

Elaine Echols

From: Elaine Echols
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2015 5:07 PM
To: Bruce Dotson; Bruce Dotson; Calvin Morris; David Benish; Greg Kamptner; Julia Monteith; Karen Firehock; Richard Randolph; Rick Randolph; Russell Lafferty; Sharon Taylor; Stephanie Mallory; Thomas Loach; Timothy Keller; Wayne Cilimberg
Cc: Faith McClintic; Mark Graham
Subject: Additional information
Attachments: VDOT Letter to County 8-14-15.pdf; Notes from Community Meeting 8-12-15.docx

Dear Commissioners,

We have additional information to share with you regarding the CPA you are reviewing for Tuesday night. Attached please find VDOT's response to our request for their determination of whether additional information is needed for their assessment of whether the CPA complies with their Sec. 729 requirements for a Comprehensive Plan. This is our summary of what the letter says:

- 1) VDOT believes the 729 requirements for a Comprehensive Plan change have been addressed. This means that no additional study is needed for the Comp. Plan Amendment.
- 2) VDOT indicates the preliminary estimates for Average Daily Trips, combined with that fact that Route 29 is a "Corridor of Statewide Significance" and the MPO's prioritization of needed transportation improvements, demonstrates this property will require a detailed analysis at the time of rezoning to verify that the development is aligned with completion of necessary transportation improvements
- 3) The traffic impact analysis needed with the rezoning must include:
 - a. A concept plan showing ingress, egress, and internal circulation on the entire area. (They do not want a piecemeal approach or any expectation of a multitude of entrances on Route 29. Chuck has said that an internal street system with very limited points of access on Route 29 will be expected.)
 - b. Analysis of the I-64 and Fontaine Avenue interchanges be performed consistent with the requirements of 24VAC30-155.
 - c. Detailed trip generation data, access needs, internal circulation, and improvements to address impacts created by this development.
 - d. Demonstration that all other access management strategies and alternatives have been pursued before any consideration of signalization. At a minimum, this must include consideration of grade separations, parallel service roads, roundabouts, and other identified possibilities.

VDOT believes development of this property would accelerate the timeframe required to make improvements at the I-64 and Route 29 interchange. That issue will need to be further explored.

Secondly, there was a community meeting held by Liz Palmer and Karen Firehock last Wednesday night to hear from the public. (Both Sup. Palmer and Karen were not able to make the earlier community meetings.) The meeting notes have been typed up and are attached for your information.

Third, Karen asked us to do an official determination of the development rights on the Sweetspot properties. We were not able to do an official determination, but, an unofficial estimate is provided below:

07500-00-00-03300, 2

07500-00-00-03400, 2
07500-00-00-03800, 1
07500-00-00-04500, 1
07500-00-00-045A0, 2
07500-00-00-045B0, 2
07500-00-00-045C0, 2

TOTALS:- 12

We had estimated possibly 52 units on the parcel zoned R1 for a potential total of 64 units. Please understand that this total is not based on any plan of development and is theoretical only.

Finally, we would note that there was a request from a Sherwood Farms property owner that the staff provide the exact number of homes within a half-mile of the boundaries of the proposed development area expansion and their assessed values. We typically look at distance from a site to the closest homes. On the south side of the site, on the north side of Rt. 29, the closest house is the church rectory, which is about 300' away. The next closest house on the north side of Rt. 29 is about 400' away. The third closest house after that is about 900' away.

Across Rt. 29 South, on the other side of the railroad tracks (Sherwood Farms), the closest houses range in distance (as the crow flies) from 700' – 900'. The vegetation between Rt. 29 South and Sherwood Farms is very dense during the summer. I am sure the residents can share with us information on what is visible behind their houses in the winter. From the closest house on Overlook Drive to the intersection of Teel Lane and Rt. 29, it is a little over ¼ mile drive.

While there are always concerns from homeowners about impacts to property values (which is a reasonable concern), we don't analyze or predict impacts to future property values – there are too many variables and it is not something we are qualified to do.

Have a good weekend and please let me know if you have questions before the public hearing.

Thanks.

