



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

14685 Avion Parkway
Chantilly, VA 20151
(703) 383-VDOT (8368)
August 28, 2009

DAVID S. EKERN, P.E.
COMMISSIONER

Ms. Judi Birkitt **MSC#62**
County of Loudoun
Department of Planning
1 Harrison Street, S.E.
Leesburg, Virginia 20177-7000



Re: ZMAP 2008-0021 Kincora Village Center
Loudoun County

Dear Ms. Birkitt:

I have reviewed the above plan as requested in your submittal dated July 27, 2009, and received on July 31, 2009. None of my March 11, 2009 comments were addressed in the response letter. The applicant needs to keep in mind the zoning submittal comments are separate from any Chapter 527 traffic study comments. The following comments are offered:

1. The historic structure at Broad Run will preclude the alignment for Pacific Boulevard shown in this proposal. An alignment west of the Toll House and Bridge Ruins should be provided. Information on Structure 53-110 from the Loudoun Dulles North Plan was sent with the previous submittal. The Pacific Boulevard connection to Russell Branch Parkway will have to go to the west of the pond across Broad Run to properly align the two roads.
2. In locations where there are entrances on both sides of Pacific Boulevard, they should be aligned to permit future signals where warranted.
3. The entrance spacing shown on the proposal does not meet the requirements which will be in place at the time the site plans are submitted. Crossovers should be appropriately spaced to meet VDOT requirements and to provide adequate length for the queued vehicles entering each entrance. Please correct the spacing between Road 1 and Road 2.
4. The turn lane lengths shown on the sketch appear inadequate. Proper turn lane lengths will be required on the site and construction plans.
5. The four lane divided section of Pacific Boulevard south of Gloucester Parkway should be carried further south to provide a proper median for the future left turn to the southeastern portion of the site.

6. The issue of noise from the proposed ball park should be addressed to avoid complaints in the future if residential uses are permitted on the site.
7. One item in Item 1 of the Factors for Consideration previously provided is a bit overstated. While people generally want to live close to their work, they generally do not live next door to their workplace for a number of reasons. Some of these are frequent job changes, relocation of workplaces from one leased place to another and a desire for living quarters other than the type provided in a mixed use type of development. I have seen no concrete data provided to back up the assumption a significant number of people employed in a development of this type will ever live in the same development where they work. There is residential property to the north, east and west of the site which offers more types of products than this type of development can offer. It is highly likely anyone working at this site who wants to live close to work will probably live nearby, but not in the development due to a lack of residential offerings.
8. How will the residential component be addressed in the Rt. 28 Tax District? This District was established as a business tax district with little or no residential property in the District.
9. The affordable housing will most likely be occupied by public sector workers and lower income labor workers, not workers in the proposed office component. The only potential service type workers living on site could possibly work in small shops within the development, but this number is likely to be limited since this type of work is generally of a shorter term with high turnover rates.
10. Affordable housing requirements do not seem to result in the use of available housing in the market. In fact, Fairfax County has one proposal to reduce the amount of affordable housing due to a lack of market interest.
11. A map or plan showing the phasing of the transportation improvements listing each phase and proposed improvements should be provided.
12. The wording in Proffer III.G. should be written more clearly in item (ii) regarding what is entailed in construction costs.
13. In Proffer V.B., the proposal regarding a landscaped median should not permit intersection sight lines to be obstructed on private or public streets. This creates serious liability issues for the County if they permit this on the private streets.
14. The design exceptions mentioned on page 2 of Exhibit B could create serious liability issues for the County as stated in the previous comment.

15. Road 13 is too close to the adjacent intersection. An entrance will not be permitted within the turn lane for the Pacific Boulevard/Nokes Boulevard intersection.
16. Right and left turn lanes will be required on Pacific Boulevard for all entrances in the southern portion of the site.

If you have any questions, please call me at (703)383-2424.

Sincerely,



Kevin Nelson
Transportation Engineer

cc: Mr. Imad Salous
zmap2008-021zm2KincoraVillCtr8-28-09JB