

# DRAFT

## MINUTES OF THE WORKSESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WARRENTON HELD ON MARCH 9, 2017

A worksession of the Council of the Town of Warrenton was held on March 9, 2017 in the Council Chambers.

Councilmembers present: Mayor Powell L. Duggan, presiding, Ms. Sunny Reynolds, Vice Mayor, Councilmembers Sean M. Polster, Jerry M. Wood, Brett A. Hamby, Alec P. Burnett, Robert H. Kravetz and Kevin T. Carter.

Also present: Brannon Godfrey, Town Manager, Whitson W. Robinson, Town and Evelyn J. Weimer, Town Recorder.

The Mayor called the worksession to order.

### Draft February 9, 2017 worksession minutes

The Manager noted that the draft February 9 worksession minutes were added for Council's information.

### Warrenton Library Capital Funding

#### Ms. Maria Del Rosso

Ms. Del Rosso, Director of the Warrenton Library, came forward and talked with Council about the Warrenton Library. She detailed how the library is used, what kind of people are using the library and noted that there was a survey conducted. She said she would share the data with Council. Ms. Del Rosso's PowerPoint presentation is part of the file.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she and the Manager sat in on the CIP presentation at the County and she was impressed with Ms. Del Rosso's presentation. Following that, she wanted Ms. Del Rosso to attend and make a presentation to Council. Ms. Reynolds noted that the library was originally to have been located on Blackwell Road but there was no agreement reached with the landowners so the location was moved to Waterloo Street.

#### Ms. Pat White

Ms. White came forward and noted that she did not want to see the CIP reduced yet again. She stated that the site on Waterloo was the Library Board's preferred site and she felt it would work well with the Town as a gateway project. She stated that the Library Board will be contributing all of its private donations toward the new library and also book sales and other

fundraising. She asked that the Town make a contribution toward the capital funding of the library. Ms. Reynolds noted that there is public donor support as well and it had been a huge community effort. Mr. Polster noted that the ability for children to access various data was important since there were many children who did not have the opportunity.

#### Greenway Trail Funding Request from the Piedmont Environmental Council

##### Mr. John McCarthy

Mr. McCarthy, the Senior Advisor and Director of Strategic Partnerships for the Piedmont Environmental Council, came forward and noted that the PEC is working with the Fauquier Department of Parks and Recreation to raise the \$58,000 needed to acquire the right-of-way needed to complete the trail link. He stated that the PEC had pledged to raise \$30,000 to match \$28,000 from Fauquier Parks and Recreation. He stated that \$10,000 had been received from the Wise Foundation, \$7,000 from Loeb, \$4,660 from various individuals, \$1,020 from the Northern Piedmont Community Foundation and \$1,000 from Chipotle which left a balance of \$6,313. He stated that VDOT has committed \$420,000 to actually fund and build the extension.

Ms. Reynolds asked if all rights-of-way had been secured and Mr. McCarthy noted that it was his understanding that Fauquier Parks and Recreation had secured all the access needed in terms of identifying it and the property owners' agreement to do so. He stated that were checking to be sure that there was the full 20 feet needed for emergency access. Mr. Carter asked if the \$6,313 was for access and Mr. McCarthy noted that the \$58,000 was for the access needed and \$30,000 of that was what the PEC is committed to help raise. The \$6,313 is what is still needed to meet the \$30,000. Mr. Wood asked that the matter be referred to the Finance Committee. Mr. Wood asked if 30 days could be given and Mr. McCarthy noted that 30 days would work. Mr. Kravetz asked how long the extension was and Mr. McCarthy felt it was around one mile. Mr. Hamby asked if it would continue from there and Mr. McCarthy noted that it would not extend any farther south but the extension at 29/business 29 does have plans for a bike/pedestrian trail to be included in the bridge overpass. The trail at Lord Fairfax would loop back into Town and would be a circuit eventually.

#### Falmouth/Shirley Roundabout

Mr. Godfrey noted that Council and staff had been talking about this option as an alternative to a signalized intersection. He stated that Mr. Nathan Umberger of VDOT had led the Council through the conceptual design of the mini roundabout. He stated that there are funds reserved in the current capital budget which totals \$434,000 and VDOT revenue sharing program and half of that amount or \$217,000 would be the Town's responsibility. He indicated that there was a Wal-mart proffer would cover all but \$34,000 for the project. He stated that it is not a matter of funding but a design which satisfies the Town's level of service currently and into the future. It has been advertised for a public hearing at the March Council meeting. Mr. Kravetz noted it has been discussed at the Finance Committee meeting.

