

**Town of Round Hill  
Planning Commission Meeting  
February 10, 2016  
7:00 p.m.**

The regular meeting of the Town of Round Hill Planning Commission was held Wednesday, February 10, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. at the Town Office – 23 Main Street, Round Hill, Virginia.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT**

Manuel Mirabal, Chairman

Michael Hummel

Elizabeth Wolford

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT**

Stephan Evers

Christopher Prack

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Melissa Hynes, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT**

Clinton Chapman

Allison Tinney

Daniel Botsch, Member, Round Hill Town Council

Mary Anne Graham, Vice-Mayor, Town of Round Hill

**IN RE: CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Mirabal called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Roll call was held, and it was determined that a quorum was present.

**IN RE: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commission Member Wolford led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Mirabal welcomed the guests in attendance.

**IN RE: PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Clinton Chapman, representing the Round Hill Partners Group, LLC, spoke. Mr. Chapman noted that the Planning Commission is close to completing the Land Use portion of the Comprehensive Plan update, and stated that he would like to bring two items regarding that portion of the Plan to the attention of the public. One of those items is the Specific Planning Policies for the Eastern Commercial District, as noted on page six, Item #4, and regarding building types and the concept of residential over commercial; Mr. Chapman stated that restricting building height to two stories would eliminate the possibility of constructing residential over commercial, and suggested that a height limit in feet be used, instead. The second item is found on page seven, Item

#14, Section D, dealing with the amount of square footage allowed; Mr. Chapman stated his belief that the amount of square footage noted was taken from another section of the Comprehensive Plan, and voiced his concern that that requirement would greatly restrict uses of the property. Additionally, Item G, regarding Public Facilities/Services and the use of proffers, was highlighted, with Mr. Chapman noting that the State Legislature is currently looking into this issue, and referencing an article regarding this in the most recent issue of The Loudoun Times-Mirror. Mr. Chapman suggested that the Planning Commission may want to keep any possible action by the legislature in mind as it updates the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chapman thanked the Chairman. Chairman Mirabal asked Mr. Chapman to provide his presentation in writing, for inclusion into the record. There was no further Public Comment.

Chairman Mirabal noted that recommendations for amendments to the Agenda will be accepted.

**IN RE: DISCLOSURES AND COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS**

Chairman Mirabal thanked the two members of the Town Council present, the Chairman of the Land Use Committee and the Vice-Mayor, for their attendance at this evening's meeting.

**IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Commission Member Wolford moved **that the Agenda be amended thus: Item #7, Business Items, Section C, Utility System Goals for Comprehensive Plan, be moved to Section A, with the other items to follow:** Commission Member Hummel seconded the motion. A vote was held; the motion was approved 3-0, with Commission Members Evers and Prack absent. The vote is recorded as follows:

<b><u>MEMBER</u></b>	<b><u>VOTE</u></b>
Manuel Mirabal	Aye
Stephan Evers	Absent
Michael Hummel	Aye
Christopher Prack	Absent
Elizabeth Wolford	Aye

**IN RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A. December 8, 2015**

Commission Member Hummel asked to clarify that the same changes noted at last month's meeting, during discussion of the minutes, will be included in this motion; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that they will be. Commission Member Hummel then made a motion **to approve the minutes with the two changes noted previously;** Commission Member Wolford seconded the motion. In response to a question from Chairman Mirabal regarding the January vote, it was explained that only one Commissioner in attendance at the January meeting voted "yes," and the two other Commissioners abstained, thus necessitating the vote this evening. Following this discussion, a vote was held; the motion was approved 3-0, with Commission Members Evers and Prack absent. The vote is recorded as follows:

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
Manuel Mirabal	Aye
Stephan Evers	Absent
Michael Hummel	Aye
Christopher Prack	Absent
Elizabeth Wolford	Aye

**B. January 12, 2016**

Commission Member Hummel made a motion **to approve the January 12<sup>th</sup> minutes, as is**; Commission Member Wolford seconded the motion. A vote was held; the motion was approved 3-0, with Commission Members Evers and Prack absent. The vote is recorded as follows:

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
Manuel Mirabal	Aye
Stephan Evers	Absent
Michael Hummel	Aye
Christopher Prack	Absent
Elizabeth Wolford	Aye

