

Town of Lovettsville

Planning Commission Minutes of Regular Meeting, February 15, 2012

Chairwoman Bushway called the Regular Monthly Meeting of the Lovettsville Planning Commission to order at 7:32 PM. on Wednesday, February 15, 2012.

Present at Meeting

- Mayor Elaine Walker
- Chairwoman Mari Bushway
- Vice Chairman Jack Burden
- Commissioners Lorraine Bauer, Jack Burden, Elaine Fischer, Rodney Gray, Deborah Summitt
- Town Manager Keith Markel
- Town Clerk Judy L. Kromholz

Absent

- Commissioner Tony Quintana

Public Comment

Chairwoman Bushway stated that she would take public comment on the agenda item after the presentation on that item. She then asked for public comment on items other than the agenda item and there were none.

Additions/Deletions/Modifications to the Agenda

Chairwoman Bushway called for changes to the agenda. There were none.

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

No minutes were presented.

Staff Reports

No formal Zoning Report was presented. Manager Markel informed the Commission that the new Zoning Administrator would start on February 27th. He also announced that Tony Quintana had been appointed to the Planning Commission, but was unable to attend the meeting due to a prior commitment. Commissioner Quintana submitted written comment on the action item on tonight's agenda (Written Submissions Attachment 1). Chairwoman Bushway stated that she had met the new Zoning Administrator and Mr. Quintana and was excited to be working with both of them.

Action/Discussion Items

A. LVSU 2010-0002: Keena Subdivision Preliminary Plat

Manager Markel presented the staff report and PowerPoint presentation for this item. The Commission is being asked to review the Preliminary Plat and related variation requests for possible approval.

Vice Chairman Burden asked why lots 31, 32 and 33 are included. Manager Markel explained that those lots are owned by the developer and their acreage was included to meet the PID requirements and to build two more houses. He explained that the existing home will remain, two new homes would be added, and he does not know if the barn will remain. The existing home can remain, but it could not be reconstructed on its current footprint because it encroaches on the required setbacks. Lot 29 is also an existing home; that lot would be subdivided. Manager Markel emphasized that he feels strongly about underground storm water control for this project because this is a very wet area.

Mr. Mark Jeffries made the presentation for the applicant. He reviewed the history of the project noting that the town approached Mr. Keena to re-zone the property to conform to the existing Town appearance. Mr. Jeffries stated that the 2007 approved concept plan showed new roads at 40' with sidewalk on one side only. The approved concept plan showed 40' right of way on Stone Jail Street and 33' on Pennsylvania Avenue. Subsequently, VDOT stated that 33' did not meet their requirements and Mr. Keena agreed to increase the width of Pennsylvania Avenue to 40' and got VDOT approval. He stated that the current staff report raises issues that were not raised in 2007.

Mr. Jeffries addressed the parking issues discussed in the staff report by noting that Pennsylvania Avenue will be wider than it is today. He stated that the ordinances require two off street parking spots per unit and this design embodies that requirement. The alleys are 18' wide and there is no requirement in the ordinances for overflow parking. There will be 6 spaces left on the Frye Court side of the development, in front of Mr. Keena's property.

Mr. Jeffries noted that the existing house at the corner of Loudoun and Locust Streets is in the area that Staff is asking to be dedicated to the Town. He recommended that Mr. Keena reserve the right of way, but not dedicate it, because it would go right through that house. Mr. Jeffries stated that this topic had not come up in the two previous reviews and it is difficult for them to react at the 11th hour.

He stated that there is an opportunity here to bring this project to a conclusion – fill in this open field with something that has the look and feel of the rest of the community. He stated that some of these items have already been decided noting the ditch sections were shown on the approved concept plan. He stated that the new street they are proposing will be designed with ditches that have 2% slope reflecting the existing slope of the property. Mr. Jeffries spoke to the advantages of grass lined ditches stating that they are a greener solution and that the ditches will filter the runoff before it gets to the pipes.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the applicant is not committing to bring curb and gutter from East Broad Way to the existing curb and gutter along Frye Court because that was not in the initial plan. However, they are offering to bring Frye Court into compliance with VDOT regulations, thereby alleviating a problem for the Town. The owners on Frye Court bought houses that were intended to be on a state maintained road and the applicant is offering to right a wrong that happened 20 years ago.

