



TOWN OF HAYMARKET PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING
~ MINUTES ~

Emily Lockhart, Town Planner
<http://www.townofhaymarket.org/>

15000 Washington Street, Suite 100
Haymarket, VA 20169

Monday, September 21, 2020

7:00 PM

Council Chambers

A Public Hearing/Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the Town of Haymarket, VA, was held this evening in the Council Chambers, commencing at 7:00 PM.

Chairman Matt Caudle called the meeting to order.

I. Call To Order

Due to the COV-ID 19 pandemic and Governor Northam's executive order on social distancing, Commissioner Aayush Kharel attended this evening's meeting via Zoom meeting from his home.

1. Zoom Invite -

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84205609560?pwd=AEpLOEhvUWIDdFVEM3IzenpGYUtuUT09>

Chairman Matt Caudle: Present, Commissioner Aayush Kharel: Present, Councilman Bob Weir: Present, Commissioner Robert Hallet: Present, Commissioner Jackie Walker: Present, Commissioner Alexander Beyene: Present, Commissioner Thomas Utz: Absent.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Matt Caudle invited everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance followed by a moment of silence.

After the moment of silence, Chairman Caudle stated that the Van Metre site plan will be moved to the first item on agenda items for the sake of time for the representatives.

III. Public Hearing Notice and Public Comment

1. Public Hearing Notice 1 - SUP 6611 Jefferson Street

Chairman Caudle opened the public hearing for the SUP application to consider a religious assembly at 6611 Jefferson Street. Mr. Caudle opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Jerry Kennedy, the property owner, addressed the Planning Commission requesting the application be approved with recommendation to move forward to the Town Council. He stated that the building served as a church for a long time. He shared that the church would occupy the basement of the building which was used by the Haymarket Food Pantry and that the church would have very little impact on the building since it has a small congregation. He also stated that because the church operates at off hours, such as Wednesday and Saturday evenings and Sunday mornings, it would have minimal effect on the other businesses occupying the building. There were no other citizens wishing to address the Planning Commission on this subject. At this time, Chairman Caudle closed this Public Hearing.

2. Public Hearing Notice 2 - Proffer Amendment 14600 Washington Street

Chairman Caudle opened the Public Hearing for the Proffer Amendment application for 14600 Washington Street. Mr. Caudle opened the floor for public comment.

Jim Payne, owner of A Dog's Day Out located at 6680 Fayette Street, stated that he thinks the lease with PWC Parks and Rec should be ironed out prior to considering the application.

Justin Brandel, 67 Sycamore Park Drive, expressed his safety concerns of excessive traffic onto Bleight Drive.

At this time, Town Planner Emily Lockhart and Town Manager Chris Coon read the emails submitted to the Town on this subject. The following are the names, addresses and a short comment on the topic.

Jim McGuire asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Nick Pulire, 6740 Bleight Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Ronald Phillips, Sr., 6700 Sycamore Park Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Joseph ManGoong, 6744 Bleight Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Greg and Yvette Teriie, Dogwood Park Lane, asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Dave O'Mara, 6717 Sycamore Park Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Cathy Pasanello, 6895 Track Court, asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 Julian Pulire, 6740 Bleight Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 Dionel Zapata, 6736 Bleight Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 Debbie Dallesandro, 14947 Madison Ct., asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 James and Maureen Carroll, asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 John Tuell, asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 William Wallace, 14808 Cypress Park Lane, asked that the Commission to deny the application.
 Larry Schultz, 6732 Bleight Drive, asked that the Commission to deny the application.

Chairman Caudle closed the public hearing after Ms. Lockhart read the entirety of emails read into the record.

At this time Dottie Leonard, 14801 Washington Street, stated that she did not have the opportunity to speak on the subject of the SUP application for religious assembly. Chairman Caudle allowed Ms. Leonard to speak on the SUP public hearing even though that public hearing was already closed. Ms. Leonard spoke in favor of the SUP application. Ms. Leonard also commented on the Proffer Amendment application. She spoke in favor to approve the proffer amendment application as presented.

**** All email correspondence are attached at the end of the minute record ****

IV. Public Hearing Adjournment

1. Motion to adjourn the public hearing.

Chairman Caudle asked for a motion to adjourn the public hearing. **Commissioner Hallet moved to adjourn the public hearing with a second by Councilman Weir. The motion carried.**

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Caudle, Kharel, Weir, Hallet, Walker, Beyene
ABSENT:	Thomas Utz

V. Citizens Time

Chairman Caudle opened the floor for Citizen's Time. There were no citizens wishing to address the Planning Commission at this time.

VI. Agenda Items

1. Van Metre Site Plan: 14850, 14860 Washington St, 6701 Hunting Path Rd

Chairman Caudle invited the representatives from Van Metre to give their site plan presentation. Town Planner Emily Lockhart gave a brief report on the Van Metre project for 14850, 14860 Washington Street and 6701 Hunting Path. Ms. Lockhart shared that Van Metre received SUP approval for 38 town homes on this property from the Town Council earlier in the year and is present at this evening's meeting to present the site plans of the project to the Planning Commission. Ms. Lockhart stated that this is the opportunity for the Planning Commission to see the plans and ask questions.

At this time, Deborah Harrover from Van Metre gave the site plan presentation to the Planning Commission.

There were questions on tying in the sidewalk from Longstreet Commons to the development.

Ms. Harrover stated that they would be tying into the Longstreet Commons development.

There were also questions on approved SUP. Commissioner Beyenne stated that he would like to go on record with his concerns on the amount of vehicles per day that the study indicated.

