June 29, 2007

Anderson & Associates
Attn: Trevor M. Kimzey, P.E.
100 Ardmore Street
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Re: SP 07-022 First & Main: Phase II Site Development Plan, dated May 4, 2007, 1500 South Main Street, First Review.

Dear Mr. Kimzey:
The Planning and Engineering Department has completed the first review of the First & Main Phase II Site Development Plan. Site plan approval is **denied** on first review. The following comments must be addressed prior to final plan approval:

Planning Comments
Steve M. Hundley, AICP, Zoning Administrator

1. The structure proposed for commercial retail use on the Phase II site development plan contains a gross floor area of approximately 176,000 square feet. The structure is a **Large Format Retail Sales** use, defined as *"(r)etail sales uses, in excess of 80,000 square feet gross floor area, including those uses classified more specifically by these use type classifications, located in one structure, whether on a single lot or contiguous lots owned or operated as associated, integrated or cooperative business enterprises."* A Large Format Retail Sales use is permitted in the General Commercial zoning district only with a Special Use Permit granted by Town Council. The proposed structure can only be approved on the site development plan after a Special Use Permit is granted for the use. [Zoning Ordinance, Sections 2103 & 3151(b)] (The Zoning Administrator has previously determined that this Special Use Permit requirement applies to this site.)
2. The Phase II site development plan does not comply with certain proffered conditions approved by **Ordinance 1412** which rezoned the property from R-4, Low Density Residential, to General Commercial. Specifically, the Phase II site development plan does not comply with **proffer number 6** entitled **Traditional Neighborhood Design**. Proffer number 6 states that *"the developer proffers that all site plans shall conform with the following principal elements of 'Traditional Neighborhood' design:"* The Phase II site plan does not comply with the following elements of proffer number 6.
   6.c. "The development will have a discernible center. This will be either:
   (1) a plaza; or
   (2) a landscaped square, green, or promenade with public seating areas; or
   (3) a landscaped traffic circle; or
   (4) a street corner with outdoor restaurant and other public seating areas."
   Note that the discernible center must be made obvious on the plan such that anyone, including citizens, can determine where and what the discernable center is.
   6.e. "Parking areas (other than parking in the row directly adjacent to buildings or along access drives), will be broken up into four or more landscaped sub-lots." Identify what the discernable center is and where it is located.

NOTE: The remainder of the review letter does not provide comments on the building structure, façade, parking layout, parking lot tree islands, or other aspects of the plan that must be modified due to comments 1 and/or 2 above.

3. Certain portions of the Phase II lot were **reviewed in the Phase I plan**. Specifically, graphic or textual information on the Phase II plan, related to the buffer on the west property line, the 100 foot radius buffer at the northwest corner, and the multi-purpose trail, are redundant where satisfied on the Phase I plan. Remove all information related to Phase I from the plan and show the Phase I boundary line and identify the areas as "Phase I". However, the tree canopy information regarding the phase I area of the lot will still be required on the Phase II site plan (see paragraph 9, below.)
4. The **vicinity map** scale is listed as 1" = 2,000'. Actual scale appears to be 1" = 1,000'. Verify the actual scale of the vicinity map and correct. [Section 5130(a)(13)]
5. Clarify whether Fairmont Realty is the **owner, the developer**, or both. Provide the clarification note at General Notes, item number 1, **Sheet C0.01** [Section 5130(a)(1)]
6. On Sheet **C0.02**, list the **current use** on adjacent tax map number 287-A-15 as Single Family, Detached use instead of 'Residential.' On the Margaret Beeks School lot the use is Educational Facilities, Primary/Secondary use instead of 'Margaret Beeks Elementary School'. [Section 5130(a)(8)]
7. **Adjacent property owner** for parcel number 287-A-15 is listed as C.D. Associates Partnership. Montgomery County Land Records show The Lester Group as the owner of the lot. Check records and correct if necessary. [Section 5130(a)(10)]
8. LLAMAS, LLC is identified as the **property owner** for parcel number 287-A-41A on Sheet **C0.01**, but Diversified Investors XIII, LLC is identified as the owner of this lot on Sheet **C0.02**. The lot line adjustment plat identifies both as owners. Please clarify who the owner(s) are and correct as necessary. [Section 5130(a)(1)]
9. The **property owners** need to sign the plan. A signature block is required for each owner (i.e. Llamas, LLC; and/or Diversified Investors XIII, LLC.) As stated above, this must be clarified and corrected as necessary. Is Fairmont University Realty Trust, LLC the owner, developer or both? This needs to be clarified. [Section 5130(a)(17) & 5110(h)]
10. Delete tax map parcel numbers 287-A-27; 287-A-27A; and 287-A-36 listed as Phase II **properties** on Sheet **C0.01**. All three lots were lot line adjusted to the Phase I area. [Section 5130(a)(9)]
11. The height for light poles is not listed on the phase II plan. Maximum **light pole height** is 25 feet in the commercial zoning district. The heights of all structures are measured from the adjacent grade to the highest point on the structure. The 25 foot height must include the highest point on the light pole, fixture, or support arm. Provide a maximum pole height note and a detail of the pole, base and fixture. [Section 2103 ('Height' definition); 5130(c); 5600(d)]
12. The Phase II plan, **Lighting Plan**, **Sheet C6.01**, was produced by LSI Industries. A separate lighting plan, submitted as a separate sheet for both Phase I and II, was produced by WLS Lighting Systems. If the WLS plan should be removed from the plan submittals for Phase II if it is not to be referred to. [Section 5130(c)]