**IN RE: BUSINESS ITEMS**

**A. Utility System Goals for Comprehensive Plan**

Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes reviewed the items for discussion contained in the Planning Commission Members’ packets, in order to ensure that each Commissioner had all pertinent documents, and that they were in the correct order. Vice-Mayor Graham asked if the Utility section would be a separate chapter; Ms. Hynes noted that it would, at least for now. Chairman Mirabal asked if recommendations for changes provided by the Town Attorney were included in the packets; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that she did not include those comments, but that they would be reviewed for inclusion separately from this evening’s review. Chairman Mirabal asked Vice-Mayor Graham, Chair of the Utility Committee, to provide an overview of the Utility System Goals. Ms. Graham explained that the section was approved by the Utility Committee in January, and that Mayor Ramsey added substantial comments to the section. Chairman Mirabal referenced a letter submitted by a resident, included in the review of this section. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that this section has been reviewed by the Town’s Utility Engineer, the Mayor, and the Utility Committee Chair, and has, thus, been thoroughly vetted. Commission Member Hummel stated that he reviewed the document for “wordsmithing,” and felt it was well done, and noted that he would defer to the knowledge of those who wrote the section. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that this section affects the whole area/utility system, therefore, the word “Town” is not used as often. Chairman Mirabal referenced Objective “a,” Strategy 4, in which the wording *under the influence of Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE)* is used; discussion ensued of whether to use that wording, or use the wording *contaminated by* instead. It was decided to change the wording to *contaminated by*. Commission Member Wolford also noted a grammatical change in that section. Goal 2, Objective “b,” regarding wastewater treatment capacity, was then discussed. It was noted that language throughout the

document, which refers to this issue, is unclear. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that she will work with Town Engineer Lane in order to devise the best way to notate this (in order to remove reference to a specific number); additionally, she will further “flesh out” the narrative. Chairman Mirabal then opened discussion of the letter, referenced earlier, received from a Round Hill resident regarding this section of the Comprehensive Plan update. Mr. Mirabal noted that many of the items brought forth by the letter involve budgetary concerns, and thus are under the jurisdiction of the Town Council. Mr. Mirabal also noted that the letter contained many good recommendations, and stated his appreciation for the resident in putting them forward; however, it is uncertain which could be included by the Planning Commission in their update of the Comprehensive Plan. Commission Member Wolford asked why Strategy 1 and Strategy 3 are included under Goal 3, Objective “b,” as they deal with non-utility revenue sources. Vice-Mayor Graham noted that Mayor Ramsey wrote this section, and stated that she felt sure there was a reason for the inclusion of these strategies. It was noted that this language was not imported from a previous document. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that she will further clarify these Strategies. Commission Member Wolford stated her belief that Strategy 1 is not appropriate for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes noted that some municipalities refer to their Comprehensive Plan as a “Town Plan,” and see it as an overarching document. Chairman Mirabal reiterated his concern that inclusion of recommendations made in the resident’s letter are beyond the authority of the Planning Commission. Chairman Mirabal asked if there were any questions from Commissioners regarding the letter; there were none. Chairman Mirabal suggested that this section be reviewed again at the next meeting. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes suggested that, if the changes discussed this evening are made, this section could be moved forward. Chairman Mirabal asked that the two Commissioners not present this evening be polled prior to finalizing this section. Commission Member Wolford asked about Goal 3, Objective “e,” Strategy 1, wondering how the Town could retain water source rights, as noted. Vice-Mayor Graham explained that that refers to wells/springs in the area of the large reservoir. Discussion ensued regarding this Strategy, with the alternate wording *while retaining easement rights for possible water sources* being agreed upon. Commission Member Wolford referenced Goal 4, Objective “a,” Strategy 2, asking if the concept contained therein isn’t “a given.” Additionally, Ms. Wolford noted, this issue is addressed later in the document. Discussion of this ensued, with Commission Member Hummel and Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes noting that two separate concepts are actually addressed. Mr. Hummel also voiced his support for retaining this as written. It was decided not to amend that language. There were no further comments on the section.