Elaine

***Elaine K. Echols, FAICP
Principal Planner – Albemarle County Community Development
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902
434-296-5823 x 3252***



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
1601 Orange Road
Culpeper, Virginia 22701

Charles A. Kilpatrick, P.E.
Commissioner

August 13, 2015

Mrs. Elaine K. Echols
County of Albemarle
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road, North Wing
Charlottesville, VA 22902

RE: CPA201500001 Boundary Line Adjustment

Elaine,

I have completed my review of the proposed amendment to the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan to expand the Development Area Boundary into the area south of I-64 and west of Route 29. The proposal is to expand the growth area by approximately 223 acres to provide an area for larger light industrial uses. The proposal depicts and states that approximately 80 of the 223 acres will be available for development due to critical slopes and other protected natural resources. The proposal further states that the remainder of the property (143 acres), which adjoins Heyward County Park, could compliment the park through resource protection measures, be added to the park proper, or be restricted through possible conservation easements. These measures do not restrict the remainder of the site from other less intense uses like a park. The following are my comments on this proposal:

1. Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation 9th Edition, trip forecasts were developed using the proposed 80 acres, the 1100 Employees, and two additional scenarios using 120 and 160 acres. For the scenarios the Industrial Park (ITE Code 130) was assumed with the balance of the site evaluated as County Park (ITE Code 412). The summary reports from the trip generation software for the various scenarios are attached. Table 1 summarizes these results. Based on the trip generation the proposed site would attract more than 5000 daily trips. According to the Traffic Impact Analysis

Mrs. Elaine Echols

August 13, 2015

Page Two

Regulations 24VAC30-155 the thresholds for a substantial impact or change are defined as “a change that would allow the generation of 5,000 additional vehicle trips per day on state-controlled compared to the

existing comprehensive plan assuming the highest density of permissible use in accordance with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation 9th Edition”, or “those changes that materially alter the future transportation infrastructure, travel patterns, or the ability to improve future transportation facilities on State controlled highways”. Based on the information provided, the development of the properties in the proposed expansion area will **significantly** increase the traffic on the surrounding roadway network and require a Traffic Impact Analysis under the 24 VAC 30-155 regulations to identify the impacts and evaluate the required improvements to support the existing and future traffic and the development.

Table 1 Trip Generation Scenario Summary

Scenarios	Daily Trip Generation
Alt 1 - 80 Acres	5220
Alt. 2 - 1100 Employees	4000
Alt. 3 - 120 Acres	7575
Alt. 4 - 160 Acres	9931

2. The expansion area is made up of eight parcels all owned by Sweetspot of Albemarle LLC. The properties are currently located in the Rural Area with zoning as Rural Agricultural/Land Use with some Residential. The proposal is to bring this area into the Development Area with a designation for industrial use. Based on the proposal the expansion area properties will still have to be rezoned in order for the development to move forward. During the rezoning process the report states that a plan for the development will be provided for the entire expansion area. The plan will need to include a Traffic Impact Analysis in accordance with 24 VAC 30-155 and will provide an in-depth look at the actual proposed development uses; trip generation; access needs; internal circulation; and improvements to address the development’s impact on the Route 29 Corridor and the interchanges at I-64 and at Fontaine Ave.
3. The development area map included in the proposal shows the potential main development areas adjacent to Route 29, but these areas do not appear contiguous. This may limit internal connectivity of the development area and create isolated development sites, which will not be acceptable. As stated above a plan for the entire development that includes internal circulation and access to Route 29 will be required for any development to move forward on the site.

Mrs. Elaine Echols

August 13, 2015

Page Three

4. Route 29 is a **Principal Arterial** roadway, and a Corridor of Statewide Significances (CoSS). In addition, the interchange of Route 29 and I-64 is just north of the proposed expansion site. As the proposal states, signals are the last option to consider when developing the access plans for the properties. When the CTB adopted the Route 29 Corridor study in 2010 it instructed VDOT to work to minimize the number of traffic signals on the corridor with the following Policy Statement:

CoSS Access Point and Access Control Policy Statement: *In managing the Corridors of Statewide Significance, and to minimize the number of traffic signals, it is the policy of the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) that intersections or new access points to those corridors shall be planned, designed, operated and maintained to ensure minimum delay to through traffic. Access locations under consideration shall be evaluated for the impact to corridor travel time and mitigation strategies, including: land use planning, access management, mode shift, transit enhancements, and/ or aggressive traffic operational strategies.*

In addition, the Virginia supplement to the MUTCD stated that:

On any roadway corridor designated by the CTB as a Corridor of Statewide Significance, intersections or new access points which meet warrants for traffic signals shall not have a new traffic signal installed until alternatives such as grade separations, parallel service roads, roundabouts, and other possible options have been evaluated and determined not to be appropriate for the location.

To this end, VDOT will only consider new signals as the **last** option after all other possible solutions have been reviewed and determined to be inappropriate.

