



STAFF REPORT **INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEM**

Item # 6.a.

SUBJECT: CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151 and 161 Hatcher Avenue

DATE OF MEETING: October 20, 2020

STAFF CONTACT(S): Andy Conlon, Senior Planner

SUMMARY and RECOMMENDATIONS:

CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue. This application was first considered by the Board of Architectural Review at the September 15, 2020 meeting. The property owner and authorized agents for the application, as stated on the application, is Casey Chapman, Martinsburg Plaza LC, and Loudoun West Investments LLC. The property owner is trading as Trails End, LLC for this development. The property has publicly maintained road frontage at 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue. The property is further identified as Loudoun County Parcel Identification Numbers 488380263, 488380172, and 488379880.

The buildings currently located on this property (see existing conditions sheet of the plan set) are to be demolished. The applicant requests a Certificate of Design Approval for a mixed use commercial and residential building, to be approximately 196 feet in length, and to be three-stories. Upon satisfaction of certain outstanding questions, staff recommends approval of the Certificate of Design Approval for the proposed mixed use building.

BACKGROUND:

The subject property currently consists of three parcels (PIN #'s 488380263, 488380172, and 488379880). The Town will not approve plans for a building that "straddles" lot lines, therefore Trails End, LLC intends to consolidate the properties into a single parcel to address this issue. Lot consolidation is a "subdivision" process. A subdivision is reviewed and approved ministerially (i.e.: by staff, and not requiring any public meeting). The lot consolidation, including the legal instrument ("deed of consolidation") must be recorded prior to approval of a site plan for the proposed development.

Each of the three parcels contains a principle structure, which are now or were initially, a detached single-family residence. The Virginia Department of Historic Resources Reconnaissance Level Survey for each of these three properties is enclosed as an attachment to this staff report.

PIN # 488380263, with the postal address of 141 Hatcher Avenue N, contains a detached single-family residence which was deemed a contributing structure through the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Reconnaissance Level Survey performed January 5, 2006. A shed on the property was deemed non-contributing. The estimated date of construction of this house (based upon tax records) is 1956.

PIN # 488380172, with the postal address of 151 Hatcher Avenue N, contains a detached former single-family residence which was deemed a contributing structure through the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Reconnaissance Level Survey performed January 5, 2006. A detached garage and a chicken coop were also deemed contributing. The estimated date of construction of this 2.5-story brick Colonial Revival-style four-square structure is 1925.

PIN # 488379880, with the postal address of 161 Hatcher Avenue N, contains a detached single-family residence (also utilized for commercial purposes in recent years) which was deemed a contributing structure through the Virginia Department of Historic Resources Reconnaissance Level Survey performed January 5, 2006. A detached garage was also deemed contributing. The estimated date of construction of this 2.5-story stucco over frame Victorian structure is 1910.

All of the structures, on all three parcels, are to be demolished. The property owner has filed demolition permits application for each property. At the time of this writing, the demolition permits have not been issued, but they are expected to be approved shortly.

These properties do not lie within the Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District. It is noted that the Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District was adopted on September 13, 2005 (the Town Council Resolution initiating the amendment was dated July 19, 2005). The Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District specifically includes all of those properties which front on Main Street (US Route 7 Business), Berlin Turnpike (VA Route 287), 21st Street N and 23rd Street N (VA Route 690), and 32nd S (Silcott Springs Road/VA Route 690). It is noted that due to frontage on 21st Street N, the segment of the W&OD Trail, from 21st Street N to Hatcher Avenue, is included in the Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District. This segment of the W&OD Trail, within the Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District, is immediately adjacent to the subject 161 Hatcher Avenue property. However, Hatcher Avenue is not included in the Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District. If the subject properties were included in the Town of Purcellville Historic Corridor Overlay [Zoning] District, then demolition would require Board of Architectural Review approval.

The underlying zoning district is C-4, Central Commercial. The Board of Architectural Review is not tasked with ruling on whether a particular land use is permitted (or permissible). However, in the interests of a complete analysis, it is noted that “dwelling, apartment” is a permitted use in the C-4 District. “Dwelling, multiple-family” is not a permitted use in the C-4 District. As Acting Zoning Administrator, I struggle to explain the difference between the two terms describing essentially the same use. The Zoning Ordinance defines “dwelling, apartment” as:

Dwelling, apartment. A part of a building containing cooking and housekeeping facilities, consisting of a room or suite of rooms intended, designed, and used as a residence by an individual or a single family; a building is an apartment building if it contains three or more such apartment units, that are not in a townhouse configuration.