Mr. Jeffries stated that the bottom line is that this plan is in substantial conformance with the approved rezoning concept plan. The district for this piece of property was created at the request of the Town. He stated that he would like to work with Mr. Markel to move this project forward. It would generate income for the Town, improve the tax base, solve the Frye Court problem, and provide lots of good opportunities for the Town.

He pointed out that note 31 on the plat says that the applicant will cooperate with the Town's East Broad Way streetscape engineer, Patton Harris & Rust to provide easements needed for the East Broad Way sidewalk. This has not been finalized yet, so they cannot do it now. However, he stated that the Town would acquire those easements at no cost when the requirements are finalized.

Commissioner Summitt asked if the alleys would be private or public and Mr. Jeffries stated that they would be private because they would not meet VDOT requirements. The Home Owners Association would be responsible for maintaining them.

Commissioner Gray asked about the slope on Pennsylvania Avenue and Mr. Jeffries stated that Pennsylvania Avenue is a little flatter than the new street would be. He noted that those streets would have to meet VDOT standards in order to be accepted into the state system.

The Commission took a break at 8:37 PM and resumed at 8:43 PM.

Chairwoman Bushway read the Commission rules for public speaking and called on the speakers in the order in which they had signed up to speak (Attachment I: Speaker Signup Sheet).

Mr. Scott Dockum confirmed that the barn under discussion is not on his property which is adjacent to the proposed development. He had written a letter to the Commission (Written Submissions Attachment 2) and stated that he stands behind what he said and is attending this meeting to answer any questions the Commission might have about his letter. He noted that the part of Town that will be matched is Frye Court, which is not typical of the varied housing in the rest of the Town. This concept plan was approved over 5 years ago, times have changed. The new concept plan has been put into place in response to what the citizenry wants – things have changed. He is in the environmental field himself and has worked with water issues for many years and drainage that will keep water out of the aquifer is preferable. The concept plan from 2007 was a concept, not a final plan – times have changed and what the community is asking for has changed.

Councilman Mike Senate stated that he has been in Town since 2004 and at the time this project was originally approved he was risk manager for the local fire company. In that capacity, he consistently asked for and received good response from other developers for roads that can take a fire truck which must be 20 feet wide. He agrees that VDOT requires 18', but the Virginia fire code says 20' which is what is necessary for two fire trucks to get past each other. He also stated that as a resident in that community, when he has company he asks them to park on his front lawn, not in the street. He noted that the Town does not have a police department and people will park on the street because they will have no alternative.

There were no other comments from the public. Chairwoman Bushway closed public comment at 8:53 PM. She then called for discussion by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Summitt stated that she is concerned about right-of-way issues and that she is not sure why there are not sidewalks on both sides since there are easements on both sides. Her concerns about the alleys include defining where an emergency vehicle would park and how it would be able to get over the ditch. Councilman Senate confirmed that the fire department would not use the alleys at all. Commissioner Summitt suggested that the alleys be labeled on the plat as private access. She also expressed concern about the turnarounds, noting that there is not enough room for vehicles to turn around if vehicles are parked there. She envisioned delivery and trash trucks having to back out. She also noted that there is an existing ground hole and questioned why the drainage from Stone Jail Street could not be tied into the existing system.

Commissioner Bauer asked about the sidewalk being extended from where they currently end on Frye Court out to East Broad Way. Manager Markel stated that he believes VDOT will require the sidewalk extension; however, if VDOT does not require it, the Town cannot require it. Commissioner Bauer also asked why Pennsylvania Avenue cannot be made wider since it appears from the plat that there would be enough space to widen it. Manager Markel showed where the plat details 18' of pavement and then a gravel shoulder on either side. Commissioner Bauer stated that sidewalks on at least one side of Pennsylvania Avenue would benefit the whole Town.

