



OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT & BUDGET

320 Hospital Drive, Suite 24
Warrenton, Virginia 20186-3208

Phone (540) 422-8360

Fax (540) 422-8366

January 19, 2011

TO: Kristen Slawter, Senior Planner
FROM: Ari J. Sky, Director
SUBJECT: Village of Catlett – 12/29/2010 Submission

At Community Development's request, I have reviewed the latest submission from Catlett Farm, LLC, for the Village of Catlett development. This revision differs from earlier submissions in several respects:

1. The project has been reduced to a maximum of 300 residential units. The August 13, 2010, analysis envisioned a total development of 645 units.
2. Commercial development associated with the application is unchanged from earlier submissions at 64,500 square feet.
3. The applicant proposes to construct a sewage treatment plant with a maximum 160,000 gpd capacity at their own expense. The plant would be constructed in two phases, the first with an 80,000 gpd capacity.

The applicant also provided a letter submitted by the Weitzman Group that challenged staff's fiscal impact methodology. Specifically, the applicant's consultant asserted that capital proffers should be considered as an offset to ongoing operating costs. The Weitzman Group chose to convey proffer value by representing the improvements as a 20 year annuity.

Staff has long acknowledged that capital proffers have value; however, it is not appropriate to represent capital contributions as a mitigating factor for long-term operating costs. It may be reasonable to assume that construction of a sewage treatment plant may become necessary to service existing and anticipated "by right" residents of the Catlett/Calverton area. A County-financed project would incur annual debt service costs of up to \$650,000, depending upon the precise configuration of the project. The County's consultants would be best equipped to determine the relative value of the proffered facilities envisioned in the applicant's most recent submission.

The accompanying attachment provides an updated fiscal impact estimate for the Village of Catlett development. Net fiscal impact from the proposed development is estimated to total \$1.2 million annually, as approximately \$3.2 million in general government and school division expenditures would be partially offset by approximately \$1.9 million in additional tax revenue.

This analysis may be revised as additional information becomes available. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

ATTACHMENT: Fiscal Impact Estimate

**Fiscal Impact Estimate - New Development
Revised Catlett LLC Proposal**

Annual Revenue Estimates

Residential Development

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Average Assessment per Unit | |
| Real Estate: | \$405,636 |
| Personal Property: | \$16,000 |
| Revenue per Unit | |
| Real Estate: | \$3,935 |
| Personal Property: | 744 |
| Sales Tax (\$75/person): | 203 |
| <u>Motor Vehicle Licenses (2.3 vehicles):</u> | <u>58</u> |
| Total Revenue per Unit: | \$4,939 |
| Number of Additional Units: | 300 |

Commercial Development

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Average Assessment per 1,000 sf | |
| Real Estate: | \$126,814 |
| Personal Property: | \$44,159 |
| Revenue per 1,000 sf | |
| Real Estate: | \$1,230 |
| Personal Property: | 1,016 |
| Business License Tax: | 325 |
| <u>Sales Tax:</u> | <u>4,812</u> |
| Total Revenue per 1,000 sf: | \$7,383 |
| Square Feet Commercial: | 64,500 |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Total Revenue - Residential: | \$1,481,601 | Total Revenue - Commercial: | \$476,195 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|

Offsetting Expenditures

School Division

| | |
|---|----------|
| Students per Household: | 0.72 |
| FY 2011 Expenditures per Pupil: | \$10,621 |
| School Division Expenditures/Household: | \$7,647 |

General Government

| | |
|---|---------|
| Average Residents per Household: | 2.75 |
| FY 2011 County Expenditures per Capita: | \$1,091 |
| Gen. Government Expenditures/Household: | \$3,000 |

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| Total Expenditures per Household: | \$10,647 |
|--|-----------------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Total Expenditures: | \$3,194,211 |
|----------------------------|--------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Net Fiscal Impact: | (1,236,415) |
|---------------------------|--------------------|