13. The "Statistical Area Summary" on the Phase II **Lighting Plan**, does not match the "Walmart Summary" Average listed on the WLS Lighting Systems plan. Both summaries list averages that are greater than the maximum permitted for commercial parking lot use. The data shall demonstrate that exterior lighting is designed at or below the **average maintained horizontal illuminance levels** for commercial parking lot use [i.e. Average FC (foot candle) of 5.] The **uniformity** shall not exceed the Uniformity ratio of 15:1, which is a measure of the maximum lighting achieved within the area to the minimum within the area. [Section 5130(c); 5601(f)]
14. The **Lighting Notes** #1 states that *"(t)he intensity at adjoining streets shall not exceed 0.5 foot candles..."* This note is in compliance with the site development standards for exterior lights. However, the proposed light intensity depicted on the adjoining street at the intersection of the primary entrance to the site and Country Club Drive includes 0.6 up to 2.4 light intensity which exceed 0.5. [Section 5601(a)]
15. Provide a **north arrow** referencing true, record or grid north (Datum 1983) on Sheets **C1.01; C1.02; C2.02; C3.02; C4.02; and C6.01**. [Section 5130(a)(18)]
16. Provide detail and note the height of the proposed fence running parallel with Country Club Drive.
17. Five **street trees** on sheet **C5.02** are located in the 4 foot grass strip between the curb and sidewalk; the remainder are located on the lot side of the sidewalk. The Town would prefer that all street trees be located on the lot side of the sidewalk for better tree growth and for consistency.
18. **Schedule B** on sheet **C5.01** lists trees located on the Margaret Beeks School property. The 16,808 square foot canopy on the Beeks lot cannot count toward the **required canopy** on the Phase II lot. [Section 5426]
19. Note that the **Schedule A** tree list is the **Phase II** area. Note that the **Schedule B** tree list is in the **Phase I** site plan area.
20. The **existing trees** that are retained on the Phase II lot may change per Phase I comments regarding the location of required buffer. The amount of existing tree canopy and new buffer canopy in Schedule B should be corrected accordingly. [Section 5130(f)(5)]
21. Provide the following General Commercial zoning district note "(a)ll **roof-top equipment** shall be enclosed in building materials that match the structure or which are visually compatible with the structure." [Section 3152(h)]
22. Three of the proposed **tree species** are not listed in the zoning ordinance as a suitable species for use in the Town. The Nellie R. Stevens Holly (IN); Green Giant Arborvitae (TG); and Wintergreen Arborvitae (TW). Select a suitable replacement species from the list or contact the Town Landscaping Supervisor (Susan Garrison, 558-0786, sgarrison@blacksburg.gov) to seek approval, in writing, for a suitable species for the proposed use. [Sections 5420(a) & 5429]

Engineering Comments
Jim Henegar, P.E., Town Engineer
Water

1. The results of Hydraulic Analysis Run 1 state that the minimum available fire flow at a hydrant on the proposed site is 2,597 gallons per minute (gpm). Based on the actual hydrant flow data that the Town has for the existing hydrants along South Main

Street, the fire flow available is approximately 1,100 gpm. Based on the Town's analysis, the minimum available fire flow on the proposed site is approximately 1,160 gpm. Is the flow of 2,597 gpm the theoretical flow required to drop pressures to 20 psi?