Ms. Harrover responded that the engineer did not give the correct estimate. Ms. Harrover stated that she would give the correct estimate once she receives them from the engineer.

With no further questions, Chairman Caudle thanked the representatives for their presentation. Ms. Lockhart stated that she would send any questions to the representatives before their next site plan presentation in October or November.

There was no action taken at this time.

2. Consideration of SUP: 6611 Jefferson Street

The Planning Commission considered the Special Use Permit application for 6611 Jefferson Street. There was a short discussion on the Town Planners recommendation.

Councilman Weir moved that the Planning Commission to forward SUP #2020-003 to the Town Council for Public Hearing with the following recommended conditions: 1). The applicant must provide a Certificate of Occupancy for the space to determine the maximum allowable parishioners in the space. This shall be provided by the applicant prior to the religious assembly operating; 2). The applicant provides a parking plan prior to the publication of the agenda on which the Town Council hearing for the SUP appears. Commissioner Beyenne seconded the motion. The motion carried by a roll call vote.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Bob Weir, Councilman
SECONDER:	Alexander Beyene, Commissioner
AYES:	Caudle, Kharel, Weir, Hallet, Walker, Beyene
ABSENT:	Thomas Utz

3. Consideration of Proffer Amendment: 14600 Washington Street

Town Planner Emily Lockhart gave a brief history on the Proffer Amendment application that went before a joint public hearing with the Town Council on June 29, 2020. Ms. Lockhart shared that the application request changed from 4.51 acres to 0 acres. Ms. Lockhart explained that once the change was discovered, the public hearing was re-advertised with the correct acreage change. Ms. Lockhart stated that the applicant submitted updated documents and gave updated information in regards to the proffered land and its use. Town Planner Lockhart stated that the applicant was present to answer any questions. Chairman Caudle invited the applicant to the podium.

Connor Leake, president of Haymarket Properties Group, stated that he would like to give the power point presentation since there the Planning Commission has new members. There was a short recess with the attempt to get the Power Point presentation could be accessed on the screen. Mr. Leake introduced Keith Lowery, a partner of Haymarket Properties Group prior to giving a vocal presentation until the Power Point was being accessed on the screen. Mr. Leake shared how Haymarket Properties Group, HPG, acquired the property and in 2014 did a boundary line adjustment to bring the entire property into the Town. He continued to state that the property was then re-zoned from residential to B-1. He also stated that at that time, HPG entered into a 10 year proffer agreement with Prince William Parks and Rec in which they would have use of the recreational fields. Mr. Leake stated that the end of the 10 years, HPG could market the property for one year at fair market value that is not the same price of what the County is paying. He continued to state that if no one comes into an agreement during that time, HPG would have the right to develop the property. He stated that HPG would like to tie the proffer in direct correlation with the lease. Mr. Leake stated that they would like to amend the proffer to allow development where the front ball fields currently sit and if the County would like to extend the lease in 2024, they would consider having a conversation at the time. At the end of his presentation, Mr. Leake answered questions from the Planning Commission.

Chairman Caudle clarified that HPG would develop the front portion of the property leaving the back portion near Dogwood Park Lane undeveloped and would remain ball fields. Mr. Leake confirmed that the plan is better detailed in the General Development Plan that was submitted and that HPG also has a concurrent Special Use Permit application submitted to the Town. Mr. Leake also shared information of an email conversation with Prince William Parks and Rec on the subject of the back portion of the property. Commissioner Beyenne questioned why Parks and Rec did not share that information with the Town Planner when she had a conversation with them. There was a discussion on subject on the back portion of the property and the proffer amendment statement submitted on June 24th. Commissioner Beyenne questioned the current lease with Parks and Recreation and the terms of lease. There was a lengthy discussion on the proffer amendment application that was submitted. Councilman Weir shared that he was part of

a recent conversation between the Town and Seth Hendler-Voss from Parks and Rec on the County's intended use of the ball fields. Chairman Caudle read an email from Mr. Hendler-Voss of Parks and Rec dated April 2018 into the record regarding the use of the ball fields. Mr. Caudle asked Mr. Leake if he had received any recent communication with Mr. Hendler-Voss. Mr. Leake stated that he received information from Mr. Hendler-Voss in regards to the proposed GDP and the intent of the ball fields. Town Planner Lockhart stated that she could reach out to Mr. Hendler-Voss for written documentation on the conversation with the Town. Commissioner Beyenne also read a recent email into the record from Mr. Hendler-Voss dated July 15, 2020. The emails read by Mr. Caudle and Mr. Beyenne will be attached to the minutes. There was a lengthy discussion on the emails provided and the Town's conversation with Parks and Rec regarding land use and the future plans of any ball fields in the Haymarket area. Mr. Lowery stated that HPG was not invited to the conversation. Ms. Lockhart stated that since this was a discussion between the Town Attorney and HPG's attorney, she felt that the Town Attorney should be invited to the next meeting to discuss the subject further. Councilman Weir stated that the Commission needs to address the application at hand, which is the amendment to the proffer that was established in 2013 which eliminates the first paragraph of the proffer. A discussion followed.

Since there were several questions on the application and in particular the lease agreement with Prince William County Parks and Rec, there was a suggestion to invite the representative from Parks and Rec to the next meeting along with the Town Attorney. Town Manager Coon stated that he will invite the Town Attorney to next meeting to answer questions of the Planning Commission.