The Zoning Ordinance defines “dwelling, multiple-family” as:

Dwelling, multiple-family. A building designed for or occupied exclusively by three or more families living independently of each other.

The definition of “apartment” seems to focus on each individual “part” (i.e. “dwelling unit”) of the building, whereas the definition of “multiple-family” relates to the overall building. This distinction does not help me to explain why “apartments” would be permitted and “multiple-family” would be prohibited. The Board of Architectural Review should proceed under the assumption that the proposed design for the proposed mixed use building appears to satisfy the requirements of the C-4, Central Commercial Zoning District.

The proposed site improvements must be approved through a site plan process. The Board of Architectural Review is not tasked with ruling on the myriad aspects of a site plan. This applicant, like others, has been advised that although it is their option, staff recommends a site plan should be resolved before a Certificate of Design Approval is sought through the Board of Architectural Review. The resolution of issues which will be raised through the site plan design and review process may impact some aspects of the Certificate of Design Approval application. This applicant has chosen to file the Certificate of Design Approval application before submitting a site plan. It is noted that a site plan is reviewed and approved ministerially (i.e.: by staff, and not requiring any public meeting), to include Town staff of the departments of Engineering, Planning & Development, and Public Utilities, as well as VDOT, and the Fire Marshal.

The site plan will consider traffic impacts of the additional vehicle trips anticipated to be generated by the proposed development. The analysis may include consideration of the extension of O Street E. Currently O Street E, going eastward from the intersection with 21st Street N, ends in a vague collection of parking lots and private drives. In the interest of good transportation network design, there has been discussion of extending O Street E to Hatcher Avenue. An extension of O Street E to Hatcher Avenue would be blocked by the subject building as currently proposed. Traffic impacts are not considered in a Certificate of Design Approval application.

The building is to consist of approximately 18,095 gross square feet on each level. The upper two levels are to accommodate 34 residential units. The surface parking lot is to be designed for 48 spaces, with an additional 9 parallel spaces shown in the public R-O-W of Hatcher Avenue, totaling 57 parking spaces. A determination has not been made as to whether the number of parking spaces is adequate for the combined residential and commercial uses. The adequacy of parking is a site plan issue, but it could limit the size of the building.

The site plan will consider pre and post development drainage and the associated grading, and permeable and impermeable surfaces of the site. These matters could influence the Certificate of Design Approval application. The site plan will include tree preservation, landscaping/screening, solid waste disposal, and lighting details. These matters could be reviewed in part through the Certificate of Design Approval application, but have not been included in the subject submission. Matters such as open space

calculations and parking design are shown conceptually in the Certificate of Design Approval application, but will be reviewed in detail through the site plan. There are other elements of a site plan which are not elaborated here.

Certificate of Design Approval

This application proposes the construction of a single three-story, multiple/mixed use development. There are to be retail/commercial uses at the street level, and two stories of residential use above. The building is to be “L” shaped in overall plan view, with 196 feet of wall fronting along Hatcher Avenue and 124 feet of wall fronting along the W&OD Trail. The building is designed to evoke a neo-traditional commercial and row house feel. The design includes treatments of painted brick and cementous lap siding walls, fabric awnings (ground level only), simulated divided lite windows (upper floors only), and flat roof. The ground level is to be natural red/brown colored brick, with painted surfaces on upper levels, accented with black cornices, awnings and trim elements. At least two variations on a color scheme were discussed at the September 15th BAR meeting. These included the upper floors wall color being all white, or alternatively, painting the recessed portions a darker gray or taupe color. The resubmission plan set depicts the two tone color scheme.

The Zoning Ordinance provisions concerning “height”, specifically in the C-4 District, were amended on September 26, 2017. The Ordinance states “buildings may be erected up to three stories and 45 feet in height” and continues with exceptions, which include that “parapet walls may be up to a maximum of 4 feet above the height of the building on which the wall rest” and “any business building or part of such building which is located within 50 feet of any residential district shall not exceed 35 feet in height”. The applicant will be required to demonstrate that the northeastern corner of the proposed building is not within 50 feet of the R-3, Duplex Residential Zoning District opposite the Post Office. The conceptual site plan (sheet A3 of the submission) indicates a 30 foot buffer yard between the proposed building and the northern (W&OD) property line, so it appears the residential district separation will be satisfied. Once that is resolved, the three story and 43 foot building height as proposed appears to satisfy all of these requirements.