FAUQUIER COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



PLANNING DIVISION
(540) 422-8210

ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION
(540) 422-8240

COURT AND OFFICE BUILDING
29 ASHBY STREET, SUITE 310
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20186
(540) 422-8200

FAX (540) 422-8201

ZONING ADMINISTRATION
(540) 422-8220

PERMITTING AND INSPECTIONS
(540) 422-8230

From: Planning Division
Date: February 16, 2011
Subject: The Village of Catlett (Catlett Farm, LLC)
REZN10-CR-002, CPAM09-CR-009, SPEX10-CR-011
PIN: 7922-34-3184

The Planning Division has reviewed the above referenced project revision, submitted January 5, 2011.

Proffer Statement (December 29, 2010)

We acknowledge that proffers are voluntary. There have been considerable changes to this document since the last submission. These comments are provided for the Board's benefit and consideration.

1. Section 4.1 states a possible type of "THREE HUNDRED FIFTY (300)". What is the total number of units being requested?
2. There are no cash proffers.
3. There is no school site or public park site.
4. There is no proffer for a collection system to be paid for by the developer off-site; No offer is made that the developer will pay for the "tap fee" for existing residents of Catlett.
5. There is no phasing of the commercial development. The phasing proposed in the Code of Development should, at a minimum, be stated in the Proffer Statement.

6. The type of residential units (i.e. single-family attached, detached, duplex) should be phased to ensure that a variety of units are built and spread out within the blocks.
7. The statement in Section 5.2 states that County will be the beneficiary of the capacity of Phase 2 WWTP expansion. This suggests that the development will be the beneficiary of Phase 1. However, the applicant's Comprehensive Plan Amendment Map 6.6C shows the reverse, where the actual community of Catlett is Phase 1 and the development is Phase 2. The applicant should reconcile this.
8. Consider placing a deadline of when the WWTP will be fully-operational.
9. All significant HOA facilities, such as the park, pool, playground equipment, fields, tennis courts, benches, should be addressed in the proffer statement.
10. There is land north and south of the subdivision that is not used for the subdivision's open space, but the applicant is asking the Board to rezone it to PRD. Match the PRD zoning to the subdivision boundaries. Consider a proffer to place the remaining land not used for the subdivision in a permanent conservation easement.
11. There is no longer a proffer to place the area west of the subdivision (for a WWTP) into permanent conservation easement.
12. A hydrogeologic study (a water study) was not required with this application, but is of great benefit before final plats are approved. Consider a proffer to submit the hydrogeologic study upon first submission of Construction Plan Review.
13. Staff discussed transportation proffers with the applicant in a meeting on 2/8/11. The applicant agreed to combine proffers 8.1-8.3 in a single statement. The applicant agreed to combine Proffers 8.4-8.6 into one statement and completed the improvements listed prior to the issuance of the 150th dwelling unit. The applicant also agreed to submit a table clearly listing the level of service (LOS) for the current year (2011), 2025 without the development, 2025 with full build-out of the development, and 2031 with and without the development. The applicant agreed to adding a proffer to construct a left and right turn lane on Old Dumfries Road onto Cedar Run Drive, to be completed prior to the 75th residential building permit. The applicant will be resubmitting a TIA to VDOT and the County for review by 2/15/2011.
14. The proffer statement clearly states that the Board of Supervisors will need to secure right-of-way for transportation improvements, using eminent domain powers, if the applicant is unable to do so. The statement also says that the Board will have a deadline of six months to do so, or the applicant is relieved of the improvements.