Councilman Weir moved to defer for consideration of the rezoning #20130528 and associated SUP 2020-002 until our next regularly scheduled meeting on October 19, 2020. This motion failed for a lack of a second.

4. Motion: A Resolution to promote the health, safety or general welfare of the Public

Councilman Weir moved to approve the following resolution. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beyenne. A discussion followed. There was a 5 minute recess for the resolution to be distributed and reviewed by all Planning Commission members. After the recess, Chairman Caudle stated that he wanted to go on record that the Commission was voting on something that they don't have total clarity on asked for a roll call vote after the review of the resolution from the Planning Commission. The motion carried by a roll call vote.

Whereas, the Haymarket Planning Commission is empowered to review land use applications to ensure the health, safety or general welfare of the public, and

Whereas, the enumeration of particular powers by the Charter of the Town of Haymarket shall not be deemed to be exclusive, and in addition to the powers enumerated therein or implied thereby, or appropriate to the exercise of such powers, it is intended that the Haymarket Planning Commission shall have and may exercise all powers which, under the constitution and laws of this state, it would be competent for the Charter specifically to enumerate, and

Whereas, for the purpose of promoting the health, safety or general welfare of the public and of further accomplishing the objectives of Code of Virginia, § 15.2-2200, chapter 58 was adopted as the zoning ordinance of the town, and

Whereas, a portion of the police power of the commonwealth has been delegated to the town, to be exercised reasonably in determining the manner of its development. The state legislature has left much discretion to the town in making such determinations, relying on the local governing body's knowledge of local conditions and the needs of its individual communities. Public necessity, health, safety, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice provide guiding factors for the council in its quest to exercise its legislative mandate in formulating a reasonable policy of town planning for the general good and welfare, and

Whereas, the Virginia Code a zoning ordinance may include provisions for the granting of special exceptions and the governing body of any city, county or town may reserve unto itself the right to issue such special exceptions, and

Whereas the Supreme Court of Virginia has consistently held the exercise of that power to be a legislative, rather than an administrative act. A fortiori, the decision of the legislative body, when framing its zoning ordinance, to place certain uses in the special exception or conditional use category, is a legislative action (Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County v. The Southland Corporation, 224 Va. 514; 297 S.E.2d 718; 1982), and

Whereas, the Haymarket Planning Commission has reviewed a proposed proffer amendment to REZ #201030528, and

Whereas, in the proffer amendment statement dated June 1, 2020, the Applicant amended the proffered acreage for park preservation from 4.51 to 2.06 acres, and

Whereas, in the proffer amendment statement dated June 24, 2020, the Applicant amended the proffered acreage for park preservation from 4.51 to 0 acres, and

Whereas, the current deed of lease for use of the park acreage entered into between Haymarket Properties Group, LLC and the Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County, Virginia will not expire until at least August 13, 2023, and

Whereas, the proffers dated August 1, 2013 provided that the recreational fields will be maintained for recreational field use so long as a public or private partner is willing to enter into a commercially reasonable form of lease agreement at a fair market price, and

Whereas, the Applicant intends to terminate the recreational use as early as August 13, 2023, and

Whereas, upon information and belief, the Applicant has not entered into a contract to sell the Project, and

Whereas, the Prince William County Parks and Recreation Department asserts that it is currently making use of all of the proffered fields, desires to continue such use and is lacking in additional park acreage in the western portion of Prince William County, and

Whereas, the Applicant has not fully complied with the conditions of the 2013 proffer statement, and

Whereas, the Planning Commission finds that each of the foregoing grounds can be deemed severable, and

Whereas, as a matter of good zoning practice the approval the proposed amendment to REZ#20130528 would not serve the health, safety or general welfare of the public;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Haymarket Planning Commission, that in order to promote the health, safety or general welfare of the public, it is recommended that proposed proffer amendment to REZ#20130528 be denied.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [5 TO 1]
AYES:	Kharel, Weir, Hallet, Walker, Beyene
NAYS:	Matt Caudle
ABSENT:	Thomas Utz

5. QBE SUP Application 30 Condos: 14600 Washington Street
Councilman Weir moved that the Planning Commission defer consideration of SUP #2020-002 to a date uncertain pending final action by the Town Council on the proffer amendment to REZ20130528. Commissioner Beyenne seconded the motion. Chairman

Caudle asked for the written draft to the motion. There was a discussion on the date of the meeting.

Councilman Weir amended the motion that the Planning Commission defer consideration of SUP #2020-002 to the meeting on November 16, 2020 pending final action by the Town Council on the proffer amendment to REZ20130528. Commissioner Hallet seconded the amended motion. There was a question from Town Staff if the Town Council did not take final action at their November meeting. The discussion continued on the subject. The motion carried by a roll call vote.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Bob Weir, Councilman
SECONDER:	Robert Hallet, Commissioner
AYES:	Caudle, Kharel, Weir, Hallet, Walker, Beyene
ABSENT:	Thomas Utz

VII. Minute Approval

1. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Aug 17, 2020 7:00 PM

Councilman Weir moved to approve the minutes from August 17, 2020. Commissioner Hallet seconded the motion. The motion carried.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Caudle, Kharel, Weir, Hallet, Walker, Beyene
ABSENT:	Thomas Utz

VIII. New Business

Town Planner Emily Lockhart updated the Planning Commission on the Jefferson Street project.

IX. Old Business

Town Planner Emily Lockhart stated that she would be available to the Planning Commission on the Van Metre first submission of the site plan that was presented earlier in the evening. She also stated to send her any concerns or questions that she could forward to Van Metre so that they can address them at the October meeting.