##### Mr. Nathan Umberger

Mr. Umberger noted he was available for questions. Mr. Polster noted that he had met with the General Manager at Wal-mart and he wanted to verify that it would not have an impact on his entrance and exit there. Mr. Umberger noted that VDOT may look at converting that lane if the option with the bypass and it may help in terms of freeing up that entrance. There would be no negative impacts. Mr. Polster asked if there were pedestrian bumpers or a safe place for them to stand and Mr. Umberger stated that there would be safe areas for them to stand. Ms. Reynolds asked Mr. Umberger if he was happy that the expansion lanes would handle future growth. Mr. Umberger stated he did not have any concerns from the operational safety aspect. Mr. Kravetz asked if it ended up costing more than the \$34,000 if VDOT would make up the difference. Mr. Umberger responded that he was willing to assist any way he can. Mr. Carter asked for verification that a traffic signal would be far worse than a roundabout at full build out. Mr. Umberger noted a roundabout would definitely be safer. In terms of operation over the long term, sometimes signal turn lanes are a little easier. He stated that in the foreseeable future he felt the Town would have a 20 year life span out of the project. Mr. Carter asked in terms of traffic flow how would a traffic signal rate against the roundabout. Mr. Umberger stated that non-peak hours a roundabout is always better and during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours they would be very comparable. He stated a roundabout is better until you meet capacity and there is gridlock no matter which option you have. It is just a matter of how you manage it. He stated a roundabout can usually process two lanes of traffic as efficiently as a signal can of four lanes.

Ms. Reynolds asked the life of a traffic light and Mr. Umberger noted that most traffic signals need to be rebuilt in 20-30 years. He said a roundabout is virtually maintenance free in terms of paving it the way you do the rest of the roads. Ms. Reynolds asked the average cost of a traffic light and Mr. Umberger said in the \$400,000 to \$450,000 range and most the traffic signal rebuilds cost \$400,000.

Mr. Wood noted that his chief concern with a roundabout was the safety of the pedestrian. Mr. Umberger stated that as far as safety roundabouts are far safer. Mr. Wood questioned costs and Mr. Umberger noted that roundabouts are far superior. With traffic signals electricity bills would have to be paid and would have to be inspected annually.

Mr. Burnett asked concerning the roundabout and safety of the pedestrians on the Greenway and wanted to be sure that a safety issue was being fixed and another problem being caused. Mr. Umberger noted he did not foresee any problems. Mr. Hamby asked about the triangle where Shirley and Falmouth Street meets and Mr. Umberger stated that is just a little area for overtracking when a vehicle would make that right turn (some additional shoulder).

#### Walker Drive Planned Unit Development Rezoning (Zoning Map Amendment 2016-01)

Ms. Brandie Schaeffer, Planning and Community Development Director, came forward and gave a brief update of the rezoning. Her PowerPoint presentation is part of the file. Ms. Schaeffer indicated that there are items listed in her staff report that needed to be worked on and if Council had others to please let her know before the April worksession.

Ms. Schaeffer noted that the applicant had deferred the application to an April worksession to allow them to address some of the Planning Commission concern. The Mayor

stated that there was uncertainty about getting a movie theater. There is talk about something else that would be guaranteed for entertainment for young people. He said it would be a plus to know what the recreation element would be. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the applicant is currently working on revised proffers and once received, she and the Town Attorney would meet with the Town Manager to discuss them. Mr. Burnett asked if there were renderings of elevations and narratives to convey the intent beyond the intent beyond the intent if close to what the development is expected to be. Ms. Schaeffer stated that the opportunity within the design guidelines with some options in the way of architecture so staff would like to refine those so there is a clearer picture. The applicant had proffered some the possible material uses to get more certainty but she felt there was more opportunity to have 360 degree architecture.

Mr. Hamby asked if the applicant had discussed transportation and Ms. Schaeffer noted that proffers are all submitted together but if there were items to be discussed around transportation there could be a separate worksession or a specific memo on that. She noted that proffers are considered as a whole.

Mr. Wood asked about F.A.R. and Ms. Schaeffer defined it as the “floor to area ratio” based upon the amount of area you are allowed to cover with the building. She gave an example in detail. She stated it did not change the use but dealt with the intensity of the use.

