



## COUNTY OF PRINCE WILLIAM

5 County Complex Court, Prince William, Virginia 22192-9201  
(703) 792-7615  
FAX (703) 792-4401

PLANNING  
OFFICE

### CURRENT PLANNING CASE INFORMATION

**Plan/Case Information:**

**Print Date: September 11, 2017**

<b>Case Type :</b>	Rezoning
<b>Plan/Case#:</b>	REZ2017-00013
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes
<b>Plan/Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181
<b>Location:</b>	The site is located within both the Rural Area and Development Area of the County; and is located within the Domestic Fowl Overlay District. Coles Magisterial District
<b>Request:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes- To rezone ±144.2 acres from A-1, Agricultural, to SR-1, Semi-Rural Residential, for the development of up to 108 single-family detached residential units on one-acre minimum lots; and to establish a 195-acre natural protec
<b>Submission #:</b>	3
<b>Submission Acceptance Date:</b>	8/14/2017

**Applicant Information:**

<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>	BRANCA DEVELOPMENT LLC ATTN: MARK BRANCA 11672 SANDAL WOOD LN MANASSAS, VA 20112	
<b>Phone:</b>	(703) 927-7783	<b>E-mail:</b> BRANCA@COMCAST.NET

**Case Planner Information:**

<b>Case Planner</b>	MEYER, SCOTT	
<b>Phone:</b>	703-792-6876	<b>E-mail:</b> SMeyer@pwegov.org

# PLAN ANALYSIS

	<b>Reviewed</b>	<b>Reviewed w/Comments</b>
<b>Land Dev Case Manager</b>	1	0
<b>Planning Case Planner</b>	0	1
<b>Transportation Dept</b>	0	1
<b>Watershed Management</b>	0	1



# Plan Comments Report

## County Archaeologist

### Review Completed

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/01/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Patton, Justin		
	703-792-5729	jspatton@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

#### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

NO COMMENTS

---

#### Section II - Questions/General Information:

A report titled "Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Mid-County Park and Estate Homes Property" (Tyrer and Muir-Frost 2016) was submitted with the application. The report identified one archaeology site, 44PW2026. Shovel testing and reconnaissance pedestrian survey recorded a substantial, cut stone foundation, with some brick, measuring approximately 10 by 20 feet. Directly associated with the foundation was a low intensity artifact. It was determined to be a domestic occupation dating between 1880 and the first quarter of the twentieth century.

The report's chain of title "Deed" research for the project area stopped at 1928. Additionally, it was determined by the Applicant that the title research in the archaeology report quickly progressed to a completely different parcel of land in Prince William County off of Davis Ford Road, approximately 5 miles to the northeast. The historic map research in the report is erroneous as well. Figures 13 - 17 and Figure 14 - 21 identify and research the wrong area and do not enclose the correct project area and many of these maps are distorted. The result is that sufficient archival research was not completed for the project area and did not cover the time period identified in the archaeological record.

Additionally, pedestrian reconnaissance survey conducted on February 8, 2017 by the County Archaeologist may have identified a second foundation on a flat ridge terminus, approximately 363 feet east-southeast of 44PW2026. Red, cut stones were observed on the ground surface adjacent a trail. These stones may represent the top remaining sections of a foundation or disarticulated stone piers. No evidence of shovel testing was observed within or adjacent these cut stones. Also, evidence of looting was observed in the foundation at 44PW2026.

A revised report titled "A Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the Mid-County Park and Estate Homes Property (2017)" was for review. Additional research identified no new information. One archaeology site was found, site number 44PW2026, and was recommended not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. No

additional survey was recommended. I concur with that recommendation.

The Prince William County Historical Commission at their regularly scheduled meeting on June 13, 2017 recommended no further work.

However, it is recommend the artifacts from 44PW2026 be donated to and curated with the County and recommend the following proffer.