Ms. Lockhart also shared that staff was to meet with the representative from VDOT regarding the replacement of the crosswalks from the recent paving on Washington Street.

Lastly Ms. Lockhart shared that she was preparing notices of violation to several properties in Town.

X. ARB Updates

Commissioner Kharel gave the ARB updates. He stated that there was a discussion of the Town obtaining a Virginia LOVE sign to bring more people into Town, how it would be utilized and involving more people in the Town. He also shared the ARB will be looking at the Town gateway and monument signs.

XI. Town Council Updates

Councilman Weir gave the Town Council updates. He shared that the Planning Commission will probably be amending the zoning ordinance in the near future.

XII. Adjournment


With no further business before the Planning Commission, Councilman Weir moved to adjourn with a second by Commissioner Hallet. The motion carried.

1. Motion to Adjourn

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Bob Weir, Councilman
SECONDER:	Robert Hallet, Commissioner
AYES:	Caudle, Kharel, Weir, Hallet, Walker, Beyene
ABSENT:	Thomas Utz

Submitted:

Approved:



Kim Henry, Clerk of the Council



Matt Caudle, Chairperson

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, September 19, 2020 12:26 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: Proffer Amenment Application

Hello -I would like to first ask -How would this benefit the community? Do we not already have an abundance of retail and unused buildings. The purpose of the original proffer was clear -has that changed ?
Are our children destined to have to search for open space just to play outside? The number of kids that have used these fields would have never known the value of teamwork and benefits of just PLAYING sports . Do Not let greed overcome common sense-
Keep Haymarket (Everyone's hometown)

Please let my comments to read and recorded at the meeting on Monday -Thank You -Jim McGuire

--
Jimmymac

that the QBE owner's engineers only looked at the design tables and that no traffic study was officially accomplished.

The updated plan has removed the landscaping screening on Bleight that was in the original development plan. Which side of these commercial buildings will be the front? Will my view from my house which currently looks at nice ballfields/green space turn into looking at the rear of a commercial building with dumpsters and the lack of landscaping screening? What is going to happen to the historic building Cookies and Cream is occupying? There are a lot of questions that need to be clarified and we can get to something that meets the town ordinance and zoning, but also does not negatively impact the homes/neighborhoods around QBE. The town approved the use of residential units in the Smith property even though zoned commercial. We keep changing what has already been zoned as commercial to add more residential. I have been asking for a few years while I was on the Planning Committee for the town to study if the ratio of commercial to residential is balanced. I feel it is not balanced and allowing more residential in a commercial zoned location takes from the intent of the town and does not meet what the citizens of Haymarket desire. Let us follow our town zoning and stop allowing these multiple residential SUPs to be approved.

The Town Planner highlights many of the issues with the current QBE 2020 plan. I only mentioned a few issues in this letter, but many of the other issues are as concerning. The original intent was to revitalize this side of town to take the old school and develop it and continue to use the green space for the use of the town/county. The QBE owner was able to buy the old school at an incredibly cheap price at only the cost of just two of the homes on Bleight. The purchase of the QBE property came with strings attached to include the proffer stipulations. This was the deal then so let's not amend the deal now. The homeowners in this town are also investors. We have a right to protect our investment like the QBE owner and the proposed plan is going negatively impact our home values, safety, and way of life if the current 2020 plan goes through. Please deny the proffer amendment and let's work with the owner to develop this part of town well as this decision has a 75 to 100 year impact potential. Once those new buildings are built the town lives with the decision we make in 2020 until possibly 2100 or longer depending on how long those buildings last. Will we regret not taking more time to develop this plan properly? I know we would.

Thank you,

Nick Pulire

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2020 12:15 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: COUNCIL MEETING OF 09/21/2020

REQUEST THAT THIS LETTER BE READ INTO TOWN OF HAYMARKET COUNCIL MEETING OF 09/21/2020:

Submitted herewith is my complete objection to Proffer Amendment Application for QBE Business Park property and also General Development Plan (GDP) which borders Bleight, Haymarket, Va. The construction of four story mixed residential and commercial building with underground parking, and commercial/retail units/pods, and ultimately an unneeded strip mall. The addition of entrance/exit lanes from/to the property off Bleight Drive and culminating with 31 parallel parking spaces are not acceptable. Current town council does not remember several years ago the legal battle that our community engaged in that prevented the construction of 360 plus condominiums being constructed as our sales contract stated "only single family homes could be constructed around our homes". This could certainly be opposed by all new single family homes recently constructed on Bleight as they would be greatly affected by Qthe BE and GDP proposals. This certainly precludes a prohibition of four story mixed residential and commercial/retail units/pods, and strip mall. Secondly, parking will cause negative impacts to our safety, medical emergencies, health, welfare, morale, daily living, property values and we also must recognize that the recent construction of single family homes on Bleight Drive will be affected to greatest extent possible. The \$500,000 dollar homes will be decimated in value and future sales will be decimated in value no family would want to purchase these homes due to inclusion of QBE and GDP in their front yards.

On Friday evening, Saturday and Sunday observed the sporting venue at QBE and over 300 children and family members were utilizing the facility for baseball, softball, and soccer. These facilities are urgently needed for our children and midget league football and soccer are entering the season and our children must be provided these facilities. How can we take away from our most precious children who aspire to compete. I believe our community owes their youth a venue for sports and not a strip mall. Do not want this space to be lost and for the sake of our children the space must be used as originally intended. Fighting traffic/autos, etc and elimination of much needed recreational space land/venue from the town of Haymarket there will be overspill parking in our community by business patrons, individuals residing in or visiting condominiums, and those employed by businesses.

