or be relocated")* is not referenced in the SOJ. What is the planned use of this building?

6. The two existing structures on the 7+ acre property are shown to remain on the Conceptual Development Plan, but no proposed use is shown. Based on the SOJ, is presumed that the

house will remain and be utilized as "employee housing." Please clarify what is meant by "employee housing." Also, identify the proposed use of the adjoining building, which is shown in the real estate records as being a shed/outbuilding.

7. The proposed restaurant use is intended to be open to the greater public, rather than focus on the resort guests. Restaurant use is not generally allowed in the RA district; it is only allowed as an Adaptive Use pursuant to Section 3-307 and 5-700 with approval of a Special Exception. Pursuant to these requirements, the Restaurant Use is allowed only within a qualifying historic structure and must meet all limitations of 5-700. Staff generally defers to Planning Staff for assessment of these standards, but zoning staff would note the following issues:

   a. Compliance with standard #8, which limits an expansion to 30% of the historic structure, is not clearly documented. The application asserts that the expansion is within the 30% limitation and it appears this may be true, but the applicant must provide a more detailed breakdown of the square footage of the original building, the square footage of each area to be removed, and the square footage of each area to be added. Note that the footprint shown on the Concept Development Plan is not consistent with the footprint shown in the more detailed drawings. These should be reconciled, as the footprint shown on the Concept Development Plan appears to far exceed the expansion allowed.

   b. The applicant references standard #10 at the bottom of page 14; his standard allows an extra dwelling on a property as adaptive reuse. On page 15 of their SOJ the applicant states that *[t]here is one single family proposed with this use. We will build a new dwelling for on-site staff as part of the one additional single family dwelling unit.* Clarification is needed regarding this statement; no additional dwelling is shown on the Conceptual Development Plan. And construction of a new dwelling would not qualify under this provision, as the dwelling would have to be in an historic structure. Clarify what is meant by "employee housing" on page 5 of the SOJ. However, it may be possible to approve such housing as a regular dwelling unit or as part of the resort.

8. The proposed resort use is allowed within the RA district with approval of a special exception pursuant to Section 3-309.5 and subject to the standards in 5-901 and 5-906. Zoning staff generally defers to Planning staff on assessment of the standards, but notes the following:

   a. While the SOJ asserts that all structures are a minimum of 150 feet from all property lines, well beyond the 100 feet required, the Concept Development plan shows many buildings in violation of that requirement. Some of the issues may be solved by consolidating the 3.3 and 2.2 with the larger parcel. The consolidation is also needed so that proposed drainfields will be on the same parcel as the structures they serve, as required by the County Code. Consolidation would not solve the deficient setback shown for the proposed new maintenance buildings on the 7+ acre property. However, buildings on the 7+ acre property also do not meet this requirement.

9. The proposed events are allowed within the RA district with approval of a special exception pursuant to Sections 3-309.16 and 5-901 and 5-916. Zoning staff defers to Planning staff on assessment of the standards.

10. The size of the proposed septic facilities triggers a requirement for special exception approval pursuant to Sections 3-320, 5-2001 and 5-2002.

12. The parking and traffic information requires clarification. While some of the details of the parking layout can be worked out at the site plan stage, it is important for the County to understand the location of all of the proposed parking facilities on the site, and whether areas beyond those shown on the concept plan will need to be improved for parking. Staff is less concerned with the technical parking requirements under the ordinance than the actual anticipated parking requirements, as the Zoning Ordinance provides significant flexibility in parking where information is provided to demonstrate that actual demand.

    a. Page 2 of the SOJ indicates employment will start at 70 jobs, rising to 120 jobs by the third year. On page 13 it shows that 25 spaces are proposed for employees on the 7+ acre property. Is this a sufficient number of spaces to accommodate all of the employees that may be on the property at one time? Also, is this the parking location for the two resort SUVs?

    b. Page 13 lists 34 spaces being provided adjacent to the restaurant. It does not appear that quite that many cars would fit in that parking area, it measures to fit more like 31 or 32. Is there a plan to slightly expand the parking area? Also, the total amount of seating in the restaurant is unclear. Page 4 notes 50 restaurant seats and 30 pub seats for a total of 80 seats. Page 5 states 50 dining room seats, 32 pub seats plus an addition 50 seats in private dining rooms and 15 seats in the wine cellar, for a total of 147 dining seats.