Ms. Reynolds noted that under certain areas where it lists proposals weaknesses there is a statement made “determined at site plan submission.” Ms. Reynolds stated that comment was noted where the wetlands was listed. Ms. Schaeffer explained that a wetlands delineation report was submitted but was not required. It is a report from 2008 so staff’s response was it this response is still good and you intend to use at the site plan just get the Corps to recertify it. The applicant responded that they would do that at site plan. She stated that if there are wetlands on the site and the rezoning is approved based on the understanding that they do not exist and it comes back that half of the site contains wetlands, that affects the overall rezoning and what the Town might get. Mr. Polster noted that he also was concerned about the entertainment and the applicant should define what the entertainment is. He asked how the Town would measure what the “best efforts” are. He noted that the connectivity among the land base was important and it should not be viewed as five projects. Mr. Polster stated that under the fire department section it noted the they would follow the IBC but the jurisdiction has other requirements.

Ms. Reynolds noted she was concerned about connectivity also except where the stormwater part. She believed between the apartments and next development there is connectivity. She stated she was not sure how to get to the condo area. There is a path along Walker Drive within the development itself to get down there. Ms. Schaeffer stated that the pedestrian connectivity is two separate things. The connectivity of pedestrians within the development was part of the TIA scope. The applicant agreed to study how the pedestrian gets from one area to another. She stated that they never provided that report even though they agreed to do it. The other is the connectivity from the development to Old Town. She stated that the staff would like to see how someone would get from a movie to downtown but again noted that the study was never submitted.

Brentmoor-Mosby House

Mr. Godfrey noted that Council had a conversation on use of the Mosby House several months ago. At the last worksession, it was noted that the item should be discussed at this worksession. He stated that there are four options:

- 1) Do nothing
- 2) Subdivide the property with the Mosby House on a one-acre parcel and the visitor center a two-acre parcel, offering it for sale
- 3) Use the property for local government office space. It would be expensive since there is no ADA capability or bathrooms
  - a. The cost would be \$400,000 for Mosby House
  - b. Cost of renovation of Visitor Center would be about \$\_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Prepare a lease agreement so that a nonprofit could operate the Mosby House as a museum

Ms. Reynolds asked if it was possible to separate the house from the side lot. She asked if the house could be sold on the piece of property but still keep the side open area for a pocket park. She was unsure whether that piece could stay with the Visitor Center. The Town Attorney said his understanding of it is the easement would have one subdivision to be able to sell to museum. He stated that it would probably take a little more analysis to see if could use that side lot. He noted he could look into it. He would have to see about the setback requirement and any other recommendations for it. He stated that there could be a problem with the sidewalk along Calhoun. The Town Attorney stated that it could be looked at.

Mr. Hamby asked if there was a geothermal system and Mr. Tucker indicated it was. The Town Attorney stated that could do an easement but it would be more complicated. He stated that if you built a park on top of it and something happened with the geothermal. Ms. Reynolds noted she was asking to build anything over it but just leave it as open space.

Ms. Reynolds noted that there were lots of things to consider that there are no answers to. She stated that the municipal building is bulging and more space is needed. She stated the municipal building would have to be redesigned or space obtained from somewhere else. If the library goes on Waterloo Street which would open up the current library and the Town would have 8,000 square feet there. She said it is unknown what is going to happen with the library. Mayor Duggan indicated that the County has said they want to use part of the space.

Mr. Burnett noted that he had more of a ceremonial recommendation but he thought the Town should do something now. He suggested that option one be eliminated. He stated he never saw doing nothing as an alternative.

Mr. Wood was in favor of number 4 and leasing to the historical foundation to give a museum change for a year. He stated if it does not work out it could be sold.

Mr. Polster stated that \$18,000 has been wasted over the last three years and making a decision is important. He stated that the Mosby group has a good business plan and perhaps the Town should give them one year to see if they can get it going and be a success.

Mr. Kravetz agreed with Mr. Polster and Mr. Wood that the Town Manager and Town Attorney should be authorized to negotiate a lease agreement with the historical group for one or two years. He said that there may be other groups who may want to lease the property so an ad should be put out that the property is available.

Mr. Polster said that they could handle events and take that burden off of staff and it would also not preclude Town use.

Ms. Reynolds disagreed with the building going back to use as a museum since house museums are not surviving anywhere in the U.S. She felt that the Council should consider putting the property on the market for three to four months to see if any action whatsoever. She stated that there are all kinds of nonprofits who are looking for places to put their headquarters .

Mr. Carter stated that action is important and he would like to get something done. He said he is more inclined to put it on the market whether for lease or for sale.

Mr. Hamby stated that he would like to see if the historic group had a business plan.

