

ORANGE COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION

JASON CAPELLE, DISTRICT 1
GEORGE YANCEY, DISTRICT 2
DONALD BROOKS, DISTRICT 3
JULIE ZEIJLMAKER, DISTRICT 4
J. BRYAN NICOL, DISTRICT 5

JOSH GILLESPIE, AICP
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
DIRECTOR



MAILING ADDRESS:
128 WEST MAIN STREET
ORANGE, VIRGINIA 22960

PLANNING SERVICES:
OFFICE: (540) 672-4347
FAX: (540) 672-0164
ORANGECOUNTYVA.GOV

Transmitted via electronic mail

September 22, 2021

Mr. Charlie Payne, Esq.
725 Jackson Street, Suite 200
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

RE: REZ 21-02 (Wilderness Crossing) Planning Commission comments

Mr. Payne:

The Planning Commission met for a work session on this application, including the draft conditions proffered by you dated August ____, 2021 and received August 12, 2021, at their regularly scheduled meeting on September 16, 2021. During the work session, the Commission members and Board of Supervisors liaison commented on these eleven (11) items for attention by the applicant before scheduling a public hearing on the case:

1. Phasing in the draft proffers. Where terms are blank, provide terms. Staff recommends these terms clearly relate to transportation and schools thresholds.

WC Response: We have provided Mr. Gillespie a general phasing exhibit and will discuss the same at the upcoming work session. Challenge is predicting future markets, especially with current inflationary and supply pressures. Also, the pandemic has had an adverse impact on office and retail expansion. However, the housing market in the general area remains fairly strong. We did submit with our rezoning application a market analysis that was prepared by RKG Associates, Inc., dated January 2021 (recently updated August 8, 2021), and you will see for the first ten (10) years of the development the consultant projected roughly 1,000 residential uses (mix of single family, townhomes and apartments) 80 assisted living beds and 125,000 square feet of retail uses (shops, restaurants and services).

2. Access points on Route 3. Limit them for access management.

WC Response: The following is an overview, in our opinion, of the traffic matters:

- **Signal Intersections** (prefer 1 at maximum—Post office location)

ORANGE COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION

- The TIA for the Wilderness Crossing Development assumes the addition of one new permanent signal along Route 3 at the existing Post Office Road by the developer. However, during the multiphase approach for the site, two temporary signals may be required by VDOT.
 - ✓ The first temporary signal that may be installed is located at Vaucluse Road. This signal is expected to be incorporated during either the first or second phases of the development. This signal will be removed with the completion of the proposed Goldmine Parkway.
 - ✓ The second temporary signal would be located at the proposed Goldmine Parkway. The signal is intended to serve as a temporary measure until VDOT realigns Route 20 and constructs an interchange.

- **Number of Access points off of Rt. 3**
 - It is intended that the Wilderness Crossing development will have a total of seven access points along Route 3 at complete build-out.
 - ✓ Three of the access points are existing (Goodwin Drive, Post Office Road, and Vaucluse Road).
 - ✓ Two future entrances (located between Goodwin Drive and Post Office Road) will be restricted right-in/right-outs movements.
 - ✓ A future unsignalized entrance between Post Office Road and Vaucluse Road will be restricted left-in/right-in/right-outs movements (i.e., no left-outs).
 - ✓ One full-movement access point is being proposed just south of Vaucluse Road and will serve the proposed Goldmine Parkway. This roadway is part of the County's Comprehensive Plan and is intended to act as a parallel road to Route 3.

- **Viewshed/streetscape/buffering from Rt. 3** (does not want a Central Park look or other Rt. 3 commercial view sheds within Spotsylvania County)
 - We are open to discussions on this front, but limited visibility from Rt. 3 could adversely impact commercial investment in the town center.

- **Timing of Goldmine Parkway and other internal road networks**
 - Relevant to development of town center and Wilderness Parke West areas

- **Timing for infrastructure improvements**
 - Proposed infrastructure improvements are anticipated to be tied to development phases
 - Some of the initial infrastructure improvements are as follows:
 - ✓ The signalization of Post Office Road with Route 3.
 - ✓ The conversion of Partnership Way at Goodwin Drive to all-way stop operation.
 - ✓ The construction of new access points.
 - ✓ The temporary signalization of Vaucluse Road with Route 3 (if needed).
 - ✓ Some minor geometric improvements and signal timings adjustments at off-site intersection along Route 3.