## **B. Land Use Map & Goals for Comprehensive Plan**

Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes began this discussion by asking if the Commissioners want to retain this title, or return to the original title; it was decided to take up that issue at a later time. Discussion of the chapter began with review of Town Attorney Gilmore’s comments, with Commission Member Hummel and Chairman Mirabal suggesting that only policy changes be discussed, not instances of “wordsmithing.” Chairman Mirabal noted the use of the word *intensities* in Strategy 4, under Goal 1, Objective “b,” and questioned the terminology; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the term refers to how much the land is being used. Discussion of

this followed, with the decision being made to retain the wording. Goal 2, Objective “c,” Strategy 3 was discussed, with attention paid to the word *discouraged*. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the Town Attorney retained that word in the document to keep in line with the consensus view of the Planning Commission that there be no further industrial development inside the Town’s limits. Ms. Hynes explained that she will check into this issue further, and expressed her concerns that, if light-industrial uses are prohibited from the area under discussion, it may open other areas to that use. In response to a question from Councilperson Botsch, Commissioner Wolford and Chairman Mirabal clarified the change made to this Strategy – replacement of the word *advocate* with the word *discourage* (this was not clearly noted in the draft copy under review this evening). Goal 3, Objective “b,” Strategies 1 through 4 were briefly discussed, with it being noted that the content is not new, but was moved from another chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, as discussed at an earlier work session. Discussion ensued regarding the prior approval of the chapter from which this information was moved, with Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stating that a vote on the entire document will take place, which will supersede votes on separate chapters. Councilperson Botsch asked how Strategy 1, under Goal 3, Objective “a” meets that goal. The Commissioners noted that the entire Strategy is new to this iteration of the document; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that it is the combination of two original Strategies. Councilperson Botsch further explained that he is unsure what the Strategy is “pushing towards,” as the Town’s existing ordinances should shape development, but discussion surrounding this Strategy makes it sound as though past development will shape ordinances. Mr. Botsch stated his concern that a future Council and/or Planning Commission would not understand the goal being put forward. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained the purpose of this Strategy by using the example of the Post Office building being torn down and replaced with another business, noting that current zoning would not provide for a building which would be in keeping with the character of the Town. Councilperson Botsch clarified that this pertains to the entire Town, and asked what the ultimate objective is for this Strategy. Commission Member Hummel explained that this is an attempt to “clean up our ordinances,” in order to allow for reasonable uses of property, which are currently prohibited. Councilperson Botsch noted his agreement with the premise, but expressed his concern that the ordinances would be changed so greatly that non-conforming would become conforming. Chairman Mirabal explained that the Strategy in question was written to allow for a study to be done, in order to provide recommendations for the resolution of these issues; however, it doesn’t suggest that changes are being made. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes provided the further example of the auto repair shop next to the Town Park, explaining that the current ordinances would make it very difficult for any other business to locate at that site. Chairman Mirabal reiterated that the Strategy only allows for a study to be conducted. Councilperson Botsch stated that the discussion held this evening clears up the issue for him, but voiced concern that the language as written is clear. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the narrative included in the Comprehensive Plan will present additional information related to these Strategies. Chairman Mirabal stated that Councilperson Botsch may make recommendations for different language; Councilperson Botsch explained that, at present, his goal is to gain an understanding of the Commission’s recommendations, and that he would suggest changes when the Comprehensive Plan comes to the Council for review. Commission Member Hummel reiterated that the