    c. Page 13 states in the *Resort Guest Cabins* row that "*there are 54 parking spaces with the current use, plus overflow on grass areas.*" Where is the parking for the cabins located? The small "parking areas" along the road next to the cabins is labeled for golf cart parking.

    d. Based on the information in the SOJ, it appears that a total of 425 seats are available for events in the Events Barn. Is it possible for all of these spaces to be utilized concurrently? Or would only a single event occur at a time, utilizing the most appropriate space, resulting in a maximum of 250 event attendees in the Event Barn at one time? How do the outdoor tents factor into this equation? At the bottom of page 14 it indicates that *even the largest event will generate under 40 additional vehicles.* This suggests that no event spaces would be utilized concurrently. Is this correct? Given the number of events proposed by quarter on page 16 of the SOJ this would appear to be the case.

12. Page 17 states that *limited, seasonal field sports* will be held for resort guests. What does this mean?

13. Site Plan approval is required.

<u>Preservation Planner</u>

1. The subject property, known as Greystone Farm [DHR #030-0029; 053-6087-0232], includes a late 18th century, two-story, Georgian style stone dwelling with multiple 20th century additions. Because this house existed at the time of the Battle of Unison (November 1-3, 1862), and is located along the route that played an integral role in the battle, the stone building is listed in the National Register of Historic Places as contributing to the Unison Battlefield Historic District. The outbuildings, including the garage, bathhouse, and gazebo, are considered non-contributing to the district. According to Section 5-701.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, the historic building with its 20th century additions is eligible for adaptive use. The existing outbuildings are not eligible.

2. The applicant must address the following concerns before this review can continue:

   - The project concept sketches submitted with the application do not correspond with the proposed new floor plans and elevation drawings. The new floor plans depicted on Sheets 4.0, 4.1, & 4.2 are not consistent with the new roof plan on Sheet 4.3 and the proposed elevation drawings on Sheets 5.1 and 5.0. Staff is uncertain of what new construction the applicant is proposing, especially along the west side of the building. Is it represented in the floor plans or the elevation drawings? In addition, a determination of the project's conformity with Sections 5-702.9 and 5-702.8 of the Zoning Ordinance cannot be made with the current application material. The applicant must provide clarity in the form of corrected floor plans and/or elevations drawings. The conceptual drawings could be corrected to match the proposal or removed from the application packet altogether to avoid confusion.

   - Section 5-702.9 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that all alterations and additions to existing historic structures and all additional accessory structures be designed and constructed in a manner that conforms to the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* (www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation.htm). Although staff is waiting for the corrected elevation drawings before making a final determination regarding the proposal's compatibility with the *Standards*, staff has a few concerns at this time and would like to suggest changes that may make the proposal more harmonious with Standard #9, which states *new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

     According to Sheet 5.1, it appears that the proposed new storage building to the west of the existing building (405 square feet) would be connected to the main building with a new stone wall, which would serve to screen the new service area beside the kitchen. Staff's concern is that the connected wall would create the appearance of a very long wing, especially when viewing the north elevation from the road. Although the grade appears to gradually slope to the west, the length of the new construction would not be compatible with the scale of the historic building. Staff suggests that the applicant break up the new wall so that it is not attached to the new wing or the storage building. Planting a hedge row in front of the wall would also provide a visual

break between wing and storage building. Could the orientation of the storage building be changed so that the length would be positioned north-south, instead of east-west?

- Section 5-702.8 of the Zoning Ordinance limits an addition to a historic structure to be thirty percent (30%) in square footage or less of the existing eligible building. Sheets 4.0 and 4.1 show the anticipated square feet of certain rooms in the new basement and ground floor. The Zoning Ordinance defines **gross floor area** *as the sum of the total horizontal areas measured from the interior faces of exterior walls, including basements; elevator shafts and stairwells; floor space used for mechanical equipment with structural headroom of six (6) feet six (6) inches or more; attic space, whether or not a floor has actually been laid, providing structural headroom of six (6) feet six (6) inches or more; interior balconies and outside balconies that exceed a projection of six (6) feet beyond the exterior wall.* Staff suggests that the applicant add the expected square feet of all new spaces, as defined by the Zoning Ordinance, to Sheets 4.0, 4.1, and 4.2 in order to make a stronger case that no more than 30% of the existing building is being added.