Commissioner Fischer asked which takes precedence – the approved Concept Plan for this parcel or the newer Comprehensive Plan. Manager Markel pointed out that the sidewalk issue had been discussed at the time the concept plan was approved and Council agreed to the lack of sidewalks despite the staff recommendation at the time to require sidewalks. Manager Markel also noted that all of the issues discussed in this staff report had been discussed with the applicant prior to this meeting and the applicant knew staff disagreed which is why they are asking for exceptions. Manager Markel emphasized that he supports the project overall and that the applicant is offering many good things for the benefit of Town but there are a few things that they have agreed to disagree on. He thinks putting the reservation on the right of way on the existing buildings is a great compromise.

Chairwoman Bushway stated that one of her concerns is that, while she understands their feeling that things keep changing, the concept plan were approved in 2007. There is now a new Comprehensive Plan and an entirely new Planning Commission.

Manager Markel explained that the rezoning and approval of the proffered concept plan travels with the property through time. However, approval of the concept plan is not absolute – it leads to this stage – and it is apparent from the discussions held in 2007 the Planning Commission and the Council knew these issues would be revisited at a more detailed level. Legally, the preliminary plat, once approved, will have a life of 5 years and the final plat will have a life of one year.

Vice Chairman Burden stated that parking is his biggest concern, noting that maneuvering room in the alleys is a big issue. Storm water runoff is also a concern. The new Comprehensive Plan is emphatic on the need for sidewalks and curbs. He is also concerned about the three lots (31, 32 and 33) in that something could be put there that clashes with the houses around it.

Motion: I move to table this item until the Town Attorney has been consulted and can advise the Commission as to the applicability of the Comprehensive Plan and as to what portions of the approved concept plan the Commission cannot change.

By: Vice Chairman Burden

Second: Commissioner Fischer

Commissioner Gray stated that he would like to express his concerns before they vote on tabling the item and the Commission agreed. Commissioner Gray stated that a number of his concerns had already been addressed by the other Commissioners, but he is also concerned about the grass ditches, having had unpleasant experience with his own. He does not see how storm water will drain properly given the slight slope of the land. The width of the new road also gives him pause; he hears that minimums are being met but his concern is that realistically there is not enough space to park all the vehicles these homes will generate. He does like the concept of the project but he believes that there remain some issues to discuss. Commissioner Gray stated that he is also concerned about the exit from Stone Jail Street and recommended a three way stop at the new intersection. He also noted that there are no driveways indicated for lots 31 and 32. Mr. Keena stated that this was an oversight and also noted that there are additional options for parking, including turning the existing barn into a garage and adding garages behind some of the new homes.

Chairwoman Bushway called for the vote to table.

Aye: Commissioners Bauer, Burden, Fischer, Gray, Summitt

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Quintana

Discussion Items

There were no Discussion Items on the agenda.

Information Items

There were no Information Items on the agenda.

Comments from the Commissioners

Chairwoman Bushway called for comments from the Commissioners. There were none.

Public Comment

Chairwoman Bushway called for comments from the public. There was none at this time.

Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn the Planning Commission meeting of February 15, 2012

By: Chairwoman Bushway

Second: Commissioner Fischer

Aye: Commissioners Bauer, Burden, Fischer, Gray, Summitt

Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Quintana

The Meeting was adjourned at 9:24 PM.

Respectfully submitted,


Judy L. Kromholz, Town Clerk

Date Approved: May 2, 2012

Attachments:

- I. Speaker Sign Up Sheet

Written Submissions to Commission:

1. Tony Quintana
2. Scott Dockum

Town of Lovettsville

Speaker Sign - Up Sheet

Planning Commission Regular Meeting - February 15, 2012

Please Print.