Curation – Within two (2) months of acceptance of this rezoning, the Applicant shall curate with the County all artifacts, field records, laboratory records, photographic records, computerized data and other historical records recovered as a result of the above excavations of archaeology site 44PW2026. All artifacts and records submitted for curation shall meet current professional standards and “The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation.” A curation fee identical to Virginia Department of Historic Resource’s curation fee will be paid by the Applicant at the time of delivery of the artifacts to the County. Ownership of all records submitted for curation shall be transferred to the County with a letter of gift. Compliance shall be demonstrated by a written confirmation from the County Archaeologist prior to site plan approval.



# Plan Comments Report

## Land Dev Case Manager

### Reviewed

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	West, Andrea		
	703-792-7014	AWest2@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

#### Rezoning Proffers - Land Use Proffer

Land Use Proffer

1.1 Proffer #11 - At which final site plan will the land be conveyed?

---

### Section II - Questions/General Information:

---

NO RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENTED.



# Plan Comments Report

## Long Range Planning

### Pending

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Mcgettigan, David		
	703-792-7189	dmcgettigan@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

#### ASHRAE 90.1 2010 - General Comment

1.02 The proposed site falls within the "Transitional Ribbon" of the Rural Area Preservation Study. The "Transitional Ribbon" is an important character area. It is a linear area of land use transition between the Rural Area and the Development Area. It follows frontage roads and streams that in some cases could create future conflict between rural area character quality and Development Area goals.

The Rural Area Preservation Study has not been approved by the Board of County Supervisors (BOCS) yet. However, the Planning Office anticipates to bring this study forward to the BOCS sometime in the fall. An approval of this study may allow the applicant to consider cluster development and allow extensions of public sewer to the proposed site, which could help protect the environment and make this application be considered a good rural cluster development.

#### Comp Plan - General Comp Plan Issue

The following deficiencies regarding the County and State Ordinances, Standards, Policies, and Codes were noticed:1

1.01 - The proposed zoning district, SR-1, Semi-Rural Residential, is not compatible with the Comprehensive Plan designation (AE, Agricultural or Estate) for this parcel.

---

### Section II - Questions/General Information:

NO RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENTED.



## Plan Comments Report

### Parks and Recreation

### Reviewed w/Comments

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/11/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Chen, Yang		
	703-792-4212	YChen@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

**Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:**

See Attached Comments

---

**Section II - Questions/General Information:**

---

NO RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENTED.



Prince William County Department of Parks and Recreation  
Memorandum

Sep 8, 2017

**TO:** Scott Meyer  
Planning Office

**FROM:** Yang Chen  
Prince William County Department of Parks and Recreation  
Phone: (703)792-4212  
Email: ychen@pwcgov.org

**RE:** REZ2017-00013, Mid-County Parks and Estate Homes, 2<sup>nd</sup> Submission  
Coles Magisterial District

The Prince William County Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed a copy of the subject application and offers the following comments, relevant to the level of service (LOS) standards contained in the Parks, Open Space and Trails of the Prince William County Comprehensive Plan.

**APPLICATION SUMMARY**

The application is proposing to rezone approximately 144.2 acres from A-1, Agricultural, to SR-1, Semi-Rural Residential, for the development of up to 108 single-family detached residential units on one-acre minimum lots and to establish a 195-acre natural protected open space/public park area adjacent to the residential development. The total project area encompasses approximately 325.6 acres and is designated AD, Agricultural or Estate; ER, Environmental Resources; and SRR, Semi-Rural Residential in the Comprehensive Plan. The site is located within both the Rural Area and Development Area of the County; and is located within the Domestic Fowl Overlay District.