5. VDOT is considering a project to improve the interchange of Route 29 with I-64 that may include improvements to the Fontaine Ave interchange. This project is the highest priority for the Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO. However, it will be a costly project and funding for any improvements are not known and the project will need to compete with other projects statewide for the limited funds available. Development of this site will increase the need and accelerate the time frame required to make improvements to the interchange and Route 29.

Mrs. Elaine Echols

August 13, 2015

Page Four

6. The expansion area which Albemarle County is considering added to the Development Area is very large. It is located adjacent to Route 29 and I-64 with the potential of attracting a significant number of vehicle trips to corridor. At this time there are many unknowns surrounding the future development on the site. The County in its evaluation has attempted to clarify some of these questions, but until a developer submits a plan for the development of the entire site the potential size and scope of the development is speculative. In order to identify and evaluate the effects of this change more accurate information is needed. This plan of development as stated above should include an in-depth look at the actual proposed development uses, the development trip generation, the proposed access and external connection configurations, the internal circulation system, and the improvements to address the development's impact on Route 29 Corridor. This plan would be part of the rezoning process for any portion of the development and would create the future plan for the entire development.

The proposal addresses the requirement of the Chapter 729 regulations.

Let me know if there are any questions.

Thanks,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. C. Proctor III', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Charles C. Proctor III
Planner
Culpeper District

Enclosures

Trip Generation Summary

Alternative: Alt. 1 - 80 Acres

Phase:

Project: New Project

Open Date: 8/7/2015

Analysis Date: 8/7/2015

ITE	Land Use	Weekday Average Daily Trips				Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic				Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic			
		*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total
130	INDUSTRIAL 1 80 Acres		2447	2447	4894		544	112	656		143	539	682
412	PARKCOUNTY 1 143 Acres		163	163	326		2	1	3		8	5	13
	Unadjusted Volume		2610	2610	5220		546	113	659		151	544	695
	Internal Capture Trips		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
	Pass-By Trips		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
	Volume Added to Adjacent Streets		2610	2610	5220		546	113	659		151	544	695

Total Weekday Average Daily Trips Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

* - Custom rate used for selected time period.

Trip Generation Summary

Alternative: Alt. 2 - 1100 Employees

Phase:

Project: New Project

Open Date: 8/7/2015

Analysis Date: 8/7/2015

ITE	Land Use	Weekday Average Daily Trips				Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic				Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic			
		*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total
130	INDUSTRIAL 2		1837	1837	3674		445	72	517		101	405	506
	1100 Employees												
412	PARKCOUNTY 2		163	163	326		2	1	3		8	5	13
	143 Acres												
	Unadjusted Volume		2000	2000	4000		447	73	520		109	410	519
	Internal Capture Trips		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
	Pass-By Trips		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
	Volume Added to Adjacent Streets		2000	2000	4000		447	73	520		109	410	519

Total Weekday Average Daily Trips Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

* - Custom rate used for selected time period.

Trip Generation Summary

Alternative: Alt. 3 - 120 Acres

Phase:

Project: New Project

Open Date: 8/7/2015

Analysis Date: 8/7/2015

ITE	Land Use	Weekday Average Daily Trips				Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic				Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic			
		*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total
130	INDUSTRIAL 3		3670	3670	7340		817	167	984		215	809	1024
	120 Acres												
412	PARKCOUNTY 3		118	117	235		1	1	2		5	4	9
	103 Acres												
	Unadjusted Volume		3788	3787	7575		818	168	986		220	813	1033
	Internal Capture Trips		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
	Pass-By Trips		0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
	Volume Added to Adjacent Streets		3788	3787	7575		818	168	986		220	813	1033

Total Weekday Average Daily Trips Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

* - Custom rate used for selected time period.

Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual 9th Edition, 2012

TRIP GENERATION 2014, TRAFFICWARE, LLC

Trip Generation Summary

Alternative: Alt. 4 - 160 Acres
 Phase:
 Project: New Project

Open Date: 8/7/2015
 Analysis Date: 8/7/2015

ITE	Land Use	Weekday Average Daily Trips				Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic				Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic			
		*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total	*	Enter	Exit	Total
130	INDUSTRIAL 4 160 Acres		4894	4893	9787		1089	223	1312		287	1078	1365
412	PARKCOUNTY 4 63 Acres		72	72	144		1	0	1		4	2	6
Unadjusted Volume			4966	4965	9931		1090	223	1313		291	1080	1371
Internal Capture Trips			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
Pass-By Trips			0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0
Volume Added to Adjacent Streets			4966	4965	9931		1090	223	1313		291	1080	1371

Total Weekday Average Daily Trips Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday AM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

Total Weekday PM Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic Internal Capture = 0 Percent

* - Custom rate used for selected time period.