The C-4 District has no minimum front yard (distance from the street R-O-W line) requirement, and a front yard cannot exceed a maximum of 15 feet. There is no required side yard, and a minimum 20 foot required rear yard applies to the subject proposal. The C-4 District requires that the front façade of the principle structure must extend across at least 50 percent of the lot width at the front setback. The Ordinance states “the zoning administrator may grant an administrative modification of these setback requirements upon recommendation of the board of architectural review, which shall include a written explanation of how any such modification will better accomplish the purpose and intent of the district”. The site design as proposed appears to satisfy all of these requirements.

The façades might be described as neo-traditional. The individual architectural elements are appropriate for that which Purcellville seeks to promote. However, there is not as much variety in the texture and color of the proposed facades as in the typical attached single family residential (i.e. “townhouse”) development in Purcellville. The stepped back balconies on the upper floors, and awnings and block columns on the ground floor effectively break up the mass of the facades. The prominent cornices, belt courses, window trim, and simulated dived lites, enhance the traditional character.

A signage plan for the commercial spaces is appropriate, particularly due to the awnings. The applicant should address this, at least in a general narrative, at this time. The plan should specify such matters as signage location and color. The applicant should make a detailed signage plan a part of the commercial lease agreements, including a written statement that it will be enforced by the property management association, and not the Town of Purcellville.

It is acknowledged that the proposal is for a fairly large building as compared to others in present day Purcellville. The scale is out of character for the streetscape in the immediate vicinity of Hatcher Avenue. The proposed single three-story building has much greater mass than the three individual principle structure it seeks to replace. The facades are more like those found on in more urban historic or newly constructed “new urbanism” or neo-traditional streetscapes. The Board of Architectural Review should seek to influence these choices, but the Board does not have the authority to block the legal exercise of a property owners rights to use of their property. The property owner has certain rights to demolish the existing structures, and to redevelop the property in keeping with applicable regulations. We recognize that in so doing, the visual character of this portion of Town may be changed.

The functioning of this portion of Town will change with a development such as is proposed. This area has long hosted a mix of single-family residential and light commercial uses, to even include the former railroad and present post office. The appearance of the streetscape is dominated by single-family residential or former residential uses. The potentially substantial increase in first order commercial uses, together with multi-family uses, will be new to this neighborhood. It is noted that the authority of the Board of Architectural Review does not extend to these broader issues of land use. Purcellville deserves to have a conversation about such changes. The newly adopted Plan Purcellville Comprehensive Plan was a part of such a dialog. However, again we must bear in mind the rights a property owner has under our codes and ordinances.

The full submission of CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue consists of:

- Certificate of Design Approval application form
- Revised Plan Set (27 sheets), including Plan View and Architectural Elevations
- Photographs of existing conditions

GUIDELINES ANALYSIS:

The following aspects, as described in the Design Guidelines for the Town of Purcellville, should be considered by the BAR in evaluating CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue:

Design Category	Sub Category	Applications Conforms to Guidelines?	Explanation/Notes
Submission Requirements	--	Yes	Complete CDA application form,
Site Development		Yes	Site Plan depicts existing and proposed improvements.
General Design Requirements		Yes	Design Guidelines considered.
Signage		TBD	Signage has not been included in the current proposal. Although the signage will be approved through a separate application, it is recommended that the sign locations and types be discussed with the BAR
Lighting		TBD	The plans note the general location on the façade for exterior lighting. However, specifications and parking lot lighting are not addressed.
Landscaping; Fencing; Demolition Guidelines		N/A	Landscaping and fencing are not addressed in the plans. They will be detailed through the site plan process. The BAR does not have authority over demolition in this case.

FINDINGS:

1. The proposed design for the CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue for a mixed use building appears to satisfy the requirements of the C-4, Central Commercial zoning district.
2. The proposed design is generally consistent with the Design Guidelines for the Town of Purcellville. However, additional details and specifications, as outlined in the staff report, would be appropriate.

MOTION(S):

I move the Board of Architectural Review approve CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue as presented.

Alternatively:

I move the Board of Architectural Review approve CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue subject to the following condition(s) and/or the following recommendations.

1. _____

2. _____

Alternatively:

I move the Board of Architectural Review disapprove CDA20-07 Trails End, LLC @ 141, 151, and 161 Hatcher Avenue, due to the following findings: _____

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

[Certificate of Design Approval Application Form & Photos of Existing Conditions](#)

[Second Submission](#)

[VA Dept. of Historic Resources Reconnaissance Level of Survey for 141, 151 and 161 Hatcher Avenue](#)