Was approached in writing by Connor Leake of Haymarket Properties Group, to walk me through plans they have for future development of commercial property at 14600 Washington Street, Haymarket, Va.

Believe that this solicitation, which I declined, could be questionable as members of his family perhaps have been elected officials in Town of Haymarket. Copy of letter is attached at enclosure #1.

I vehemently oppose the Proffer Amendment Application QBE Business Park and General Development Plan which borders Bleight Drive, Haymarket.

Ronald Jay Phillips, Sr at 6700 Sycamore Park Drive, Haymarket, Va 20169

Sent from my iPad

Joseph NamGoong
6744 Bleight Drive
Haymarket, VA 20169

September 20, 2020

Subject: Proffer Amendment Application, QBE Business Park
Property

* PLEASE READ MY COMMENTS AT THE MEETING AND SUBMIT IT FOR THE
RECORD.

Mayor, Town Council and Town Planning Committee:

My name is Joe NamGoong, my family and I live on Bleight Drive.
Unfortunately, due to work, I cannot make this meeting in
person. However, I am writing to you again because this is VERY
IMPORTANT to us and to my neighbors.

We are 100% against this Proffer Amendment Application. We feel
that the safety, welfare, health, daily lives, and property
values will have a negative impact if the Proffer Amendment
Application is approved. Here are a few of my reasons:

- 1) There are 7 children on Bleight, all under the age of 10.
Who is going to guarantee their safety with the increase of
traffic? By adding parking and a new entrance/ exit on
Bleight, you will increase traffic, not to mention add to
the speeding issue we currently have.
- 2) With additional parking on a residential street for
customer of Zandra's or any future bar/ restaurant, there
will be an increase chance of accidents on Bleight by drunk
drivers. Not to mention our daily lives will be disturbed
by the noise of drunken customers and the sound of loud car
exhaust systems in front of our homes, late at night. As I
stated above, we have 7 children under the age of 10, we do
not want them to be woken up in the middle of night by loud
drunks, witness any fights or crimes, etc that is
associated with bars.

3) These potential changes will DECREASE our property value.
Who would want to live in a home/ raise a family on a busy
street and deal with noise from bars/ restaurants 7 days a
week? This side of town is residential and should stay
residential.

If this is approved, we plan to appeal it as laid out in the
zoning ordinance.

Thank you for your time,

Joe, Jeeun, and James NamGoong

Dear Town of Haymarket Planning Commission Members,

We hope this finds you and your families well.

As residents of the wonderful town of Haymarket for almost 16 years, we are writing this email to express our concerns about the construction plans at the QBE property. We have several questions/concerns about the construction including:

1. We humbly request that you PLEASE consider the concerns of the residents and how this construction will negatively impact our lives. We also ask that you consider if you would want this next to your home and think about the long term effects of more noise, crime increases due to strangers constantly in our neighborhood, increases in rodents and trash from the retail pads.
2. The construction of this project will disrupt the lives of residents especially those who work at home.
3. It is already a challenge getting in and out of the neighborhood with only one way in and out and 31 parking spaces right next to our homes and the constant extra traffic of people using the only access in and out of our neighborhood will create further issues. Extra noise will be generated from cars parked in those spaces and a sense of security will be lost because of a constant influx of strangers parked near our homes and litter will probably become an issue as well.
4. The construction process especially the underground parking will cause an enormous amount of chaos and this is not fair to the existing residents.
5. Why can't the developer just add on to the existing building? This way, there will still be green space for the residents to enjoy.
6. Since there are multiple empty retail pads in the area, why is there a need for this development? Remember, once the construction is there and it remains empty, we can't get the green space back.
7. Is it possible for the developer to work with the community to keep the green space on Bleight Drive and build something smaller on the first baseball field closer to the main highway? That way, people could still access via the existing access off of Highway 55.

It is our sincere hope that the Town of Haymarket and the developer will understand that the majority of residents have expressed that they do not want this huge development or feel as if it is needed. It will create a host of issues for the current residents and will destroy the tranquil environment of our neighborhood and the small town feel that so many of us love. Our homes are supposed to be our peaceful havens and we should be able to all come home after work and be able to enjoy our time there without worrying about extra noise and traffic. This project does not fit in our residential area and we hope and pray that you think about the long term effects of a project of this magnitude and how it will disrupt the stability of our peaceful and beautiful community. We as residents of the great town of Haymarket only want the best for this area and we really hope that you will consider the concerns of its residents. Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

Greg and Yvette Terrie

Dogwood Park Ln.

Ms. Henry,

I want to express my vehement opposition to the Proffer Amendment Application under consideration and urge that it be denied. This will destroy the surrounding neighborhood and eliminate recreation for hundreds of families and individuals. I would be directly affected, as my development is adjacent to Bleight Drive.

The fact that such an application is even being considered is appalling.

Dave O'Mara
6717 Sycamore Park Drive
Haymarket

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Kimberly Henry


From: Emily Lockhart
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 3:21 PM
To: Kimberly Henry; jcpasa@comcast.net
Subject: FW: Please DENY the Special Use Permit and reject the proffer amendment statement for the property at 14600 Washington Street.

Cathy,

Thank you for your comments. I have copied Kim on them as well to print for the meeting and reading into the record.

Have a good afternoon!
Emily

-----Original Message-----


Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 12:27 PM
To: Emily Lockhart <elockhart@townofhaymarket.org>
Subject: Please DENY the Special Use Permit and reject the proffer amendment statement for the property at 14600 Washington Street.

