

**Town of Amherst
Planning Commission Minutes
April 2, 2008**

A meeting of the Town of Amherst Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson June Driskill in the Council Chambers of the Town Hall at 7:30 PM on April 2, 2008. It was noted that a quorum was present as indicated below:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| P Jason Campbell | P William Jones |
| P June Driskill | A Steve LaBar |
| P Lyle Garrette | P Richard Wydner |
| P William Hathaway | |

Town Manager Jack Hobbs was present in his capacity as Secretary to the Commission.

The minutes of the March 5, 2008 Commission meeting were approved on a motion by Mr. Wydner, seconded by Mr. Hathaway, and carried 6-0 according to the following:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----|----------------|--------|
| Jason Campbell | Aye | William Jones | Aye |
| June Driskill | Aye | Steve LaBar | Absent |
| Lyle Garrette | Aye | Richard Wydner | Aye |
| William Hathaway | Aye | | |

Ambriar Small Area Plan Ordinances

The Town Manager gave a report on the impact of the proposed access management regulations on the development proposed at the Ambler property. The text of the report was follows:

After its public hearing on the proposed Ambriar access management regulations on March 5, 2008, the Town of Amherst Planning Commission asked me to review a conceptual Ambler property development plan against the proposed ordinance amendment. I offer the following:

Background

Significant work to support Comprehensive Plan amendments and the proposed ordinance amendments were summarized in the VDOT-funded "Traffic Impact Overlay Plan for the Ambriar Area".

The conceptual development plan being discussed was drawn to support a rezoning proposal that was approved by the Town Council on April 12, 2006 (ZP#06-11) and the subject of some correspondence following the October 10, 2007 (ZP#07-28) adoption of the "Ambriar" amendment to the Town's Comprehensive Plan. The drawing shows a concept developed by the former owners of the property ("Lancer Square" drawing dated May 3, 2005, last revised on April 18, 2006). The current

owner's development plan is to sell pieces to one or more future owners, so there is a high probability that the plan being reviewed will not be realized. Note that this development plan has not been approved by the Town of Amherst. Further, during the March 5 meeting the owner's representative and his consultant indicated that the third and northernmost entrance should be considered deleted from the proposal.

Applicable Regulations

It should be noted that for a project like this to be approved under the Town of Amherst Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance, its site plan must be approved by the Planning Commission. For all major developments, in addition to county grading and land disturbance permit approvals, VDOT must approve the entrance permits. Specific to this project, water and sewer utilities do not exist and would need to be installed according to the Comprehensive Plan. Further, traffic impact statements per the new HB527 rules would need to be developed and reviewed by VDOT and that review submitted concurrently with the official application for site plan approval. It is anticipated that a significant increase in traffic will result from the development of the property as follows:

| <u>Use/ITE reference</u> | <u>Unit</u> | <u>Basis</u> | <u>Multiplier</u> | <u>Est. VPD</u> | |
|--|-------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Hotel/310 | | | | | |
| 3 sty x 280' x 60' = 50,400 SF; 60 rooms | Room | 60 | 8.92 | 535 | |
| Restaurant/932 | | | | | |
| 5,594 SF | 1,000 SF | 5.59 | 130.34 | 729 | |
| Shopping Center/820 | | | | | |
| 14 units @ 1,600 SF, 2 units @3,400 SF-29,200 SF total | 1,000 SF | 29.20 | 42.94 | 1,254 | |
| | | | | As Shown: | 2,518 |
| Vacant Land/820(@ 10% coverage ratio) | | | | | |
| 95-A-91; 7.72 vacant acres | 1,000 SF | 33.63 | 42.94 | 1,444 | |
| 110-A-103 (820); 11.076 vacant acres | 1,000 SF | 48.25 | 42.94 | 2,072 | |
| | | | | Future on same multi-parcel Tract: | 3,516 |
| | | | | Total at Buildout: | 6,034 |

