

Bock Farm Meeting
Supervisor Storck's Office
December 2, 2016

In Attendance:

Dan Storck (DS) Joe Francone (JF) Bill Bock (BB) John Harris (JH)
Dean Moore (DM) Mark Higgins (MH) Shahin Saloom (SS) Jay Whitton (JW)

Opening Remarks: 7:00 PM

DS A. When we met last time Nov. 22, 2016, we left with the understanding that developer Long/Bock LLC would provide more information regarding potential "options" to the proposed Plan "A" high occupancy condominium (128 UNITS) style 55 and older senior living dwellings that WMNCA opposed. At that meeting Joe Francone (JF) mentioned other potential plans that he could provide information back to us at this meeting.

JF As mentioned I have two other options to discuss tonight;

A. Plan "B" - is a slightly lower capacity at 124 UNITS that is still 55+ with special exemption, but it would be built around a more common "town house" appearance enclosing three floors of units with central lobby and elevator access; fully sprinkled and protected; with underground loaded parking at 3 ends of the each building. The 4 buildings would be hip roofed at offsets to each unit to modify the ground view [bulk] of the development, rising no more than 49' above grade. The facades would be Hardie-board and Brick. The road system would have the same main entrance but most likely would have an addition "right in / right out" second entrance on Hinson Farm Rd. They would pick up maybe 17 more surface parking spaces This project would be similar to another nearby: Hidden Brook in Springfield, VA off FFX CTY Pkwy at Rolling Road. Diagrams and elevation photos coming soon. This plan would still fall into R8 Zoning. JF stated that there is only one builder for this type of project, but he has had talks with them and they are interested.

B. Plan "C" – is a complete change of direction to construct 36 3-story "Market Rate" not 55+ set aside, high-end town houses; est. \$750K-\$800K. Diagrams and elevation photos coming soon. These town house units would be stepped / offset elevations with a mansard pitch front elevation [35'] at roof sloped / tapered toward the back [31'] with front loading individual garages. The facades would also be Hardie-board and Brick. Road system would be similar to Plan "B". Developer would satisfy the county required low income set-aside with a contribution to the County fund at value equal to loss from Plan A; additionally he would make 4 units available to "Work Force" ownership at most likely 80% mean income. This plan would most likely fall into R8/PDH8 Zoning depending on County Zoning input.

JW "As stated at the last meeting by SS he personally favored the Plan "C" concept and tonight I think we all support that. [DM / MH / JH supported.] What would be the County's preference tonight?"

- DS “I am still in favor of the 55+ development but I need to hold a greater community meeting to gather input.” In his understanding of Plan B he saw that it had a greater appeal to the senses and might find favor with the community. He also knew that others still favored a 55+ development.
- JW “When might you hold this meeting with the Greater Community?” This is still pending; DS also wants to receive from the developer the poster boards with site plan and typical elevation photos to support both options.
- SS “Density is still the main driving issue and all other issues relative to traffic and appearance stem from that. Plan “B” at 124 UNITS is still a non-starter for covenant holders.”
- JF To DS “128 – 124 – 168 are all still the same thing, density”

Meeting adjourned and discussions turned to schools and Embark 2020 and how those long range planning options impacted future Rt. 1 discussions.