Planning Commission is not trying to make every use/structure conforming. Vice-Mayor Graham noted her concern that this may encourage construction which will not be in keeping with the character of the Town; discussion of this ensued, with Commission Member Wolford noting that passing ordinances would be required prior to changes being allowed. Discussion then turned to the section titled "Specific Planning Policies for the Eastern Commercial District." Commission Member Hummel explained that Mr. Chapman, of Round Hill Partners Group, LLC, approached him following last week's work session regarding building height allowed in the Eastern Commercial District, as noted in Item #4, in light of existing proffers. Mr. Hummel explained that he, Commission Member Wolford, and Vice-Mayor Graham discussed this issue further at that time, and that he also had a phone conversation with Chairman Mirabal regarding the issue; Commission Member Hummel noted that he did not remember the Commission focusing on language restricting building height to two stories. Commission Member Hummel further noted his belief that that language may limit construction that the Town may want to see at the site. Mr. Hummel suggested that the Commission may want to eliminate language contained in this item regarding single- and two-story structures, noting that the PDCC Ordinance already contains height restrictions. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that, at a previous work session, the Planning Commission decided that items 1 through 13 in this section govern 100% commercial development at the site, with no mixed-use. Commission Member Hummel noted his agreement with the single- and two-story height restrictions on commercial-only buildings, and stated that Ms. Hynes' clarification of this issue was helpful. Discussion ensued regarding possibly omitting the language, or clarifying that it refers to commercial-only structures. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes expressed her concern that omitting the language could lead to possible problems later. There was also further discussion of the pros and cons of possible height restrictions. Commission Member Hummel also addressed the cap on residential development at the site, which was raised by Mr. Chapman at this evening's meeting, noting that that number was agreed upon and voted on by the Planning Commission. Chairman Mirabal added that the site is to be a predominantly commercial development, thus the number of residential units agreed upon by the Commission. Commissioner Hummel also addressed the issue of omitting language dealing with cash proffers, as raised by Mr. Chapman. Mr. Hummel noted his belief that the Planning Commission felt strongly that proffers represent normal zoning practice and should be included for residential development. The newspaper article referenced by Mr. Chapman was also addressed by Commissioner Hummel, with it being noted that the article was poorly written, and that most builders do not support the General Assembly's efforts, as proffers have been a useful tool, especially in this area. It was also noted by Mr. Hummel that the language included in the Comprehensive Plan does not deviate from the requirement by the General Assembly that there not be unreasonable proffers which are not related to the impacts created by the development. Mr. Chapman stated that he found on-line that height restrictions are not to exceed 35 feet. Chairman Mirabal asked if the Planning Commission wishes to include a height requirement; the Commission initially suggested removing the height reference altogether. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes discussed the legislation before the General Assembly, explaining that, if this vehicle (proffers) for funding public facilities is removed, much development may cease, as municipalities will not be able to shoulder the burden of providing those facilities. Vice-Mayor Graham asked to revisit the height restriction issue, noting her belief that a height restriction should be included in the

Comprehensive Plan, as it would be relatively easy to change the zoning ordinance to satisfy a developer's request. Commission Member Hummel stated his belief that, if a height restriction is to be included, it should be included at this time. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that, after adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, she will begin writing zoning ordinance amendments, in order to be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan; therefore, if the requirement is not included in the Comprehensive Plan, a zoning ordinance amendment would not be generated. Discussion ensued regarding if a requirement should be included, and how best to word the height requirement in the Comprehensive Plan; it was suggested that a thirty-five foot limit be included, as well as specific directions for how the measurements are to be made. Commission Member Hummel and Vice-Mayor Graham both stated that a height requirement should also be included for mixed-use development; discussion ensued regarding whether the requirement should be in stories (limited to two) or in feet. The Commissioners asked Mr. Chapman for his opinion regarding a height requirement; Mr. Chapman stated that a measurement in feet is preferable. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes asked the Commission to consider how varying roof lines would be measured. Chairman Mirabal raised the issue of what may be economically viable for a developer when building a commercial structure at this site, noting that the Planning Commission is "picking a number out of thin air" when choosing a height requirement, without knowing its impact economically. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that the wishes of the populace regarding the look of development at the Eastern Commercial District should be a primary consideration in the update of the Comprehensive Plan. Vice-Mayor Graham reiterated her belief that a thirty-five foot height limit should be included. Commission Member Hummel suggested that an additional bullet-point be added which stipulates that the thirty-five foot height limit, as currently included in the PDCC, be maintained for all future uses. Chairman Mirabal suggested that the current zoning be tracked, in regards to this issue; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the current zoning was imported from the County, and that the Town never wrote its own zoning ordinances. After further discussion it was again suggested that a thirty-five foot height limit be included, with it being noted that the issue may be discussed again at a future meeting/work session. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes suggested that the Commissioners not consider the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance together, but rather "go with what your hearts lead you to for the Comprehensive Plan." Commission Member Wolford noted that the Town's Zoning Ordinance addresses the height limit, and that these proposed changes could create a conflict between the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. Again, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes urged the Planning Commission to go with what they think will look best at this site, and noted that the Commission is to be a representative of the citizenry in these issues. Commission Member Wolford stated that the Town's Zoning Ordinances will restrict the height of any building at this site. Councilperson Botsch suggested combining the two – no building is allowed which is over thirty-five feet and which is more than two stories. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes and the Commission Members updated the wording for this item. Vice-Mayor Graham referenced Item "m," which deals with odors or noises detrimental to adjacent properties/users of the parcel; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that that item is to be included. Chairman Mirabal then discussed Item #14(d), which states, *No more than one-third of the total permitted square footage may be considered for residential uses*, noting that that item was included to ensure that the development remains