2. Provide ASSE 1013 reduced pressure zone assemblies on domestic lines shown on Sheet C4.02.
3. Provide an ASSE 1048 backflow assembly on the fire line shown on Sheet C4.02.
4. Provide backflow protection for the private yard hydrant.
5. The horizontal separation between the storm drain shown on Sheet C2.02 and Waterline B shown on Sheet C4.04 is 4 feet. Section 1.54 1.a. of the *Town of Blacksburg Standards and Specifications Water Distribution System* states that there shall be a minimum 10 foot horizontal separation between a waterline and storm drain as measured edge to edge. Where this is not possible, the waterline may be laid closer provided that it is in a separate trench and that the bottom of the waterline is at least 18 inches above the top of the storm drain. Please determine if the 10 foot horizontal separation can be obtained.
6. Note 6 on Sheet C4.01 is not correct. The water lines shall be Class 50 ductile iron pipe rather than PVC C-900.
7. Waterline B shall be 8-inch diameter rather than 6-inch diameter.
8. Please provide separate connections to the water main for the sprinkler line and domestic lines.
9. Waterline B from Station 27+00 to Station 27+90 is laid at an approximately 23 percent slope. This section shall be anchored with concrete anchors.
10. The proposed landscaping on Sheet C5.02 is in conflict with the Waterline B from Station 12+00 to Station 13+70. Please relocate either the waterline or the landscaping.
11. The profile for Waterline B is provided in the Phase 1 plans. If Phase 2 is to be considered a separate plan, provide this profile with the Phase 2 plans also.
12. Connection fees are based on the meter size as provided on the plans and the Town's connection fees as of July 2007. For a 2-inch meter, the water connection fee will $7,992 and the sanitary sewer connection fee will be $20,152 per connection. This cost assumes that the contractor will install the laterals. If the Town installs the laterals, the connection fees will be $8,801 for water and $20,864 for sanitary sewer. Connection fees are based upon the fees in effect at the time the building permit application is submitted.

Transportation

13. Mark designated fire lanes with painted curb and signs at the following locations (referencing Plan Sheet C0.02):
    1. East and west sides of the drive aisle along the east side of the building.
    2. Sidewalk edge along the entire south side of the building.
    3. Fence line (outside exposure) of the Outside Sales and Display area on the west side of the building.
    4. Locations can be identified and discussed during the post-review meeting.
14. Confirm in writing an analysis was run to determine internal driveways and intersections can accommodate emergency response vehicles.

15. Note available sight distance for the Country Club Drive site entrance.
16. Extend the site entrance no left turn median beyond the striped crosswalk.
17. Provide curb ramps on the east and west corners of the site entrance where sidewalk crosses the entrance.
18. Resolve conflicts on Sheets C5.02 where tree canopies encroach into the Country Club Drive right of way.

Grading

19. Reconcile site grading in the northwest corner of the site with site grading for the multi-use trail shown in Phase I site plans.

Stormwater

20. Narrative page No. 1 does not specifically state that the "bypassed" flow from the offsite area #1 will be combined with outflow from the North-End Retailer detention system, as was stated in the Phase I narrative, clarify the change.
21. Table #1 indicates that the SWM Detention Outflow will increase from what was presented in the Phase I narrative, explain differences.
22. Phase II Predevelopment Calculations and plan sheet (Appendix A) appear to be the same as what was submitted for Phase I, confirm that this is a copy of the same hydraulic analysis submitted with Phase I. If these are not the same calculations, identify specific changes over the Phase I analysis.
23. Phase II Post-development Calculations and plan sheet (Appendix B) appear to be the same as what was submitted for Phase I, confirm that this is a copy of the same hydraulic analysis submitted with Phase I. If these are not the same calculations, identify specific changes over the Phase I analysis.
24. Phase II Water Quality Performance Summary (Appendix C) and plan sheets appear to be the same as what was submitted for Phase I, confirm that this is a copy of the same information submitted with Phase I. If these are not the same calculations, identify specific changes over the Phase I information.
25. Culverts B-2 and B-5 shall be installed as part of Phase I bike route construction to address drainage issues with installation of the bike path proposed in Phase I, see Phase I comments.
26. Provide a copy of the maintenance plan and agreement for stormwater management and drainage facilities.
27. Subcatchment plan sheet C2.02 does not include the drainage areas located to the south and west of the delineated drainage areas, revise and resubmit. The bike path is to be installed in Phase I of the project so drainage calculations for the proposed public improvement shall be included with the phase I submittal.
28. Unable to determine what hydraulic storm conditions were input into the StormCAD model from which hydraulic profiles have been submitted, please provide additional input information to confirm VDOT rain fall data used and that specifies the intensity of the storm.
29. The storm sewer design and hydraulic grade line calculations appear to be based upon a 10 year storm, the proposed site detention is for a 25 year storm event, provide routing calculations that confirm that the proposed collection system network can adequately convey a 25 year storm to the storm water management systems.