Impact of Proposed Ordinance

Following are the comments that I would return if the conceptual development plan were submitted as a conceptual, non-final, site plan:

1. Although the minimum appears to have been met, the throat length for the Lancer Lane entrance should be maximized. [§18.1-922.05(2)b]
2. In anticipation of a traffic light or traffic circle at the Lancer Lane entrance, provide for an entrance with a one-in, two-out configuration. [§18.1-922.05(2)d]
3. Provide better cross access between the motel, restaurant, shopping center and balance of the property. Provide (a) a continuous service drive, (c)tie-ins to adjacent property and (d) a unified access and circulation system plans that includes coordinated and shared parking. [§18.1-922.08(2)]

4. The drawing shows an 85'+/- separation between the edge of the southern access and the property line, and the edge of the entrance for the Leonard building is 13'+/- past that line. A 245' edge-to-edge separation between the southern entrance and the Leonard building driveway needs to be provided. [§18.1-922.10(1), §18.1-922.16(d)]
5. Show the limits of use zone at the Lancer Lane intersection. [§18.1-922.12, §18.1-922.16j]
6. Provide bike racks. [§18.1-922.13(3)]
7. Provide an internal sidewalk network. [§18.1-922.13(6), (7) & (8)]
8. Provide trip generation data and an appropriate traffic impact study. [§18.1-922.16(h); §18.1-919; HB527]

Conclusion

Improved planning and consideration of several access management techniques in the early stage of the design development process will help mitigate the impact of new developments that will increase the amount of traffic on S. Main Street.

A report from the Town Attorney in regarding the proposed regulations was presented. The text of the letter report was as follows:

I am responding to your request on whether Section 18.1-922.10.1 and 18.1-922.06.1 of the Town Ordinance are in conflict. Based on my reading of both sections, I do not find them in conflict.

Section 18.1-922-.10.1 creates a minimum separation distance between entrances while 18.1-922.06.1 creates "the minimum number necessary" relying on safety and access needs to enhance circulation of traffic.

My concern is that 18.1-922.06.01 creates the possibility of subjective decisions. This may be controlled by close review of site plans.

Mr. Jones made a motion to recommend that the Town Council approve the following amendments to the Town of Amherst Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance pursuant to the March 5, 2008 public hearing on the matter:

1. §18.1-302.94.1 - Establishment of a definition for *Preserved area*.
2. §18.1-405 - Adjusting the road frontage requirement for new lots.

3. §18.1-801 - Creating new minimum lot widths in the T-1 and B-2 districts.
4. §18.1-922 - Establishment of a new Ambriar Access Management Area and associated regulations.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Garrette and carried 6-0 according to the following:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----|----------------|--------|
| Jason Campbell | Aye | William Jones | Aye |
| June Driskill | Aye | Steve LaBar | Absent |
| Lyle Garrette | Aye | Richard Wydner | Aye |
| William Hathaway | Aye | | |

Mrs. Driskill stated that full Ambriar area site plan proposals should be reviewed very closely and that fine-tuning adjustments to the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance could be made at that time.

Comprehensive Plan

The Commission reviewed draft economic development and sewer infrastructure sections of the proposed comprehensive plan.

The Secretary gave a report on a series of current state problems and initiatives that will probably influence the Town's land use regulation program in the coming years. These include a lack of funding for new road construction and maintenance, an ongoing revision of the "land use" permit regulations (the way VDOT has traditionally managed new development), new "access management" standards, new secondary street (subdivision road) design and acceptance requirements and the new traffic impact analysis regulation (HB527).

There being no further business, Mr. Hathaway made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Wydner and carried 6-0 according to the following to adjourn the meeting at 8:56 PM:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----|----------------|--------|
| Jason Campbell | Aye | William Jones | Aye |
| June Driskill | Aye | Steve LaBar | Absent |
| Lyle Garrette | Aye | Richard Wydner | Aye |
| William Hathaway | Aye | | |

June Driskill, Chairperson

Attest: _____