predominantly commercial. Discussion ensued regarding the amount of commercial development allowed for by this requirement, with it being noted that a new district would be written, with new language, if the decision were to be made to go forward with mixed-use development. Mr. Chapman asked to clarify that this means no stand-alone residential will be allowed at the site; Chairman Mirabal stated that the concept being put forth at this time calls for residential over commercial. Vice-Mayor Graham asked if the term *total square footage* is adequately defined; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that this item is put forth in this manner because a new zoning district must be written, but it is unknown what that formula will be, therefore this language is purposely vague. Commission Member Wolford asked if height requirements should also be considered in this section dealing with mixed-use; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes expanded upon this by noting that a sentence should be included which allows for taller buildings, but only up to thirty-five feet, if a mixed-use development is built. Discussion ensued regarding the concepts of mixed-use proposed for the development of this parcel. Chairman Mirabal asked if the ideas put forth by the Loudoun Design Cabinet have been presented in written form; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that, as there have been many questions regarding their proposals, the Cabinet representatives will attend the next Town Council meeting. Mr. Chapman asked if there is a way the Town could allow for less restrictive development requirements at the Eastern Commercial District site; Chairman Mirabal explained that numerous recommendations, many of which he delineated, were taken into account by the Planning Commission, and stated that the provisions provided thus far were included because the Planning Commission felt them to be necessary. Mr. Chapman further stated that his group is asking for the ability to negotiate this item; Chairman Mirabal explained that the Planning Commission respects his concerns, but did put much thought into the way the updated draft document is currently written. Mr. Mirabal also noted that Mr. Chapman's group will be able to take their concerns to the Town Council, when it conducts its review of the updated Comprehensive Plan. Commission Member Hummel stated that he "doesn't like how loose this is, as it is," and expressed his concern that this leaves open the possibility of construction on the parcel being exactly what the Commission has already seen, and does not like. Mr. Hummel further stated that he does not know how to limit the type of construction and still provide flexibility. Commission Member Wolford suggested that the Planning Commission should include a description of what it sees as mixed-use; a discussion of this ensued. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the Central Commercial District is considered mixed-use, and includes houses next to commercial buildings. Ms. Hynes also noted that review of various types of mixed-use developments could take a great deal of time, with Commission Member Wolford stating that Staff and the Commission have a good feel for what types of uses for that parcel are desired by residents. The construction of townhouses at the site was discussed, with it being noted that Commissioners are not completely against including townhouses, but do not want a block of eighty-four townhouses as put forth by the Round Hill Partners Group. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the goal of mixed-use is to integrate commercial and residential uses, giving the historical example of cities in which rows of townhouses had small markets/businesses at the end of the block, or in between houses. The subject of the economic viability of such a development was raised, with Ms. Hynes noting that it is not the responsibility of the Planning Commission to ensure economic viability. Chairman Mirabal then asked attendees for their comments.