The applicant has stated the following in the Proffer Statement with regard to parks and recreation:

1. #11. Park Description, Dedication and Use Restrictions. In lieu of a monetary contribution for Parks, Open space and Trails and subject to acceptance by the Prince William Board of County Supervisors, the Applicant shall dedicate, and convey in fee simple, to the Prince William Board of County Supervisors, subject to the terms and conditions outlined herein, a minimum of one-hundred and ninety-four (194) acres of land located in both the Development and Rural Areas, as generally shown on the Generalized Development Plan as "Mid-County Park and Protected Open Space." The Mid-County Park and Protected Open Space shall permanently preserve and protect approximately 1.6 miles of the Long Branch Stream Valley, and will provide public access to the Long Branch Stream Valley and the natural protected open space. Use of the Mid-County Park and Protected Open Space shall be limited to permanently protected natural open space; trails; a stormwater management wet



pond; a ten (10) car parking area for park visitors; and the grading, drainage, utilities and stormwater management improvements required along the roadways on the edge of the park, provided that no more than 10% of the park is utilized for said improvements.

Active recreational uses such as soccer, baseball or other ball fields, basketball courts, the riding of All-Terrain Vehicles, (“ATVs”), four-wheelers, motorcycles or other motorized vehicles, with the exception of emergency and park maintenance vehicles, and similar active recreational uses shall be prohibited within the park.

Prior to bond release of the final subdivision plan that includes Maple Springs Place and the Gated Private Road, the Applicant shall provide a Special Warranty deed for the conveyance of said Mid-County Park and Protected Open Space to the County, subject to County review and approval of the deed of conveyance.

2. #12. Park Improvement Requirements. Prior to the Conveyance of the Mid-County Park and Protected Open Space to the County, the Applicant shall:
  - A. Install a minimum of two (2) miles of single lane natural surface trails, as generally shown and described on the GDP. The approximately centerline of the trails shall be shown on the final subdivision plans. The final trail width and alignment shall be determined in the field during a trial alignment meeting with the Department of Parks and Recreation (“DPR”), the Trail Contractor, and the Applicant prior to the installation to the trails to minimize cut, fill, grading, overall clearing and land disturbance and to utilize the natural terrain wherever possible. The trails shall be constructed in accordance with the standards established for Class 2 trail as described in the Trail Class Matrix, Figure 2.1, of the Prince William County Department of Parks and Recreation Trail Standards by a Trail Contractor acceptable to the DPR.
  - B. Install the standard County boundary markers or signs along the Park boundary in locations as determined by the DPR, provided the boundary markers or signs are provided by the DPR at its expense. Provide and install all trail identification signs and paint blazes along the trails.
  - C. Install a paved parking area for ten (10) parking spaces including one van accessible handicap parking space. The parking area shall be located near the trailhead and pond in the central portion of the park off of Classic Springs Drive in the general location shown on the GDP. A two or three horizontal board or split rail fence shall be installed around the parking area to prevent vehicles from driving from the parking area into the Park. The parking area, fence, and pond shall be shown on and bonded with the fist final subdivision plan for the Property.
3. #31. The value of the Park dedication is \$4,974,160 (194 acres \* \$25,640/acre), based on the costs outlined in the County Monetary Policy Guide for Linear Parks. The requested total monetary contribution for Parks is \$603,936 (108 homes \* \$5,592/unit). The value of the Park dedication in excess of the requested total

monetary contribution or net value if \$4,370,224 (\$4,974,160-\$603,936). The Applicant shall receive a credit of \$2,185,112.00 (1/2 the net value of the Linear Park dedication based on the costs outlined in the County's Monetary Policy Guide for Linear Parks) towards the monetary contribution referenced in the foregoing proffers. The Planning Office shall determine the amount of the credit that will be applied towards each monetary contribution.

### **PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES NEAR THE PROJECT AREA**

<b>Park Type</b>	<b>Park Name</b>
<b>Neighborhood</b>	None
<b>Community</b>	Valley View Park
<b>Regional</b>	None
<b>Linear/Resource</b>	Doves Landing
<b>Trails</b>	Trail at Doves Landing and Valley View Park

### **LEVEL OF SERVICE ANALYSIS**

The Prince William County Comprehensive Plan contains levels of service (LOS) standards for parks and recreation areas. The Department of Parks and Recreation is responsible for parks and recreation services and facilities and has determined LOS standards from government requirements, professional or industrial standards, citizen surveys, and citizen expectations.