Name and Association	Address	Topic - Please Indicate Public Hearing or Other Topic
Scott Dockum	9 South Loudoun St.	PIDD
Michael Genate	8 South Loudoun St.	PIDD
MARK JEFFRIES, P.E. APPLICANT'S REP.	15 LOUDOUN ST. CABBING	KEENA PBLUM.

Each speaker will be limited to no more than three (3) minutes.

From: Tony Quintana [<mailto:tonyquintana@usa.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2012 6:35 PM
To: toflovettsville@gmail.com; clerk@lovettsvilleva.gov; kmarkel@lovettsvilleva.gov; ladyva73@yahoo.com; jbauer@lovettsvilleva.gov; mbushway@lovettsvilleva.gov; rkqg.gray@verizon.net
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting Feb. 15 2012

Dear Fellow members of the Planning Commission,

As noted in previous correspondence I will be unable to attend my first two meetings of the Commission due

I have reviewed carefully all materials provided in reference to The Keena Subdivision, and must say I am :
this project.

This project has in its own right much potential. But its density is already troubling, and allowing the deviation
Like to go on record against voting favorably on all line items before this commission on LVSU 2012-0002.

Please accept my apologies for my absence on this crucial matter. I hope my note provides my stance on the

Thank you,

Anthony Quintana

19 Black Forest Lane, Lovettsville, VA 20180-8536

Home [540-822-5608](tel:540-822-5608)

Tony Quintana | Oberthur Technologies
Business Development Manager-Corporate & Healthcare Markets
4250 Pleasant Valley Drive • Chantilly, VA 20151 USA
E-Mail: t.quintana@oberthur.com
[+1 703 322 8918](tel:+17033228918) (Office) • [+1 703 347 4936](tel:+17033474936) (Mobile/Cell) • [+1 703 263 7134](tel:+17032637134) (FAX)

Scott and Brenda Dockum
9 South Loudoun St.
Lovettsville, VA 20180

Dear Members of the Lovettsville Planning Commission.

Due to a prior commitment in Leesburg, I cannot attend the Planning Commission Meeting on Wednesday, but wanted to ensure that each of you have my comments on LVSU 2010-0002 Keena Subdivision Preliminary Plat (with variation request). If you have questions please email me at sdockum1@gmail.com and I will be happy to discuss further.

As a former Lovettsville Planning Commissioner and Town Council Member, I try to stay up to date on activities going on within the Town. As such I received all the documents related to the LVSU 2010-0002 Keena Subdivision Preliminary Plat (with variation request) and have provided my comments on this preliminary plat below. I ask that the Planning Commission take these comments into consideration as the preliminary plat is discussed for future implementation.

General Discussion and Background

Back in 2007 I was part of the Lovettsville Planning Commission and worked on the conditional rezoning of this development and as town staff has indicated in their letter, only proffers were approved as part of the rezoning. These proffers included the concept plan architectural elevations for the homes, and a commitment to install frontage improvements or provide funding in lieu of actual construction. At that time I do not remember seeing a preliminary subdivision plat as the one provided for this discussion. So back in 2007 the decision to approve the conditional rezoning was based only on the current proffer information provided and it was noted that future discussions on the design specifications as they relate to the design of the overall project would be negotiated at a later time.

Lastly, I want to remind everyone involved in this process that times have changed in Lovettsville since 2007. Since that time, the Town has implemented a new Comprehensive Plan and the Town has taken great strides to promote a safer and pedestrian friendly environment in the older section of town. I ask that members of the Lovettsville Planning Commission review the polices that are listed in the 2011 Lovettsville Comprehensive Plan and ask if this preliminary plat provided by the developer conforms to these polices.

Specific Comments/Issues

Below are specific comments and issues I have with the preliminary plat. Again if you have questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

1. The developer has not met the ordinance requirements for roadway right-of-way, sidewalks, curb and gutters.

Recommendation:

Do not allow the developer to only use the minimum VDOT standards for this development.