Emily,
Could you please read and enter into the record? Thanks in advance.

Please DENY the Special Use Permit and reject the proffer amendment statement for the property at 14600 Washington Street. My grandson played and now my granddaughter is playing softball on those fields. We need to keep some green space so our future athletes have places to play! I hope at the 10 year mark the county will have the option to renew the lease for those fields. I also feel we have more than enough residential units being built all around us, enough is enough. We need more businesses, not more residences.

Respectfully as a town paying taxpayer,
Cathy Pasanello
6895 Track Ct.
Haymarket, Virginia

Sent from my iPad

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 4:08 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: Zapata - 6736 Bleight Drive - Proffer Amendment Application

Good Afternoon,

I would like to just be on record, strongly against this development, its completely unnecessary in this area of town. The amount of traffic this development would add to Bleight road is unprecedent and quite disrespectful to the community, as nobody in the community is asking for this. There is literally 100+ town homes being built right beside this area (VM Construction, I believe, on both sides of Piedmont Center Plaza), we don't need further development.

The Piedmont Center Plaza has over 50% of its retail space vacant, there is no demand in this area for more retail.

I'd like to ask anyone present, if they would like an intersection to be built directly in front of their home? (the plan shows a street intersection right in front of my property).

I'm not asking for this to be moved, it's quite shocking that someone would be so inconsiderate to throw a road that would have 100s a car a day right in front of anyone's home.

Thank you for your time,

Dionel Zapata
6736 Bleight Drive Road
Haymarket, VA 20169


Kimberly Henry

From: Emily Lockhart
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 3:20 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Contact Us

-----Original Message-----

From: Town of Haymarket Virginia via Town of Haymarket Virginia <elockhart@townofhaymarket.org>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 3:05 PM
To: Emily Lockhart <elockhart@townofhaymarket.org>
Subject: Form submission from: Contact Us

Submitted on Monday, September 21, 2020 - 3:04pm Submitted by anonymous user: 71.200.88.211 Submitted values are:

First Name: Debbie
Last Name: Dallesandro

Question/Comment:
09/21/2020

Dear Planning Commission,

This letter is in reference to the application by QBE to amend their Proffer Agreement with the PWC Parks and Recreation Department and the development of that property.

I have lived in the Town of Haymarket for many years. I like many others love our community. We love the Mom and Pop shops and small businesses that just add to the desirability of this area. Over the last couple of years, we have experienced the addition of chain restaurants and now a new hotel coming. You can see that the addition of Walmart and shopping has added to the traffic congestion through our town. I am aware that this area is not part of the Town of Haymarket, but you can see that continued development within the Town will only bring traffic more through the area. When I look at the Town of Haymarket sign "everyone's home town" will no longer be relevant, as I cannot believe that people that bought homes here are looking forward to a shopping center, a parking garage and more residential "condos" across the street from their property.

I urge that the Planning Commission stick to the original zoning for this property and not allow the development of this property.

Thank you for your consideration,
Debbie Dallesandro
14947 Madison Ct.
Haymarket, Va. 20169

Kimberly Henry

From: Emily Lockhart
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 11:07 AM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: FW: email on SUP for 14600 Washington Street

See below.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2020 9:12 PM
To: Emily Lockhart <elockhart@townofhaymarket.org>; Matt Caudle <mcaudle@townofhaymarket.org>; Robert Hallet <RHallet@townofhaymarket.org>; Alexander Beyene <ABeyene@townofhaymarket.org>; Jackie Walker <JWalker@townofhaymarket.org>; Aayush Kharel <akharel@townofhaymarket.org>; Robert Weir <rbw@trademarkinfo.com>
Subject: email on SUP for 14600 Washington Street

September 21, 2020

Please read the following email into the record of tonight's Public Hearing on the SUP application for 14600 Washington Street

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

The recreational fields at 14600 Washington Street are used and enjoyed by many town residents. It was our understanding that Prince William County and the owner(s) of QBE had an agreement to lease these fields for ten years for the enjoyment of local residents. The following is quoted from the agenda packet and refers to a discussion between Town Planner Emily Lockhart and the Prince William County Parks and Recreation Department: "The County explicitly stated the fields are in use and they hope to continue use of the space for time to come." The zoning amendment to reduce the proffer to zero acres is totally unacceptable.

Please DENY the Special Use Permit to allow the proffer amendment statement for the property at 14600 Washington Street.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 6:49 AM
To: Kimberly Henry
Cc: Matt Caudle; Aayush Kharel; Alexander Beyene; Jackie Walker; Robert Hallet; Bob Weir
Subject: Planning Commission Meeting - September 21, 2020 - REQUEST for Entry/Reading into the Record
Attachments: Town of Haymarket Council - QBE Business Park 9.21.20.pdf

Good morning Haymarket Town Clerk Henry,

I am requesting that my attached correspondence regarding the above titled proposal under consideration by the Town of Haymarket Council and Planning Commission be recorded and read aloud at tonight's scheduled meeting.

My profession requires frequent travel and I am scheduled to depart for Lincoln, NE in early afternoon today (Monday 9/21) and am therefore not able to be present for tonight's scheduled proceeding.

I am copying the members of the Planning Commission to respectfully ensure they are aware of my position in advance of the proceeding. Please let me know if there are any other steps I must take to guarantee consideration of my input despite my unavailability to attend in person.