LOS standards for parks, open space, and recreation facilities are measured by applying per capita standards for park facilities based on the characteristics of the development for which a rezoning is sought. The LOS Standards in Appendix B (Page 19-22 in the Parks, Open Space and Trails Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan) are based upon existing conditions within the county and are recognized and accepted national, state, and county standards. They also reflect resident demand for these facilities. The LOS standards ultimately quantify monetary costs for providing a countywide park system and recreation facilities for new residential and non-residential development in the county. These LOS standards are the basis for the county's capital improvement program and for county requests for monetary contributions for park and recreation facilities to serve new development.

### **Comments and Recommendations**

- After a few agency meetings, the Prince William County concluded that we don't agree with the \$25,640/acre credit the applicant is asking for. First, based on the Rural Preservation Study, 163 acres out of 194 acres must be preserved and is not considered to be developable land by the applicant. This dedication therefore has minimal value and/or monetary impact on the application. Therefore, we can only credit the land value of 31-acre difference in the proposed dedication vs. the Rural Preservation Study requirement, rather than the full 194 acres of park land requested by the applicant. Second, DPR believes it's more reasonable to credit the cost of actual site improvement, rather than an estimated cost. Third, the \$25,640/acre is based on the "Development Area", and doesn't apply to the rural area.

- The Department of Parks and Recreation request the \$603,936 monetary contribution, but DPR will credit the applicant the land value of 31 acres (194 minus 163) and the design and construction cost of the trail and parking lot (excluding the cost of the stormwater pond). The applicant shall provide evidence of the costs of such improvement to DPR for review and approval of the value of any such improvement and the applicant shall receive a credit against the Parks and Recreation monetary contributions for such amounts.
- The Department of Parks and Recreation needs to review the final plat before the land transfer. The dedication shall be made a matter of record by property deed to the Board of County Supervisors and such deeds is prerequisite to recordation of a final plat.
- DPR requests the final trail alignment and design minimize water crossings where practicable to avoid undue impacts to aquatic resources or stream habitat.
  - Stream crossings on the trail along the proposed park's western boundary, identified during the site visit, shall be crossed using US Forest Service (USFS) standard wetland puncheon or bridge. DPR will provide diagrams/plans if requested.
  - Non-bridge water crossings shall be constructed according to USFS standards for armored fords. DPR will provide diagrams/plans if requested.
- Should the applicant employ professional contractors for design or construction services, contractors shall be members in good standing of the Professional Trail Builders Association (PTBA), or possesses equivalent professional certification and experience with recreational trail design and construction, as determined by the County.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact Yang Chen at 703-792-4212 or [ychen@pwcgov.org](mailto:ychen@pwcgov.org). Thank you.



## Plan Comments Report

### Planning Case Planner

#### Reviewed w/Comments

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/06/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Meyer, Scott		
	703-792-6876	SMeyer@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

#### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

NO COMMENTS

---

#### Section II - Questions/General Information:

NO RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENTED.



## Plan Comments Report

### Planning GIS Specialist

### Review Completed

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/05/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Mccleary, John		
	703-792-6859	JMcCleary@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

#### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

NO COMMENTS

---

#### Section II - Questions/General Information:

NO RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENTED.



## Plan Comments Report

### Proffer Administrator

### Pending

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Bernal, Juan		
	703-792-4084	jbernal@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

---

#### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

NO COMMENTS

---

#### Section II - Questions/General Information:

NO RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENTED.



# Plan Comments Report

## Transportation Dept

### Reviewed w/Comments

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/01/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Phillips, George		
	703-792-8094	GPhillips@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

#### DCSM Sec 600 (Effective August 2015) - 601.06 B Street Extensions to the Property Line

All planned interparcel connections shall be constructed to the subdivision or site boundary limit with adjoining properties. If a temporary turnaround is required onsite, the right of way for the turnaround shall be dedicated and all setback requirements referred from the right-of-way line or the temporary turnaround easement whichever is more restrictive.