- There appears to be a mistake on Sheet 5.0, which shows Note 9 pointing to the chimneys. To clarify, staff understands that three existing chimneys will remain and will be repaired and restored, as needed. In addition, the applicant intends to remove an existing chimney on the east side and rebuild it.

- Sheet 3.0 shows that existing windows on the north elevation will be replaced. Please add a description/photo of the expected replacement windows to Sheet 0.2, Materials.

- Sheet 0.2 describes the new wood siding as "neutral." Please expand this description (i.e. painted brown, gray, etc.).

Soils

1. Staff is concerned that waste flows and water usage have been underestimated. The peak flow provided is 9049 gpd. Using sewage flows from the Virginia Department of Health's Sewage Handling and Disposal Regulations Table 5.1 (a very conservative estimate), the total flows would be 2.5 times higher.

   The waste disposal system dispersal field was designed at an extremely conservative loading rate and the total area delineated, 14.8 acres, greatly exceeds the area actually proposed as the dispersal field, 3.6 acres. With that much additional area available, accommodating a higher total flow should not be problematic. The report from Old Dominion Engineering appears to supply sufficient data to show the technical feasibility of the wastewater treatment dispersal field. The system should be reviewed and approved by the Virginia Department of Health before approval of a site plan for this project.

The greater concern is the amount of water used by the project. The 9049 gpd may underestimate the water usage and also does not appear to account for irrigation, vehicle washing and other water uses that do not return as waste flows. Water usage will probably be substantially higher. Staff would note that the requirements for a hydrogeologic test, Subdivision Ordinance 18-1.A, only address cases involving a subdivision of land. However, for commercial/industrial subdivisions, withdraws of 10,000 or more gpd triggers the requirement. The Blackthorne Inn water withdraw will approach, if not exceed, 10,000 gpd. Staff highly recommends a hydrogeologic test meeting the requirements of Subdivision Ordinance Section 18 be completed and approved prior to approval of a site plan for this project.

2. Lot lines must be adjusted or the lots consolidated so that each drainfield and the structure(s) it supports are located on the same parcel (Fauquier County Code 17-7.a.9).

3. Drainfields and/or wells taken out of use should be properly abandoned per Department of Health regulations and with all required permits.

Economic Impact Analysis

1. It is unclear what the $7,500,000 figure in cell C2 represents. It appears to be identified as total investment, but the figure is used in the calculation of the meals tax and the business license fee. If it is a gross receipts figure, (i) it is significantly larger than the 'comparable' of Pippin Hill that is used ($4,094,205), (ii) it seemingly encompasses more than simply meals as it is used for the business license fee calculation as well as the state sales and use tax calculation and so should not be used for the calculation of the meals tax, and (iii) there is no justification or explanation provided as to how this number was reached.

2. The existing real estate assessed value of the four parcels listed on the statement of justification is $4,302,200. The analysis assumes a real estate value of $4,000,000. The applicant is proposing improvements to the property that would seemingly improve the assessed value of the property.

3. Provide the source/basis for the personal property value. Working backwards from the tax rate for the comparable of Pippin Hill, their Personal Property Value was only $111,140 – a figure much less than $1,750,000.

4. Provide details as to how the County receives 25% of the 2019 revenues in 2018 but the state receives 75% of the 2019 revenue.

The analysis does not provide sufficient justification of the origin of its estimates. Staff recommends this analysis be revised and substantiated in order to provide an estimate of the fiscal impact of the proposed project.

Office of Drinking Water

The purview of the Office of Drinking Water includes public water supply wells, which essentially means those wells that serve 25 or more people per day for at least 60 days out of the year. It appears that the proposed modifications to the site will result in an increase in the number of people served by the existing public water supply well on site, and by several private wells that may or may not result in those wells becoming public water supplies also. The owner will be required to contact this Office to determine permitting requirements for these wells and to demonstrate that adequate capacity is available to serve the proposed water demand.