Respectfully, John

John A. Tuell, Executive Director

RFK National Resource Center for Juvenile Justice

Robert F. Kennedy Children's Action Corps

Telephone: 571-261-0435 / jtuell@rfkchildren.org



www.rfknrcjj.org

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2020 1:45 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: Proffer Amendment for QBE Business Park Property

Mr. Henry,

I am writing to you regarding the 9/21/2020 meeting the Planning Board to take the request from QBE ,Shawn Landry for Proffer Amendment for the afore mentioned property. As a resident of Cypress Park Lane I am vehemently opposed to theses plans. Being that I am in the high risk group it is not in my best interest to attend this hearing, but I would request my voice be heard.

The additional traffic and parking on Bleight drive would make leaving my subdivision worse than it already is. The addition of the subdivision just beginning construction plus the requested shops and housing on QBE property would put the two lane road on severe overload. Mr Landry has stated that parallel parking being proposed would be beneficial to the area and an improvement to the current parking. He has posted a picture of one truck parked on Bleight as an example of the improvement. Having lived here longer then Mr. Landry has owned the property, I can tell you the only time there is large numbers of vehicles parked there is on Haymarket Day. One day out of the year is certainly bearable as opposed to a daily occurrence from over flow parking from the proposed residences and stores.

Using his property as the center, there are currently 21 vacant stores within 1 mile, so I certainly feel we need more stores!!REALLY?? I am sure that under the current economic conditions that number, unfortunately, could grow while the new buildings remain vacant. And what about the homes that will be facing this four story building?? Stores bring dumpsters , the residences bring more traffic the families need places to play. How long will it be before the rest of the property is developed?? The current businesses in the old QBE building will also need parking which will end up creating problems on Bleight and the surrounding neighborhood, How many of these vehicles use the surrounding residential streets to turn around to exit from the parallel parking spaces.

The current roads do not warrant the addition of more vehicles as ere is no way the existing roads can widened Add traffic lights??No not the answer. Between the Pre schools and elementary schools and the subdivision only starting construction I feel a traffic study should be conducted which will tell us this addition is a bad idea.

I am requesting that my comments and concerns be read outloud and recorded during citizen time. Logic says this is a bad idea!!

Thank you,
William Wallace
14808 Cypress Park Lane

P.S.

Let us not forget about the hotel that is yet to be built !!!

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, September 20, 2020 5:14 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: Development of recreational field and multiuse four story building

Town Clerk

I strongly object to conceding the recreational field of 4.51 acres to QBE.

This field provides a nice buffer between Bleight Drive and the businesses in the QBE building.

I strongly object to building a four story mixed residential and commercial building which includes spaces for small businesses.

Such a building would require entrance and exit lanes onto Bleight Drive, and add 30 some parallel parking spaces the entire length of Bleight Drive. This would turn Bleight Drive into a commercial street instead of being a residential street as it is now. As a resident on Bleight Drive I would be directly impacted by the increase in traffic, the resulting traffic noise, and congestion. Many people, especially families, walk along this street during the day and evening. More spaces for small businesses are not needed because Haymarket and Gainesville already have spaces which are vacant.

Gaining control of the recreational field and developing a four story multiuse building will potentially be profitable to the QBE interests at the expense of a quality life-style for anyone who lives on Bleight Drive, or in the immediate community.

Please record and read this letter during citizens time at the meeting on September 21, 2020.

Sincerely,

Larry Schultz
6732 Bleight Drive
Haymarket , Virginia 20169

Kimberly Henry

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2020 3:34 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: Please read and enter for record during tonight's meeting

Hi Kim, if you could please enter the comments below for record, and read for tonight's town meeting, I am home with the 4 kids so won't be able to attend in person, thank you!.....

As a resident of one of the potentially affected homes on Bleight Drive from tonight's decision, I implore the Planning Commission and Town Council to do what is right for the residents and vote NO to this special proffer amendment that is being sought to remove the ball fields at the QBE Property.

After a rushed, secretive session in June during the previous administration, we now know that tonight's vote is about so much more than just removal of the ball fields. The ultimate goal is a highly developed 4-story residential and commercial building with underground parking garage, a large strip mall, removal of the historic Cookies and Cream building, 31 parallel parking spaces on Bleight Drive, add an ingress/ egress on Bleight and a potential future drive thru request.

The issue was such an overwhelming no from residents back in June, and it still is the same overwhelming no today. Nothing has changed. Residents concerns are being ignored by the seeker of this proffer amendment yet again.

The plans that would be sought if the proffer is allowed to be pushed through are not right for the community, not right for the residents, and not right for the town. Behind the QBE property, all of the land and trees are currently being razed for a huge development on the Gainesville border which will increase congestion on the Haymarket side as well. We need to consider that that is already happening and that is further reason to put a stop to this now. This is the last of the green spaces left in the town other than the playground (which has not much green space left either when it is filled with parked cars).

The land in question was purchased for just over a million dollars (which is less than the price of about 2 single family homes in town) and the contract stipulated that the ball fields must be preserved for 10 years. The contract must be served out in full as the clearance price for the property and land was given with conditions that contract needed to be followed to receive that astonishingly low price. No special treatment should be given and the contract should be fulfilled in it's entirety.