*Comments:* 1.01- The Applicant proposes a gated private road connection, rather than a public road connection, between proposed Maple Springs Place on-site and existing Classic Lakes Way. The Applicant notes the private gate is designed to prevent cut-through traffic between two arterial roads, Bristow Road and Dumfries Road. However, a possible cut-through traffic issue has not been demonstrated by the Applicant. For example, it seems unlikely that AM peak southbound traffic on Bristow Road would cut through the proposed circuitous Mid-County Park & Estate Homes street network to then go south on Dumfries Road and vice versa with more direct access via the Dumfries Road/Bristow Road intersection. This is also likely the case for PM peak northbound traffic on either Dumfries Road or Bristow Road needing to cut through the circuitous proposed Mid-County Park & Estate Homes development. This is because the decision regarding which road to take would be made at the Dumfries Road/Bristow Road intersection well to the south of the site entrance at Dumfries Road/Canova Drive intersection. Second, the placement of a gated private drive between two public (VDOT) roads may not be acceptable to VDOT in this case due to circuitous travel for maintenance vehicles, street acceptance, etc. Prince William County Transportation staff recommends the Applicant provide a public road connection to Classic Lakes Way via Maple Springs Place. However, Prince William County Transportation staff will agree with VDOT's final recommendation in this matter.

*Note:* The Applicant's supplemental traffic analysis, dated August 23, 2017 examines the impact of a second site connection with direct access to Bristow Road via Maple Springs Way and Classic Lakes Way. The analysis shows that the Bristow Road/Classic Lakes Way intersection will operate at LOS A during both peak hours with no queueing issues.

## **Section II - Questions/General Information:**

Based upon the County's need to reduce or prevent congestion on the public streets, to facilitate the provision of adequate transportation facilities, and to protect against congestion in travel and transportation, this rezoning application can be supported once the Applicant agrees to provide the recommended inter-parcel access connection to Classic Lakes Way with a public road road connection or accommodates VDOT's final recommendation on this matter.

The Applicant's are advised that while this report has examined their rezoning application primarily within the context of the Transportation Section of the Comprehensive Plan, this does not infer a reduction in their obligation to comply with the appropriate requirements of the DCSM during site plan review.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact George Phillips at [gphillips@pwcgov.org](mailto:gphillips@pwcgov.org) or 703-792-8094.





# Plan Comments Report

## VDOT Fairfax Review Completed

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/06/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Phillips, George		
	703-792-8094	GPhillips@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

See Attached Comments

### Section II - Questions/General Information:

VDOT does not have any other comments to offer on this subject rezoning application. The previous comments have been adequately addressed. VDOT has no objection to approval of this application.

Contact Yao Lu at Yao.Lu@VDOT.Virginia.gov with any further questions.

<b>VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION                  PRINCE WILLIAM LAND USE                  PROJECT REVIEW                  COMMENT AND RESOLUTION SHEET</b>				<b>TIA - ACCEPTED</b>		<b>COMMENT CATEGORIES:                  1. REQUIREMENT                  2. RECOMMENDATION</b>	
<b>COUNTY PROJECT NUMBER: REZ PLN 2017-00013</b>			<b>DEVELOPER/ENGINEER: BRANCA DEVELOPMENT LLC                  &amp; VETTRA (TIA)</b>		<b>REVIEWER(S): YAO LU, P.E.</b>		<b>DATE: 9/06/2017</b>
<b>PROJECT NAME: Mid-County Park &amp; Estate Homes</b>			<b>REVIEW PHASE &amp; TYPE: REZONE 3<sup>RD</sup> SUB/UPDATED TIA</b>		<b>DISCIPLINE: PWC LAND USE SECTION</b>		
<b>ITEM                  No.</b>	<b>DWG.                  No. (1)</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>COMMENT                  CATEGORY</b>	<b>RESPONSE(2) DATE: 7/25/2017</b>			<b>FINAL DISPOSITION(3)</b>
	G	The applicant submitted a supplemental TIA that included a new study location at the intersection of Bristow Road and Classic Lakes way. The Report examined the potential impact of the proposed site. After review, the TIA is found to be acceptable. We do not have more comments to offer on this subject rezoning application.	1				The previous comments have been adequately addressed. No objections to approval.