Fiscal Impact

1. The Office of Management and Budget calculated that the annual fiscal burden of this subdivision on the County could be \$1.2M, assuming occupancy of the commercial component at 64,500 square feet (s.f.). However, this could climb upwards to \$1.7M annually if this amount of commercial space does not materialize. There is nothing in the Proffer Statement that binds the commercial to be built. The Code of Development

indicates a phasing plan for 15,000 s.f. only, but relieves the developer from building even this modicum of commercial space, if market conditions are poor. This implies that there is not likely a market for more than 15,000 s.f. at best even with 300 new homes.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Text, Materials, Maps (December 29, 2010)

1. Page 6 refers to Map 6.6B that is an illustration of the community as it matures. Please submit an amended Map 6.6B to show The Project within the illustration. (On 11/17/10 the applicant responded to this comment stating that they would submit the illustration, but nothing was submitted.)
2. This comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff. The applicant has added the language to Page 5, paragraph 3, where if an applicant utilizes the PRD zoning designation, then land should be approved for more than 3 units per acre. This is not consistent with County policy contained in the Introduction of Chapter 6-Service Districts and should be removed. Text on pages 10 and 11 of that chapter states that rezoning applications must “justify” more density above 1 unit per acre by submitting a proposal that covers a number of areas, including traditional design. Therefore, a density bonus is already included in the land use plan designations and density ranges above zoning density.

The applicant did not remove this language, nor submit an amendment to Introduction of Chapter 6-Service Districts to reconcile this discrepancy in County policy. Staff would like to make note that a Comprehensive Plan Amendment of text applies not only to one property-owner but cuts across the County.

PRD Concept Development Plan (December 29, 2010)

1. The residential unit count is down from 450 to 300, yet the subdivision design has not changed. Please explain.
2. A tot lot and swimming pool and neighborhood retail are now included in the HOA Park area on page 7. The neighborhood retail cannot be included in the open space calculation for the subdivision.
3. Dedicate a sheet to the Special Exception for the WWTP and address landscape buffering, fences, parking, site access, etc. as required in the SE standards in the Zoning Ordinance. Page 18 of the applicant’s 12/29/10 submission does not address this comment. (This comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff.)
4. Page 2 shows an area north and south of the proposed subdivision that will not be used for development or open space requirements, yet the applicant is seeking to rezone that land to PRD. Staff recommends that this land not be rezoned to PRD, but rezoned to RA with proffers with no density allocated to it.

Code of Development (December 29, 2010)

1. The Board of Supervisors amended the PRD District in January 2011. A Type 1 Soil Report is now a submission requirement in the PRD District, including the area to be developed for areas that will be disturbed, such as building lots, parks, road areas, etc.. (The applicant was notified of this requirement.)
2. Lot Variety needs to be documented. The variety of housing type, size, and setbacks are unclear. (This comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff.)
3. What is the number of single-family attached, detached and duplex units that will be in each block? (This comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff.)
4. The neighborhood retail section on page 7 of the CDP is not shown in the COD.
5. The applicant must follow the County implementation procedures. Remove the applicant-proposed process on page 7-9. Describe only the timing of submittal of the Block Development Plan.
6. Page 11 classifies block B21 as Single Family Detached homes, but Retail on page 13. A similar discrepancy is for block A13 on pages 11 and 13.
7. The number of units is not specified on page 11, but refers to the Proffer Statement. The number of units should be identified in the COD as well.
8. Page 11 states that the number of Single Family Attached homes (i.e. townhomes or duplexes) could be as few as 0 or high as 60. The PRD Ordinance requires a mix of housing types, so it is not allowed to have a 100% of the units be Single Family Attached. Page 31 states in each block that townhomes and duplexes could be make up 0% of each block. This would result in a uniform subdivision. Also, document a breakdown of the number of SFA and Duplex homes per block.
9. The applicant must submit all primary, secondary, Special Exception, and Accessory uses at the time of the Rezoning, therefore, omit all text on page 12, unless text showing how relevant criteria are met is added.
10. Page 14: Define the function of the Town Green. Incorrect use of the word “mews”. Please delete.
11. Page 14: define how the sidewalks in the retail section are different from other sidewalks in the subdivision. Will they be wider or include areas for eating/sitting, etc.?
12. Page 16: The legend lists seven street types, but only four are shown on the Street Network diagram.
13. Page 17-19: Streetscape sections S1a, S3, and S5a are not shown on the Streetscape Network Diagram.
14. Page 18: The County does not have a planting zone standard, but 5-6 feet is what we have been advised will work.
15. On page 20, crosswalks are to be placed at every section to get to the retail section, but what about crosswalks from the neighborhood to the trail system running parallel on Cedar Run Drive?