The residents who purchased their homes in these safe and quiet neighborhoods in town had zero expectation of being forced to sit in traffic to simply exit their streets that only has one way out for multiple areas, an intersection being built with dangerous conditions right in front of their driveways

making it dangerous to exit their own driveways and also dangerous for children to play outside their homes, do not want more vacant retail spaces by way of a new strip mall (the town already has plenty of vacant retail spaces in other areas), and do not want the extreme noise, light, and environmental pollution in front of their yards by the ultimate goal of a mini Gainesville Gateway in Haymarket by way of this proffer. If anyone wanted these things in their front yards, they would have bought in the city. The Town of Haymarket is a special rare gem in NOVA and should be preserved.

This is the last of the true green spaces left in town and it should be preserved as long as possible, and any other future plans sought should be done rationally and with the residents most affected in mind and actively participating, remembering that the residents homes in these nearby neighborhoods were built here first. If this green space gets taken away or massive things go up, you can't get it back.

I implore the commission and council to consider the health, safety, way of life, and properties of the residents and vote NO to this proffer. Thank you- Jillian Pullire

20 Sept 2020

Hello,

My name is Nick Pulire. I live at 6740 Bleight Drive, but I am stationed in Korea in the Air Force as a Civil Engineer for the next year while my family has stayed in Haymarket. The bottom-line for my comments is to urge the Planning Committee to recommend denying the proffer amendment. The QBE owner has big plans for the property which he needs the 3 years to develop properly versus trying to amend the agreement to develop that green space now. The owner entered into an agreement with the town and we need to see it through until it expires in Aug 13, 2023. The town has 3 years to work with the owner to get the B-1 design that fits our town ordinances and reduces the impact to the adjacent residences.

Robinson Manor residential development is being build right behind QBE. The Smith Property was allowed to also add residential in a commercially zoned block of town. We are letting the town be developed like towns closer to the city which turn out high density residential units. People move to Haymarket to get away from these high-density residential units with street parking. Haymarket needs more commercial development, not more townhomes, that was the intent of repurposing the old school. We do not want to lose the small town feel and uniqueness of Haymarket.

I feel many of the "standards" of the zoning ordinance are not met and are reasons to deny the development in the current form. The current plan has adverse effects on QBE neighbors. I encourage people to review many of the comments made by the applicant back in the June 7th, 2017 Planning Committee video found on the town of Haymarket Site located at this link

<http://haymarkettownva.ig2.com/Citizens/SplitView.aspx?Mode=Video&MeetingID=1618&Format=Minutes>

Significant capital investment would need to happen on Bleight Drive. The QBE owner needs to be liable to improve all roads and utilities if he is going to significantly change the land use. The parallel parking is a line of sight concern. Parking is allowed in front of the homes on Bleight, but with adding parallel parking on the opposite side of the road would now narrow the lane as well as create blindspots. Backing in and out of my driveway under these conditions when large events have occurred in town at the QBE site has impacted my ability to enter onto Bleight safely. The applicant promised multiple times to work with the neighbors to reduce impacts to them in the June 7th, 2017 discussion, but unfortunately these recent updated 2020 plans were not openly discussed with the neighbors. It was found out only when my wife asked the town about the proffer amendment notice she received a few days before the June 2020 planning meetings and right before the out-going town council left their seats on 1 July 2020. The consensus was overwhelming in the June meeting that the town was against the new 2020 QBE plan and although the owner has made some changes now it is by in large the same plan with still many questions/details to be answered.

Additionally, at minute 52 of the video, the road proposed by QBE that enters Bleight is to satisfy a "Fire Access Road" requirement only and not a primary entrance/exit as now indicated by the owner. Only a "Fire Access Road" was approved by the town. I am concerned when the QBE owner now changes the road's purpose for a primary access road. The owner also mentions in the 2017 video that Bleight can only take 4,000 vehicle trips a day and that in his calculations, in 2017, were 1171 trips a day. What is the expected trips now with the new plan? It was also mentioned in 2017 video, as I understood it, was

Kimberly Henry

From: Alexander Beyene <beyenea@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2020 4:10 PM
To: Kimberly Henry
Subject: Fwd: Ball Fields on the QBE Business Park Property in The Town of Haymarket

Per your request. Thanks!

Alexander Beyene

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Hendler-Voss, Seth A. <SHendler-Voss@pwcgov.org>
Date: Wed, Jul 15, 2020, 1:47 PM
Subject: RE: Ball Fields on the QBE Business Park Property in The Town of Haymarket
To: Alexander Beyene <beyenea@gmail.com>

Good afternoon Mr. Beyene. Our current lease for the ballfields does not expire until 2023 and we have not made any changes to lease to date, including taking the tee ball field out of play. However, we have had exploratory discussions with the owner about the possibility of modifying the lease. Neither my office or the County Board of Supervisors has not approved or endorsed anything the owner has submitted to the Town.

Thanks,

Seth

From: Alexander Beyene <beyenea@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2020 1:27 PM
To: Hendler-Voss, Seth A. <SHendler-Voss@pwcgov.org>
Subject: Ball Fields on the QBE Business Park Property in The Town of Haymarket

This email is from an EXTERNAL source. Use caution when replying or clicking embedded links.

Mr. Hendler-Voss,

I'm a resident of the Town of Haymarket, and I'm reaching out to you for information about the ball fields on the QBE Business Park property. It's my understanding that the county will be removing the tee-ball field from the current or future lease. If that's the case, then could you please let me know when the change will take into effect?

In addition, as you can see in the attached General Development Plan (GDP) submitted to the Town of Haymarket as part of a Special Use Permit Application, the development plan indicates the elimination or relocation of a second ball field. Is the county aware of this and has the county and QBE/Mr. Landry been in discussion to eliminate or relocate the second ball field?

Sincerely,

Alexander Beyene