Mr. Burnett noted that he endorsed number "4".

Mr. Robinson noted that given the history of this particular project on behalf of himself and the Town Manager, he requested definitive direction for the Council meeting. He wanted to be sure that they had some actual direction from Council. Ms. Reynolds felt that there should be a public hearing held. He asked for some actual technical direction. Ms. Reynolds noted that there are citizens who have their points of view and she felt Council should listen to them. Mr. Robinson noted that what he was hearing as direction at the moment was mixed. Mr. Kravetz noted that he would have a motion to introduce at the Tuesday Council meeting.

#### Signage Steering Group and Urban/Village Development Area Steering Group Approvals

Mr. Godfrey noted that there were two groups ready for Council appointment. He stated that there are eight citizen representatives suggested for the Signage Committee. He read the list of those eight. There are also representatives from the ARB, Planning Commission, BZA and Chamber representatives who had agreed to serve on the committees. A listing is part of the official file. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the others would not be precluded from attending. Ms. Reynolds asked if there was someone from the bypass included. Ms. Schaeffer noted that an effort was made to do that. Ms. Crystal Willis had a business on the Bypass but now had a business in Town. She wanted to participate to show the differences in having a business on the bypass and in Town. Ms. Schaeffer stated that staff reached out to management companies but did not get anyone interested. She spoke with Nick Kallas who manages the shopping center where Golds Gym is located and he preferred in the UDA Committee. The lady at Chick Filet participated in the stakeholder meetings and said she would continue to be involved but had not gotten back to her to indicate she would serve on the steering committee.

There was a consensus the membership of the Steering Committee was approved.

Mr. Godfrey noted that there is also an Urban/Village Development Area Committee. He listed those who are on the committee. A listing of those members is a part of the official file. The consensus of Council was that the group was approved.

### March 14 Regular Agenda Review

The Manager highlighted the agenda for the upcoming Council meeting.

The Mayor noted that he would prepare a proclamation in honor of Judge Dudley Payne. Mr. Polster asked if there is anything open concerning the Chilton House such as fire issues. Ms. Schaeffer noted that she knew Mr. Polster had concerns about fire alarm, sprinkling and there are two things with the building. She stated that conversion to a bed and breakfast still remains as a residential use and does not change it to commercial use. Ms. Schaeffer noted she had talked with Mr. McAuliffe about installing the super boxes so that if there was fire, damage would not be done to the house. She stated that the E911 system can note the address as a bed and breakfast when the call comes in. Mr. Polster noted that at the Planning Commission there had been discussions about events. The Town Attorney stated that he and the applicant's attorney would be discussing that in an upcoming meeting.

Ms. Schaeffer reviewed the proposed conditions for the events. She stated that any conditions placed on the SUP will override any conditions or policies and also noted that the use and conditions goes with the land. Ms. Schaeffer noted that the Instagram account was taken down before the Planning Commission meeting but put back up after. Staff has looked at that problem. Instagram account shows it as a location for events and weddings but the conditions would still preside. She stated that what is on the record is that the applicant does not intend to host social events. Mr. Burnett noted that on Facebook it indicates that the Chilton House is the first bread and breakfast and events would occur there. Mr. McAuliffe came forward and noted that the Chilton House is billed as the first bed and breakfast in Old Town. Ms. Schaeffer indicated that the issue was that it is advertised as a b&b but is not yet approved. Mr. McAuliffe stated that empathy of advertising before opening gives folks the opportunity to imagine what he was hoping to create. He stated that he thought he had permanently disabled the Instagram entry but it reappeared.

Mr. Kravetz noted assuming that the Special Use Permit would be approved and Mr. McAuliffe violates the conditions and is holding weddings there, is there the option of revoking the special use permit. Ms. Schaeffer noted that it could be revoked.

There was discussion of funding for the dog park. Mr. Polster felt that the request was not to appropriate another \$40,000 but to use the funding for the Depot Park. He noted that he would rather not take any more money out of the General Fund.

The recommendation from the Finance Committee was to use the reservation for the Depot Park at about \$20,000. Ms. Rice noted that the unexpended amount for Depot Park would be used and the balance would come out of unrestricted funds money so it is put at about

\$20,000. She stated that staff is still trying to work with the developer to get those costs down as low as possible. They are trying to get some things donated.

There was discussion of the \$173,000 recreation proffer funds and it was noted a more definitive idea of what the proffers were to be used for should be obtained.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Evelyn J. Weimer, Town Recorder