16. There is a missing link in the trail network on the north side of the subdivision on page 20 that is shown on page 26.
17. The Fauquier County Connections Plan shows a trail on Old Dumfries Road and Route 28, but none is shown on the plan.
18. Trails and HOA facilities need to be tied to a particular phase.
19. Much of the open space shown on page 24 is not located on good soils for recreation, although allowed by the ordinance. Also, much of the open space is linear on the west side, not good for active recreation, although it is contiguous.
20. Page 24: What trail link are you referring to in the statement that it “will be within a 40-foot area dedicated to Fauquier County”? Does this mean all trails? What happens in the areas of the gas line easements in terms of landscaping? Will the area be left open with cut grass?
21. Page 25: Text is identical to page 14.
22. Clearly delineate sidewalk, crosswalk and trails for the entire subdivision on page 26. The text on page 26 is identical to the text on page 14.
23. Page 27: Ensure that all transportation, commercial, recreational improvements, and the timing of these improvements, are documented and correspond to the language in the Proffer Statement.
24. The table on page 31 is meaningless with percentages of 0%-100% per block to explain house types and front or alley loaded lots. This means there is no variety for a block. (This comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff.)
25. Provide the maximum number of units per block by unit type in the Matrix on page 31. (This comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff.)
26. Page 30: Staff discussed with the applicants that the lots fronting the village greens (in B6, B7, B12, and B13, B7), therefore they would be alley loaded. Change the map on page 30 and adjust the matrix on page 31 accordingly.
27. Page 31 and 32: A side loaded garage may count towards either a front or alley loaded home. Staff believes that this note should be deleted because it could result in homes loaded from the front only.
28. The lot widths, shown in the table on page 32 will allow for uniformity in the subdivision. The question is how many of the total number of units per block will have different lot widths? Different house types? Variety is important and what has been shown will result in a very uniform subdivision.
29. Page 33 lists setback ranges for the lots. However, the front setback ranges for blocks listed as “type a” are 10-15, and “type b” are 15-20. This means that both blocks labeled on page 33 as “a” and “b” would be allowed to have 15-foot setbacks, which would create uniformity. The same goes for Types “b”, “c”, and “d”. Document how many different setbacks will be guaranteed in each block.

30. Page 33: The second bullet point states “Setbacks of 20’-25’ in residential streets, but the legend shows “Type a” streets as having setbacks of 10-15’. It is our understanding that “Type a” streets are residential.
31. Pages 34-37: Maximum front yard setbacks also should be variable in a TND environment and are required in the PRD.
32. Page 36-37: Are all of the townhomes and duplexes alley loaded? Clarify.
33. Pages 34-37 show typical lots, indicating that the front yard setbacks, side yard setbacks, and lot widths will be uniform. As stated in comments issued on 11/17/10 by staff, The Comprehensive Plan requires applicants seeking greater densities to demonstrate lot and housing variety.
34. Page 38: Demonstrate how the units will not be all of the same architectural style.
35. Page 38: The placement of a garage is critical and must comply with Zoning Ordinance Section 4-107 (C3). Typo on the word “maximum”.
36. Page 57: Provide an example of a front door not in the center as described in bullet #9.
37. Page 61: Pictures 2-4 are not craftsman. Omit these drawings.
38. Page 61: For the Craftsman example, why not have an L-Story example? Also, the sketches do not have low-pitched roofs, when this is listed in bullet #1.
39. Page 65: “One predominant style is required, if a Civic/Institutional building is constructed.” Since this is not shown on the CDP, where would these be? Additionally, is there any requirement by block for architectural styles? There is the potential to have one home of one style and 149 homes of another style. Clearly this is not enough variety. A mix of heights and front elevation are important also, and there is no guarantee of a mix of these either.
40. Page 66: There needs to be a standard for windows on the front-façade to avoid blank walls.
41. Page 68: Are the “Stoop”, “Porch and Fence” and “Dooryard” illustration allowed in the commercial area?
42. Page 78: The Plant Material List is so general that it is unclear what “look” you are trying to achieve.
43. Appendix A shows five types of housing styles proposed. Where in the COD does it list the number of styles per block, to ensure variety? (A similar comment was made on 11/17/10 by staff.)