(1) Indicate drawing no./page no. or use "G" for general comment. (2) To be filled out by Applicant/Engineer. Date of Response is required. (3) The VDOT reviewer is responsible for the final disposition of all comments.	Note: This form is to be used by the VDOT land use team to provide comments or concerns associated with the rezoning applications, site plans or any other plans when requested by the county or the applicants.  REVISED SEPTEMBER, 2014
---	---

<b>VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION                  PRINCE WILLIAM LAND USE                  PROJECT REVIEW                  COMMENT AND RESOLUTION SHEET</b>				<b>TIA - ACCEPTED</b>		<b>COMMENT CATEGORIES:                  1. REQUIREMENT                  2. RECOMMENDATION</b>	
<b>COUNTY PROJECT NUMBER: REZ PLN 2017-00013</b>			<b>DEVELOPER/ENGINEER: BRANCA DEVELOPMENT LLC                  &amp; VETTRA (TIA)</b>		<b>REVIEWER(S): YAO LU, P.E.</b>		<b>DATE: 9/06/2017</b>
<b>PROJECT NAME: Mid-County Park &amp; Estate Homes</b>			<b>REVIEW PHASE &amp; TYPE: REZONE 3<sup>RD</sup> SUB/UPDATED TIA</b>		<b>DISCIPLINE: PWC LAND USE SECTION</b>		
<b>ITEM                  No.</b>	<b>DWG.                  No.<sup>(1)</sup></b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>COMMENT                  CATEGORY</b>	<b>RESPONSE<sup>(2)</sup> DATE: 7/25/2017</b>			<b>FINAL DISPOSITION<sup>(3)</sup></b>
3.01	GDP	Revised GDP shows a gated private road connection between the two cul-de-sacs of Maple Springs PI and Classic Lakes Way. Applicant had previously submitted a SSAR exception that was approved by VDOT based on constrains it presented in order to provide such a connection. As such, please justify how the private road is now proposed between the two developments? If the public street connection is difficult to build, the same is true for a private road connection at the same location.	1	In addition to the justification provided in the SSAR Exception, the following additional reasons for the Gated Private Road connection between two public roads were discussed with VDOT in a meeting with the Applicant at VDOT on July 20 <sup>th</sup> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County approved inter-parcel connection waiver (see attachment) allows a Gated Private Road connection to Classic Lakes Way to serve as the 2<sup>nd</sup> access to the proposed low-density residential development.</li> <li>• The Gated Private Road between two public road cul-de-sacs recommended by the County will prevent the functional classification of Classic Springs Drive and Classic Lakes Way from being changed from local streets designed and intended to serve the internal movements within the existing low-density residential neighborhoods and connect to the arterial system, to collector roads that would penetrate the existing low-density residential neighborhoods to provide intra-county traffic a new through road or cut-through connection between two arterial roads (Bristow Road and Dumfries Road) through the existing low-density residential neighborhoods of Classic Springs and Classic Lakes. I would further add that, Classic Springs Drive and Classic Lakes Way are low volume residential streets that provide direct access to individual residences and were never designed or intended to serve as a through road connection between Bristow and Dumfries Roads for a short cut for intra-county traffic.</li> <li>• The proposed development is located along the boundary between the Development and Rural Areas. The proposed low-density estate home cluster development provides a transitional land use between residential land uses in the Development Area to the east and the Rural Area land uses to the west.</li> </ul>			Comment Closed

(1) Indicate drawing no./page no. or use "G" for general comment. (2) To be filled out by Applicant/Engineer. Date of Response is required. (3) The VDOT reviewer is responsible for the final disposition of all comments.	Note: This form is to be used by the VDOT land use team to provide comments or concerns associated with the rezoning applications, site plans or any other plans when requested by the county or the applicants. REVISED SEPTEMBER, 2014
---	---