Health Department

1. This office has many sewage disposal system permits for this property. Some of these permits are confusing as to what facilities they are presently serving as compared to the original system design.

2. New sewage disposal systems are being proposed to serve existing, proposed and/or expanded facilities. This office has not received applications for or plans for these proposed sewage disposal systems.

3. Water supplies shall conform to the Department of Health/Office of Drinking Water Waterworks Regulations.

4. All existing sewage disposal system which are not scheduled for replacement, modification and/or expansion shall be thoroughly evaluated by a licensed Onsite Soil Evaluator/Professional Engineer to determine if the system is Safe, Adequate and Proper for its existing and/or proposed usage.

5. The existing sewage disposal system which served the restaurant facility has a history of system repairs and with the proposed expansion, a new system shall be required properly designed for the expected occupancy of the facility.

Virginia Department of Transportation

The above referenced SPEX application showing a County date of February 21, 2017 and received by VDOT on March 1, 2017 has been reviewed. The submission included a Statement of Justification, Concept Development Plan and other supporting documentation.

The Concept Development Plan addresses comments that were discussed with the applicant at the August 8, 2016 preapplication meeting. The plan reflects closing of two existing entrances on Route 50 and a new entrance west of the inn that aligns with an existing entrance on the north side of the highway. The three access points on Route 50 that will serve the site meet access management separation requirements. The proposed entrance will need to be perpendicular to Route 50. Existing entrances may need to be upgraded to meet current VDOT standards.

The Statement of Justification provides a brief traffic assessment that lacks the detail needed to have a clear understanding of how traffic generated by the proposed uses will impact traffic on Route 50. A proposed total site generated volume of 416 AADT is provided, but there is no

distribution of this total showing the movements anticipated at each of the Route 50 entrances. The assessment also states that traffic from the proposed uses will occur at non-peak hours avoiding conflict with peak hour traffic on Route 50. However, no traffic counts are provided for Route 50 to demonstrate when peak hours occur, nor is a timing comparison of the two peaks provided.

There are other transportation elements that the application does not address. For example, intersection sight distances and right/left turn lane warrant analyses were not included. Items like these can be addressed at the site plan phase. However, assessing them earlier in the process is strongly recommended in order to account for potential improvements that may result in significant increases to project costs.

VDOT has no objection to approval of the Special Exception application. The applicant should be made aware that a complete review of compliance with VDOT standards will be conducted at the site plan phase. They should be informed about the need for VDOT special event permits for events that will impact the Route 50 right-of-way (e.g. signs, traffic control, etc.) as well.

Emergency Services

1. Provide fire-department access/road frontage to all structures (VSFPC Chapter 5). This includes the cottages.

2. All R uses in the building codes require fire sprinkler systems (except R5). Other proposed structures require fire sprinkler systems as well.

Transportation Planner

This one is challenging. There are no trip rates for a spa, cooking school, or the Equestrian Room, so I'm at a loss with those. Regarding the hotel and restaurant, on page 17 under the Traffic Assessment section, there are a few issues:

1. They are using the trip rates from our DSM which is from the 7th edition of the ITE. However, page T-18 of the DSM specifically states that they should use the information from the latest version, which is the 9th edition so they need to revise this.

2. We require that the applicants assume the highest trip generating use allowable, which for a restaurant is based on the sf, not the number of seats. Based on this and using the 9th ed. ITE, with 6,500 sf restaurant, using code 931, Quality Restaurant, the rate is 89.95 trips per 1,000 sf for a total number of 585 trips.

3. I think the Resort Hotel, ITE code 330, is more appropriate for the use described; however, the ITE reference I have only provides a Saturday daily total per occupied room, which is 13.43 trips for a total of 322 trips on Saturday. I would assume this is lower during the week, but this hasn't been studied enough to give more information for an AADT. We can use the information they have listed for code 311, an All Suites Hotel with a rate of 6.24 trips per occupied room for a total of 150 trips per day, but I think we need to be mindful