Councilperson Botsch stated that he wants the Town to leave open options which will help ensure that the project is profitable; additionally, Mr. Botsch noted, such things as design and materials are important. Mr. Botsch also stated his belief that helping to ensure viability of the project will encourage the developer to work with the Town in the design of the development. Councilperson Botsch stated that “how you put that on paper is a challenge.” Chairman Mirabal stated that the Planning Commission feels it has gone as far as it can with this, and that the Land Use Committee and the Town Council can make changes/additions they see fit, when the document is under their review. Mr. Mirabal also noted that the Planning Commission will review this again at its next work session. Mr. Chapman provided a point of clarity, noting that the architect working with his group tried to reduce setbacks by including townhouses in the design for the parcel; however, he noted, nothing is “set in stone.” Chairman Mirabal stated that he believes Mr. Chapman’s group could provide a plan which would more closely meet the Town’s wishes. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes then presented the Land Use Map, explaining that the purpose of the Land Use Map is to provide policy only, it is not a zoning map and does not regulate. An error on the map, concerning the Lake Ridge development, was pointed out, with Ms. Hynes noting that that will be corrected. Ms. Hynes then provided a recap of discussion of this map, held at the last work session, explaining the following: 1) low density – maximum of one unit per acre; 2) medium density – one-plus units per acre; 3) orange areas – churches/institutional uses; 4) pink areas – community commercial, meaning downtown/B-1; 5) planned commercial – the PDCC area, containing larger commercial uses with more high-traffic; 6) public facility – the County-owned property proposed as a commuter lot, the Town Park, and the Hayman Lane Waste Water Treatment Plant; and, 7) dark green – light-industrial. Ms. Hynes also pointed out two properties on Main Street which were included in the community commercial area by the Planning Commission. Commission Member Hummel asked about the placement on the map of the Methodist Church parsonage, which Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated was done in error and would be corrected. Commission Member Hummel also asked where the language is, which is to be included with this map; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that there is a chart which will be included. Commission Members also discussed density requirements, in order to provide clarity on that issue. Councilperson Botsch asked to clarify that the recommendation of the Planning Commission is to zone 3 and 5 Main Street as commercial properties. Commission Member Wolford noted that that is not correct, and explained that this was done in regards to possible future commercial development on the east side of Main Street, in order to contain that development, rather than allowing for commercial from East Loudoun to the grocery store at the corner of Main and Mulberry Streets. The properties at 3 and 5 Main were zoned thus because they are between other properties zoned commercial. Commissioner Wolford also explained that the Commission was considering the Streetscape Plan, in which commercial on Main Street was discussed; commercial on East Loudoun Street was not discussed. Discussion then returned to the density issue, with a chart provided for review by the Planning Commission; Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that the chart was “a strawman,” provided to generate conversation. Ms. Hynes explained that every Comprehensive Plan must address affordable housing, and, at present, there is no affordable housing in Round Hill. Therefore, the Planning Commission needs to put forth a plan, going forward, to provide for varied lot sizes, house sizes, house costs, etc. Discussion ensued regarding possible scenarios in Town which could provide for affordable housing, and how Round

Hill's zoning requirements could affect this. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes asked the Commission if it wants any type of housing in Town which is smaller than a half-acre and/or a duplex or multi-unit building. Commission Member Hummel stated that he does want this type of development, but stated that "it doesn't mean that it has to be greater than two to the acre; you could do smaller lots, with the rest of the parcel used as an open space/park." Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes noted, in response, that there are only three infill lots in Town which are greater than one acre. Mr. Hummel noted that that is correct, "unless you assemble." Ms. Hynes noted that that would require that existing houses be torn down, to which Mr. Hummel replied that some houses in Town need to be torn down. Following further discussion, Chairman Mirabal and Commission Member Hummel stated their opinion that this proposed policy is creating an incentive for a developer to increase the density in the Town. Commissioner Hummel explained how affordable/senior housing is provided for in Fairfax County, and suggested that Round Hill may want to adopt a similar plan. There was further discussion of how to provide for affordable housing without providing an incentive for higher-density development. Chairman Mirabal then suggested that written definitions for each area be provided, and that the Planning Commission revisit this issue at its next work session. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that she is trying to leave open the possibility of building smaller footprint homes on in-fill lots, and will include language in the Comprehensive Plan which will preclude high-density development. Ms. Hynes further stated that she does not want the Land Use Map to be the guiding document, but rather she wants the Comprehensive Plan to be the guiding document. Commission Member Hummel explained further the Fairfax County plan, in response to a question from Councilperson Botsch. The Commission and the Town Planner/Zoning Administrator then discussed open space requirements for affordable/cluster development. Chairman Mirabal then stated that he believes the inclusion of language to facilitate what the Town hopes to accomplish is important – provide for creative development while not creating an incentive for assemblage. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that she wants the Commissioners to review again the Housing Chapter and the Land Use Chapter, and to be very critical. The Land Bay Map was then discussed, beginning with a review of Land Bay Areas inside of Town areas. Those areas include: 1) the train station district, which includes three parcels, and for which a possible rezoning may be considered at a future date, with an eye to highlighting the history of the area; 2) the commuter lot, for which language is also included in the Regional Land Use Bays, and for which concerns of residents and possible uses by the Town be addressed; 3) the antique store on Main Street, which the Planning Commission wishes to remain residential, and for which four parking spaces would be required if it were to be turned into a bed and breakfast; 4) Milligan's store, which presents difficulties in regards to parking; 5) the Hammerly House, which, Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes noted, would be one instance in which the Town may want to incentivize developers, in order to allow for that house to be razed and two homes to be built, or to allow for that building to be rebuilt/restored and used as a bed and breakfast inn, insisting that the character of the original house be maintained; 6) the fire department building and the post office, which are zoned B-1, and specifically that special exception language be included for the post office building, which would support other uses of that site; 7) the properties at 3 and 5 Main Street, which are currently zoned residential, and which the Planning Commission is recommending be zoned commercial; 8) the current light-industrial area, which the Planning Commission is recommending be