Any additional information may substantially change the comments.



Fauquier County Public Schools

Janice G. Bourne, Assistant Superintendent for Administration
320 Hospital Drive, Suite 40
Warrenton, VA 20186-3037
(540) 422-7017
jbourne@fcps1.org

Excellence by Design

www.fcps1.org

TO: Kristen Slawter
Department of Community Development

FROM: Janice G. Bourne
Fauquier County Public Schools

DATE: January 26, 2011

SUBJECT: Catlett Farm, LLC (Village of Catlett)
Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPAM09-CR-009
Rezoning REZN10-CR-002
Special Exception SPEX10-CR-011

New residential development creates an impact on the School Division's operating and capital costs. Based on the proposed conceptual development, the parcel will be divided into a maximum of 300 dwelling units. The dwelling type for the 300 units is undefined. To provide an estimated cost impact on the school division, we have developed two scenarios which offer a range of costs.

| SCENARIO 1 | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| CAPITAL COSTS FROM DEVELOPMENT – ASSUMES 100% SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED UNITS | | | |
| <u>Dwelling Type</u> | <u>Units</u> | <u>Per Unit Cost ¹</u> | <u>Total Cost</u> |
| Single family detached | 300 | \$21,424 | \$6,427,200 |
| Total Capital Costs | | | \$6,427,200 |
| ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS FROM DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| Elementary school students | | | 112 |
| Middle school students | | | 48 |
| High school students | | | 56 |
| Total students from development | | | 216 |
| Cost per student ² | | | \$11,359 |
| Total Annual Operating Costs | | | \$2,453,544 |
| TOTAL CAPITAL & OPERATING COST IMPACT: | | | \$8,880,744 |

1 Source: Fauquier County Department of Community Development Proffer Policy, revised December 8, 2005.

2 Source: School Division Budget Office. Cost includes Federal, State and local per pupil expenditures appropriated for School Division operations.

| SCENARIO 2 | | | |
|---|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| CAPITAL COSTS FROM DEVELOPMENT – ASSUMES SPLIT 80%/20% | | | |
| <u>Dwelling Type</u> | <u>Units</u> | <u>Per Unit Cost ¹</u> | <u>Total Cost</u> |
| Single family detached | 240 | \$21,424 | \$5,141,760 |
| Duplex/townhouses | 60 | \$13,390 | \$ 803,400 |
| Total Capital Costs | | | <u>\$5,945,160</u> |
| | | | |
| ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS FROM DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| Elementary school students | | | 104 |
| Middle school students | | | 44 |
| High school students | | | 52 |
| Total students from development | | | <u>200</u> |
| Cost per student ² | | | \$11,359 |
| Total Annual Operating Costs | | | <u>\$2,271,800</u> |
| | | | |
| TOTAL CAPITAL & OPERATING COST IMPACT: | | | <u>\$8,216,960</u> |

This subdivision is currently located in the following school zones:

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Elementary school: | H.M. Pearson Elementary School |
| Middle school: | Auburn Middle School |
| High school: | Kettle Run High School |

The impact from a build out for this development may exceed the capacity available in one or more of these schools. These zones are subject to change at the discretion of the school division.

The differential (if any) between any contribution provided by the developer for public education and the above amount must come from other forms of revenue, primarily real estate taxes and state funding.

1 Source: Fauquier County Department of Community Development Proffer Policy, revised December 8, 2005.

2 Source: School Division Budget Office. Cost includes Federal, State and local per pupil expenditures appropriated for School Division operations.