ORANGE COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION

- Due to the nature of the development and the expected lengthy build-out period, it is being recommended that other future infrastructure improvements associated with later phases of the development be reassessed periodically to ensure that Wilderness Crossing mitigates its impacts and any improvement meets current standards.
 - **Clarify that developer is not responsible for redesigning, relocating and constructing new Rt. 20 and Rt. 3 intersection**
 - It is not the intent of the Wilderness Crossing development to be responsible for the realignment of Route 20. The realignment is expected to be initiated and facilitated by VDOT and would have Route 20 terminate in alignment with the proposed Goldmine Parkway.
 - **Community Development Authority:** We have/will proffer the ability to create a CDA to assist in financing certain public infrastructure.
3. Water reservoirs. Fulfill the Germanna Wilderness Area Plan vision for reservoirs on the subject property.

WC Response: We are not showing on the GDP at this juncture, but land area is available for future reservoir(s) which will require extensive, multiagency government approvals and design/construction efforts. At this juncture, we are not prepared to commit to such within the development, but certainly open to future discussions with the County and RSA as the project evolves.

4. School age children. Plan for development components and phasing generating school age children with the provision of public school facilities not presently planned, designed or funded.

WC Response: We have retained a consultant to evaluate this issue. The report is not completed.

5. Fiscal impacts. Proffers should address fiscal impacts comprehensively.

WC Response: As noted above, RKG did prepare a 10 year and 30 year fiscal outlook for the project. RKG's 10 year outlook projects a positive net return of \$6.6 million and 30 year outlook projects a \$73 million net positive return. We are also evaluating impacts and mitigation measures for schools and public safety. This report is not complete as of the date of this response.

6. Public input. Desire to facilitate opportunities for public input (outside the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors public hearings, future opportunities for design input).

WC Response: We did have an initial community meeting this past June 17, 2021, whereby close to 100 individuals did appear. We also have a website which consistently receives input from the community <https://wildernesscrossingva.com/>. We are also open to additional community meetings and work sessions with the planning commission and board of supervisors.

ORANGE COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION

7. Integration. Walkability and interconnections between properties in and around a master-planned community have not been emphasized or are not clearly shown as commitments.

WC Response: We are committed to this and show extensive walking trails and community mobility within the project. We are in the process of updating our GDP and design manual to better clarify. I would also note that interparcel connections of various residential sections of the development, especially to the north of the site, are challenged by environmental and topography constraints.

8. Dedications and physical improvements to be made by the developer, and when (if proffers). Seeking definition and potential expansions relative to the Germanna Wilderness Area Plan for interconnections, and local services, recreation, shopping, dining and employment.

WC Response: We will proffer land within the development for a new school, parks and public safety facility. We are certainly open to discussions on timing.

9. Off-site intersection improvements at Route 3/20. Are these part of the application? Is this being proffered? Does the alignment shown have obstacles to realization?

WC Response: We should not be obligated to construct or relocate the Routes 3 and 20 intersection, but certainly open to working with the County and VDOT regarding the planning for this process and perhaps dedication of necessary right of way. All to be determine as that process moves forward by others.

10. Transportation improvements. What is decided between those planned in the case and those acceptable to the Virginia Department of Transportation?

WC Response: Please see above response #2.

11. Zoning conditions in force and variance from approved plans. Differentiate between zoning conditions that would not be altered (Design Guidelines) without Board approval, those that could change to a similar or enhanced level, and those that could be adjusted (e.g., shifting land uses geographically)

WC Response: We are open to discussions on this matter and are willing to proffer our design guidelines and baselines for the development and design standards. Please note that we believe flexibility should be built-into the process and our covenants will require architectural review boards (via HOA) for various aspects of the development.

We will discuss these comments by phone today, Wednesday, September 22, 2021, expecting substantial progress to address the comments from the Planning Commission work session. I look forward to discussing this with you today and later as application materials may change.

Sincerely,

ORANGE COUNTY

PLANNING COMMISSION

Josh Gillespie, AICP

Cc: Kenny Dotson

Members, Orange County Planning Commission

James Crozier, District 4 Supervisor and Chair, Board of Supervisors

R. Mark Johnson, District 1 Supervisor, Vice-Chair, Board of Supervisors, and
Planning Commission Liaison

James White, District 2 Supervisor

Keith Marshall, District 3 Supervisor

Lee Frame, District 5 Supervisor

Theodore Voorhees, County Administrator

Thomas Lacheney, County Attorney

Eric Lansing, Assistant County Attorney

Members, Application Review Committee (ARC)