<b>VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PRINCE WILLIAM LAND USE PROJECT REVIEW COMMENT AND RESOLUTION SHEET</b>				<b>TIA - ACCEPTED</b>		<b>COMMENT CATEGORIES: 1. REQUIREMENT 2. RECOMMENDATION</b>	
<b>COUNTY PROJECT NUMBER: REZ PLN 2017-00013</b>			<b>DEVELOPER/ENGINEER: BRANCA DEVELOPMENT LLC &amp; VETTRA (TIA)</b>		<b>REVIEWER(S): YAO LU, P.E.</b>		<b>DATE: 9/06/2017</b>
<b>PROJECT NAME: Mid-County Park &amp; Estate Homes</b>			<b>REVIEW PHASE &amp; TYPE: REZONE 3<sup>RD</sup> SUB/UPDATED TIA</b>		<b>DISCIPLINE: PWC LAND USE SECTION</b>		
<b>ITEM No.</b>	<b>DWG. No.(1)</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>COMMENT CATEGORY</b>	<b>RESPONSE(2) DATE: 7/25/2017</b>			<b>FINAL DISPOSITION(3)</b>
3.02	GDP	Two public streets are proposed to be connected with a gated private street. It is not acceptable. Such a connection should be proposed with a through public street removing the temporary cul-de-sac at the existing subdivision terminal (Classic Lakes Way).	I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County stated in an email to Yao Lu, P.E. dated April 19, 2017 (see attachment) that: <i>"we believe that development or re-development of the parcels adjacent to the proposed Mid-County Park &amp; Estate homes development will likely not occur within the next 20 years."</i></li> <li>Section 2 on page 2 of the <i>"Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Regulations"</i> for the Classic Lakes subdivision (see attachment) prohibits redevelopment of the Classic Lakes subdivision to permit <i>"the creation of additional Lots from the Property."</i></li> <li>The owner of the Property wants to utilize the existing 56' ingress-egress easement for access and does not want to dedicate the fee simple right-of-way.</li> <li>The Applicant will provide "End of State Maintenance" and "Private Road" signs on each end of the Gated Private Road.</li> </ul> <p>For the reasons provided above the proposed Gated Private Road connection between the public road cul-de-sacs of Classic Lakes Way and Maple Springs Place, as shown on the GDP certified on May 30, 2017, was determined to be acceptable to VDOT in the above referenced meeting.</p>			Comment Closed

(1) Indicate drawing no./page no. or use "G" for general comment.  
(2) To be filled out by Applicant/Engineer. Date of Response is required.  
(3) The VDOT reviewer is responsible for the final disposition of all comments.

Note: This form is to be used by the VDOT land use team to provide comments or concerns associated with the rezoning applications, site plans or any other plans when requested by the county or the applicants.



# Plan Comments Report

## Watershed Management

### Reviewed w/Comments

<b>Plan/Case #:</b>	REZ2017-00013	<b>Date:</b>	09/01/2017
<b>Plan/Case Name:</b>	Mid-County Park & Estate Homes		
<b>Plan Case Address:</b>	12775 CLASSIC SPRINGS DR NOKESVILLE VA 20181		
<b>Reviewer:</b>	Eib, Benjamin		
	703-792-6689	BEib@pwcgov.org	

The following items/issues were noted on your case. Please review and provide a letter responding to these comments, along with revised plans and proffers. Please be advised that staff might not identify all of the issues that arise during the case review and public hearing process. In addition, the solutions to the issues identified in this correction report might not be the only solutions, but are thought to be the most desirable solutions as determined by staff. Please note that any modifications will result in further review by pertinent agencies and staff, and could result in changes to the analysis and/or any recommendations.