rezoned as residential in the future, if doing so meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan; 9) the four parcels currently owned by the Town, which are zoned residential but are next to the stone house, which is zoned commercial, and for which verbiage needs to be included indicating what type of use is wanted there; 10) the property adjacent to the Town Park, which is land-locked with no road frontage and no access easements, and which could be used for parking for the Town Park; 11) the house adjacent to the Town Park, which was originally a bed and breakfast-type establishment, which could be used as a country inn and which is located on a three-acre lot which could be used for special events; and, 12) the four lots on Yatton Road, which just were sold, and for which water and sewer lines must be installed, currently zoned AR-1. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes asked Planning Commission members to review these areas for further discussion. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator recommended that the discussion of the Joint Land Management Area be tabled until the next meeting. The Regional Round Hill Land Bay Map was then discussed, with attention paid to the following regional land bays: 1) the Hill High Orchard building, with discussion centering on whether or not to preserve the building, due to its historical significance; 2) the Sheriff's Office Substation, with discussion of compatible uses for the site; 3) the Powers Thomas property, with discussion centering on possible uses of the parcel; 4) the old elementary school, and the desire by the Town that it be turned into a community center; 5) the park/civic lot, for which the language in the document is the same as for the commuter lot; areas 6 and 7, which contain the same verbiage, but for which consideration must be given to extending water/sewer service to the sites and if that complies with the Comprehensive Plan, the goal being that homes not be built on those sites; and, 8) the twenty acres south of Town. Vice-Mayor Graham and Commission Member Wolford noted that the Joint Land Management Area cannot be expanded because of the capacity of the sewer system. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes asked that Commission Members let her know if they are not happy with her suggestions for areas six and seven. Vice-Mayor Graham asked if including these areas in the Comprehensive Plan would create the requirement that the Town extend services; it was noted that it would not. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes noted that areas six and seven would not require a rezoning, but would require a special exception, and that the County could be encouraged to allow a use there the Town would want. Additionally, area eight, the twenty acres south of Town, contains a low-density zoning, which would be appropriate for a nursing home/retirement facility, or a wedding venue. Requirements for this parcel were reviewed. Ms. Hynes noted that some sections discussed this evening contain specific policies which will be refined at the next work session. It was also noted that an AR-1 zoning district allows for many uses. Town Planner/Zoning Administrator Hynes noted that there will not be discussion of JLMA goals this evening, but asked that attendees e-mail changes/suggestions to her; she further noted that she is trying to determine the Town's rights in relation to the JLMA.

#### **IN RE: ACTION ITEMS**

The Commission discussed possible dates for its next work session, with February 23<sup>rd</sup> being suggested. If the work session cannot be held on this date, each Planning Commission Member will be notified.

#### **IN RE: TOWN PLANNER REPORT**

This item was not presented.

**IN RE: NEXT MEETING**

Vice-Mayor Graham and Commission Member Wolford noted that there are currently budget meetings scheduled for Thursdays, so Planning Commission meetings should not be scheduled for that day of the week. Chairman Mirabal recommended that a work session be held on March 1<sup>st</sup>, and the regular Planning Commission meeting be held on March 8, 2016; the Commissioners agreed to this schedule.

**IN RE: ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Mirabal at 10:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Manuel Mirabal, Chairman

---

Debra McDonald, Recording Secretary