Per the Lovettsville Subdivision Ordinance, "new developments must have streets with a minimum right of way of 50ft." I agree with staff comments that the right-of-way for Stone Jail Street must conform to this ordinance.

I disagree with Staff's recommendation that the minimum VDOT standard of 18ft can be used for Pennsylvania Avenue. My disagreement is based on the fact that there are multiple lots on the new Pennsylvania Avenue that will have driveways fronting the roadway. If a resident of these lots owns a large vehicle (i.e. Mini Van or large pickup truck) there is very little room to safely maneuver these vehicles in or out of the driveways due to the proposed 18ft width of Pennsylvania Avenue. As an example my 2005 Honda Odyssey is a little over 16ft in length. If I were to park in these driveways, I would have less than 2ft of space to work with while trying to back out or enter these driveways. Pennsylvania Ave should at a minimum conform to the current roadway specifications and design of Frye Court which has a roadway that is a minimum of 30ft in width and also contains curbs and gutters.

With regards to sidewalks, per the Lovettsville Subdivision Ordinance, "sidewalks shall be built on both sides of each street, whether in the State System or not. Sidewalks shall be composed of concrete or brick and not less than four (4) feet wide and installed according to Town and Virginia Department of Transportation specifications." I agree with Staff's recommendation that sidewalks must be constructed on Stone jail Street as required by the Ordinance. However, I disagree with Staff's recommendation for Pennsylvania Avenue that sidewalks do not need to be constructed. My disagreement is based on the fact that there are 4 lots that front Pennsylvania Avenue. Residents that live in these lots should have a safe means to access the sidewalks currently found on Frye Court which also provides a pedestrian connection to the planned sidewalk network on East Broadway. By requiring these changes it, will ensure that all residents that live in the PIDD have safe pedestrian access to East Broadway via the current Frye Court sidewalk network.

Lastly, requiring the roadway width, curbs, gutters and sidewalks to be designed to the ordinance and existing Frye Court aligns the development to be compatible with the existing neighborhood on Frye Court. The intent of the Planned Infill Development District (PIDD) was to create an infill development with diversity in housing stock compatible with the **pattern** of the surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed designs of the roadways and lack of infrastructure (gutters, curbs and sidewalks) does not conform to the roadway and infrastructure pattern of the existing neighborhood on Frye Court. Since the Frye Court neighborhood is going to be the one neighborhood that is most impacted by this new development, it only makes sense to create a design that is coordinated to the same infrastructure standards as the older development on Frye Court. This creates an area in town where the infrastructure is uniform rather than being severely disjointed as currently proposed.

2. The Developer has not allowed for any on street parking within the development due to the use of minimum VDOT standards.

The 2011 Lovettsville Comprehensive Plan states that future developments should ensure adequate parking for existing and future residential, business and employment uses. Based on the provided preliminary plat, there is no additional

on street parking anywhere. Only residents that occupy a lot have two provided parking spaces. This leads to several questions that need to be considered and addressed.

1. Where will residents that own more than two vehicles park within the new subdivision?
2. Where will visitors park their vehicles within the new subdivision if they can't utilize the designated parking spots found on each lot?
3. What impacts will the proposed minimum VDOT standard as related to on street parking have on surrounding neighborhoods, particularly Frye Court?

Recommendation:

Do not allow the developer to only use the minimum VDOT standards for this development.

Per the Lovettsville Subdivision Ordinance, "new developments must have streets with a minimum right of way of 50ft." I agree with staff comments that the right-of-way for Stone Jail Street must conform to this ordinance. This would provide for on street parking and satisfy the questions raised above.

As stated above, I disagree with Staff's recommendation that the minimum VDOT standard of 18ft be used for Pennsylvania Avenue. Pennsylvania Ave should at a minimum conform to the current roadway specifications and design of Frye Court which has a roadway that is a minimum of 30ft in width and also contains curbs and gutters. This would also allow for on street parking and answer the questions above.