30. Plan sheet C2.02 shows discharge from storm water detention facility (27L) not connecting to storm pipe installed in Phase I, revise and resubmit.
31. No profile or storm water details have been provided, revise and resubmit. Show stations on plan sheets that correspond to profiles and provide details for storm water management and control structures.
32. Provide a detailed storm water maintenance plan that specifically identifies the suppliers recommended schedule for maintenance, minimum O&M requirements, and parts replacement schedules. Specifically identify the legal authority that is accepting responsibility for proper operation and maintenance of the storm water facility.
33. It is unclear which structures D1 and D2 drain into, please clarify.
34. Provide information that confirms that the project is obtaining an individual permit from the Corps of Engineers and overview of mitigation that is being addressed for the loss of watershed assets.
35. Provide a statement that the Owner understands that Virginia Water Protection Permit Program and COE requirements are independent of the TOB and have stipulations in addition to TOB code requirements.
36. Confirm that the Owner is aware that additional project stipulations may be imposed by the Department of Conservation and Recreation Virginia Stormwater Management Program (VSMP) Construction Permit. Water Quality BMP is being stipulated by the VSMP permit.

Erosion & Sediment Control

37. Construction road stabilization is graded across the proposed multi-use path in the northwest corner of site, provide clarification and resubmit.
38. Two discharge pipes are shown from the SB #3, provide details on function of piping that is consistent with Phase I E&S plans. Provide an 11 x 7" plan sheet that shows routing of emergency spill way across the Phase I development site.
39. Provide controls at the construction entrance onto Country Club Drive which prevents exiting left turns towards Airport Road and directs construction traffic east towards South Main Street. Will this construction entrance be installed with Phase I or Phase II?
40. Provide an erosion & sediment control security. An estimate of the erosion & sediment control security amount will be provided in the final site plan approval letter. An erosion & sediment control security must be received before the Town will release the approved site plan.

Sanitary Sewer

41. Provide sewer line profiles and details.
42. Confirm that the projected sewer loadings submitted with Phase I plans reflect build out of Phase II retail.

General

43. Add the following standard notes:
    1. Backflow prevention devices shall be supplied by the owner.
    2. All lowest floor elevations will be served by gravity sewer.

3. Town will tap existing water lines for main extensions or laterals at the owner's expense and Town will provide the meter at the owner's expense.
4. The contractor shall plug with an angle wing nut test plug the connection of proposed to existing sanitary sewer prior to extending the sanitary sewer. The plug shall be maintained in place until such time as the sewer is completed, inspected, and accepted by the Town.
5. Maintenance of detention facilities is the responsibility of the owner or property management association.
6. It is the owner/developer's responsibility to obtain any additional permits required by any other federal or state agency.
7. It is the owner/developer/design engineer's responsibility to coordinate any retaining wall design and construction with the Town's building division for professional engineering seal and building permit requirements.

44. Provide a construction schedule and have the developer pay applicable erosion & sediment control and public infrastructure inspection fees of $210/week. Inspection fees must be received before the Town will release the approved site plan.
45. Provide a construction schedule and have the developer pay applicable erosion & sediment control and public infrastructure inspection fees of $210/week. Inspection fees must be received before the Town will release the approved site plan.
46. Supply an engineer's estimate of Phase II public improvements and provide the required public improvements security based on this amount. The public improvements security must be received before the Town will release the approved site plan.

A post review meeting is scheduled for all First and Main site plan and plat review letters from **1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 10, 2007 in the Town Council Conference Room, 1st floor of the Municipal Building, 300 South Main Street.** While this meeting is mandatory for the design team, the owner is encouraged to attend as well.

Jim Henegar and I coordinated the review of this plan. Please contact Jim at 961-1124 (e-mail jhenegar@blacksburg.gov) or contact me at 961-1115, (e-mail shundley@blacksburg.gov) if you have questions or concerns regarding this review.

Sincerely,

Steve M. Hundley

Steve M. Hundley, AICP
Zoning Administrator
Planning & Engineering Department

Cc: James Schiely, Fairmount University Realty Trust