### Section I - Comments that Require Applicant's Response:

#### Rezoning Proffers - Environment Proffer

Environment Proffer

Comments: 3.02 (Repeat Comment) Staff recommends the Applicant proffer to provide a tree preservation plan that meets the minimum elements outlined in the Plant Selection Guide. This site is heavily wooded and the Applicant has indicated they may leave many narrow tree save areas on lots. These areas typically result in construction damaged trees that will not survive in the short term. The tree preservation plan is prepared by a professional arborist who identify trees for removal early in the construction process and can provide care to ensure other trees survive construction in a healthy state. (EN-10.3)

#### Rezoning Proffers - Environment Proffer

Environment Proffer

Comments: 3.01 Regarding the proposed proffers:

a. Proffer #1 is too broad in its allowance for changes at final engineering. More than minor changes are allowed lots and open space. Staff recommends it be revised to, "However, minor revisions to lot and open space layout, and road and trail alignment may be allowed in accordance with final engineering considerations."

b. Proffer #11.

i. It is unclear where the boundaries of the 194 acre park are. Please clearly show and label this boundary. Please provide lead lines from the labels so the boundaries are clear.

c. Proffer #14 regarding on-lot conservation areas: The final paragraph sounds like a lot owner could be the enforcer for his own lot. The use of "and/or" indicates these decisions could rest solely with the lot owner. Please revise to "shall rest solely with the Homeowners Association."

d. (Repeat Comment) Proffer #22, which was struck:

i. Please retain this proffer;

ii. Please change "generally" to "substantially".  
 iii. This proffer is not enforceable because the language of "gentler slopes" has no definition. Please provide language that can be enforced by using a defined standard for the slopes to be avoided. E.g., slopes of 15% or greater. This proffer has now been deleted.

e. Staff recommends the Applicant simplify proffers intended to limit clearing with the proposed park. Proffer #11 address the limits of disturbance allowed within the park. Proffer #21 refers to "Perimeter Tree Save Areas". As far as staff can tell these areas lie entirely within the park, and so Proffer #11 governs what could occur in them. Please delete Proffer #21 as it is confusing and appears unnecessary.

f. Proffer #22 has the last sentence struck out in the strikethrough copy, but the same language is kept in the clean copy. Please delete this language from the clean copy.

**Section II - Questions/General Information:**

REQUEST: Rezone 144.2 acres fraom A-1 to SR-1 for the development of up to 108 single-family detached residential units on one-acre minimum lots and establish 195 acres natural protected open space.

SITE: Entire site is wooded with RPA, floodplain, wetlands, and steep slopes. The stream system of Long Branch travels along the eastern and northern boundary of this site. Long Branch is currently a stable stream system with minimal impacts from surrounding development.

SUBWATERSHED: Occoquan subshed 424  
 TOTAL SITE AREA/ ER AREA: 325.6 acres/ 61 acres (per County Mapper GIS)  
 TREE SAVE AREA: Not provided  
 UNDISTURBED AREA: Not provided  
 PERCENT IMPERVIOUS/ PERVIOUS: 6% / 94%  
 AREA OF DISTURBANCE: Not provided  
 REFERENCE FOR RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES: None indicated.

**SOILS:**

No.	Soils name	Slope	Soil category	Erodibility
6A	Baile loam	0-4%	III	Moderate
10B	Buckhall loam	2-7%	I	Moderate
10C	Buckhall loam	7-15%	I	Moderate
15A	Comus loam	0-2%	III	Slight
19B	Eliok loam	2-7%	I	Moderate
19C	Eliok loam	7-15%	I	Moderate
23D	Gaila sandy loam	15-25%	I	Severe
23E	Gaila sandy loam	25-50%	I	Severe
24B	Glenelg-Buckhall complex	2-7%	I	Severe
24C	Glenelg-Buckhall complex	7-15%	I	Severe
24D	Glenelg-Buckhall complex	15-25%	I	Severe
27A	Hatboro-Codorus complex	0-2%	III	Slight
29B	Hoadly loam	2-7%	II	Moderate
38B	Meadowville loam	0-5%	III	Slight-moderate
44D	Occoquan sandy loam	7-25%	II	Severe
44E	Occoquan sandy loam	25-50%	II	Severe
50D	Spriggs silt loam	15-25%	II	Severe
51E	Stumpton very flaggy loam	25-50%	II	Severe