These recommended changes to the preliminary plat for both Stone Jail Street and Pennsylvania Avenue will ensure that residents that live in the PIDD have adequate parking locations for multiple vehicles and visitors. This allows the development to be compatible with the one neighborhood that is most affected by this new development as most likely overflow parking under the current proposal will end up on the existing Frye Court roadway. Currently residents that live on Frye Court are utilizing the on street parking located on the existing roadway and there is little room to allow additional parking pressure from the proposed 31 homes in the preliminary plat.

3. The proposed minimum VDOT standard for Stone Jail Street, Pennsylvania Avenue and the proposed alleyways are not sufficient for easy ingress and egress for large emergency vehicles such as local fire trucks and fire tankers.

The developer has not provided a means for emergency vehicles to easily maneuver within the proposed roadways and alleyways thus creating a hazard to residents that live in the PIDD.

Recommendation:

Do not allow the developer to only use the minimum VDOT standards for this development.

As I have detailed above, Stone Jail Street must have a minimum right-of-way of 50ft per the ordinance. Pennsylvania Ave should at a minimum conform to the

current roadway specifications and design of Frye Court which has a roadway that is a minimum of 30ft in width. Additionally the proposed alleyways do not appear to be wide enough for large emergency vehicles and it should be recommended that these be widened to a minimum width that is agreed to by emergency personnel.

These required right-of-way widths will ensure that emergency vehicles have equal access to all residents that live in the PIDD development. Additionally it is recommended that the proposed roadways and alleyways must be reviewed by emergency personnel to determine potential choke points for getting emergency vehicles in and out of the development, and should be approved by emergency personnel before the Planning Commission approves the final plat.

4. The proposed minimum VDOT standard for Stone Jail Street, Pennsylvania Avenue and the proposed alleyways are not sufficient for short term parking for typical delivery vehicles.

The developer has not provided a means for larger vehicles to easily park within the proposed roadways and alleyways thus creating a burden to residents that may need to have goods and service delivered to their property. An example of a large delivery vehicle that may frequent this development is local propane delivery trucks if homes require this service. Additionally, Fed-Ex and UPS vehicles may find it difficult to make a delivery with no available parking and limited space to maneuver through the development.

Recommendation:

Do not allow the developer to only use the minimum VDOT standards for this development.

As I have detailed above, Stone Jail Street must have a minimum right-of-way of 50ft per the ordinance. Pennsylvania Ave should at a minimum conform to the current roadway specifications and design of Frye Court which has a roadway that is a minimum of 30ft in width.

Additionally, the alleyways should be widened to allow access of larger vehicles to properties. As currently proposed a delivery truck would obstruct traffic flow in the alleyway if stationary for any given time.

5. The Developer has not provided plans to develop a three way stop at the intersection Stone Jail Street and Locust St.

In early discussions with the developer during the concept plan stage, it was recommended and agreed to that the intersection of Locust Street with Stone Jail Street be turned into a 3 way stop. Additionally it was discussed that lines of sight may be an issue for any vehicle turning onto Locust Street thus having the 3 way stop would be safer for drivers. Also this 3 way stop would ease the current problems with speeding on Locust Street and provide for traffic calming.

Recommendation:

There should be a requirement that this intersection be approved as a 3 way stop by VDOT before the final plat is approved.

6. The need to subdivide the corner lot at Locust St. and South Loudoun St. into three lots does not make sense. It appears that this part of the development has received very little planning/attention to detail since the plan is vague on what would happen at this location as compared to the rest of the PIDD development. The Town and developer needs to answer these following questions.

Major Concern

1. If possible the Town should reevaluate the corner lot at South Loudoun St. and Locust Street to determine if it really should be part of the PIDD. It appears that this corner lot was a quick addition to the proposed plan but not really thought out. The proposed lots impact the low density homes in the existing neighborhood on South Loudoun St. and are not conforming to the existing R-1 Residential Zoning District standards. The impacts of this area are quite substantial if allowed to proceed and I strongly encourage that this area be reevaluated to determine if the lot should remain under the PIDD or be zoned as R-1 which conforms to the surrounding neighborhood.

Questions for the developer

1. If this corner lot has to be part of the PIDD, is there a possibility to only subdivide the lot into 2 lots to reduce the density of homes?
2. What type of homes will be built on these new lots (i.e., will they be exact elevations to those being proposed in the PIDD)? Or something more characteristic of the older historic homes found on South Loudoun St.?
3. What are the setbacks for these new homes from property lines and other existing structures?
4. The preliminary plat provides no ingress or egress for vehicles for each of the proposed lots. It's not clear where vehicles would enter the lots or park?
5. Would the developer provide improvements to curbs, gutters and sidewalks at the locations of these new access points for each lot?
6. Where would the parking be for the current home located at 11 Locust St.?
7. The homeowners at 14 S. Loudoun Street use the easement on the east side of South Loudoun St. for parking since they do not have a driveway. How would this easement be changed and what impacts would there be for on street parking on South Loudoun St.?

Recommendation:

The Town needs to weigh in on changing the PIDD to remove this corner lot.

The developer needs to satisfactorily answer all these questions and provide evidence that these additional lots are needed and **WILL NOT** provide a negative impact to the surrounding community on South Loudoun St. The developer should clearly indicate how the new homes conform to the current neighborhood on South Loudoun St. and how this new development will enhance the character of the South Loudoun St. neighborhood. Lastly, the developer should be required to complete all infrastructure improvements for these new lots on both Locust Street and South Loudoun St.

7. The developer has proposed inadequate storm water runoff infrastructure for this development. As stated in the memo from Town Staff, "As part of the subdivision process, the developer is required to improve the east side of Locust Street along the frontage of the project. This includes the dedication of additional right of way so that

there will be 25 feet of right of way from the center line of Locust Street to the developments property line to the east. The frontage of Locust Street will need to be improved with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. It appears that street storm water runoff on Locust between Stone Jail Street and Pennsylvania Avenue will be collected into a street drain; however there is no such provision for storm water runoff to the south of Stone Jail Street. It is believed that the developer intends for the storm water from Locust to be collected and channeled to the open ditch along Stone Jail. As with much of the older part of Town, there is minimal slope and the soil is often saturated with water. Staff recommends that curb, gutter, and underground storm sewers be provided to convey the water efficiently away from this development to the existing outfall to the south east of this property. This storm water will then follow the natural drainage through the County parkland and will be used for the future pond water feature within the park.”

Recommendation:

The Developer must follow the recommendations as detailed by Town staff to install curb, gutter and underground storm sewers on the east side of Locust Street and install curb, gutter and underground storm sewers for Stone Jail Street, Pennsylvania Avenue and all alleyways (Ritchey Alley and Spotter Post Alley) to channel storm water away from the proposed development.

After a storm event, it is not uncommon for storm water to pond in and around this area of town. Often this water can be present for days to weeks after a storm event. As a resident that often has water infiltrating into the basement, ensuring that storm water is properly disposed of will lessen the burden on existing and new structures near or within the development. Additionally, because the soils in this area drain poorly there is concern that accumulating surface water will become stagnate and will increase the current mosquito problems. Having an effective removal storm water removal system will enhance the development and limit the impact to existing structures and residents.

Conclusion

I encourage the members of the Lovettsville Planning Commission to take these comments and recommendations into consideration and strongly encourage Planning Commission members to deny the requested variations to the subdivision ordinance and deny approval for the preliminary plat until all the issues identified by the Planning Commission, Town Staff and the Public are answered and met.

I want to thank all of you for your hard work and dedication to the people of the Town. Again if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best Regards,



Scott Dockum