

2 Drainage/Stormwater (search words used: drainage, flood, runoff, stormwater)

From 2004 Planning Commission Minutes:

1. March 1, 2004: Planning Commission: "Gary Cox addressed the Planning Commission stating drainage is a major concern. Mr. Cox added there is a fear of the unknown, that the property could be sold and then developed leaving it wide open for uses."
2. March 1, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Canada stated the Huff family had provided a drawing to the Planning Commission. Mr. Byrd stated it is a good possibility the family will develop the property, which would include 80 homes plus the current house. Commissioner Carter stated this plan is moot because it has not been proffered. Commissioner Carter added, additional homes would buffer noise from the interstate and a drainage pond would help the properties."
3. March 29, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mrs. Kecia Wimmer addressed the Planning Commission with concerns regarding drainage. Mr. Terpenney stated the development would have regulations to follow and that should address the problem."
4. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade introduced the request. Commissioner Carter stated a previous request in this area was approved for Sam Simpkins, which was contingent on the completion of a project list. Mr. Terpenney stated not all items have been completed including a drainage ditch that was being relocated, but the Town engineers will review the issues for completion."
5. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mr. Rice stated he felt townhomes would be a better fit for the neighborhood; however the land will be developed. Mr. Rice added that College Street is at the bottom of a drainage basin and that when you get 7 or 8 inches of rain in a three day period, it will run downhill to the bottom of the drainage basin."
6. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mr. Rice stated he has a contract with Mr. Simpkins that is tentative on the approval of this request. Mr. Rice stated that the property is scheduled as Residential in the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan and that he plans to build 6 townhouse units similar to the units on Wimmer Street. Vice-Chairperson Simmons stated that citizens will raise issues about water and where it will go. Mr. Rice stated no additional water will be allowed to leave the site and Mr. Terpenney stated a storm water pond will be on the property. Commissioner Carter asked if any water can be taken across W. Main Street and Mr. Terpenney stated any water will run down College Street. Commissioner Stipes asked if any over detention is planned for the property and Mr. Neel responded that he is not sure at this time as a topographic study has not been done, but that they would do what is economically feasible. Commissioner Stipes asked what was previously done on College Street and Mr. Neel stated a 10- year post- to a 1-year pre-development storm detention was used."
7. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mr. Terpenney stated that the concept drawing shows 18 parking spaces and that at least 12 additional parking spaces would be added since 2 spaces per unit is the requirement. Mr. Neel stated a portion of the 5 foot street widening dedication could be used for storm water if done as an easement if the Town was to allow it and Mr. Terpenney stated that the dedication area may be needed for street widening."
8. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mr. Terpenney stated that the Planning Commission had

been provided with a sheet detailed Low-Impact Development techniques that could be utilized in development and provided an example of storm water management utilizing underground detention such as a geogrid membrane. Mr. Terpenney stated that the Town staff is reviewing some of the Low-Impact Development techniques and suggested that the Planning Commission review the concept. Commissioner Stipes stated that he had been to the same Low-Impact Development workshop that some of the Town staff attended and thought there were some good ideas presented. Mr. Neel stated that he agreed, but thought that the ideas would work effectively on some sites and perhaps not as well on others."

9. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mr. Neel stated that his firm is utilizing some Low-Impact Development ideas now and that they will likely utilize the concept more in the future. Mr. Neel asked that if the Conditional Use Permit is approved that the development be given an "either-or" option regarding a 10-year post- to a 1-year pre-development storm detention versus a geogrid membrane/drywell due to fiscal feasibility. Commissioner Stipes stated that the drywell is essentially a French drain with no outlets."
10. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Mr. Terpenney stated that over detention is what is desired and that both would be acceptable options to reach the goal and that he felt the requirement of storm water being detained from a 10-year post-development rate to a 1 -year pre-development rate was adequate. Chairperson Wade asked Mr. Terpenney to explain what 10-year post- to 1-year pre-development rate meant and Mr. Terpenney stated that it was essentially limiting storm water that would be experienced with a 10-year storm be released at a 1-year storm rate after development. Mr. Terpenney stated that there are some variables in the equation such as terrain that can be classified differently. Commissioner Stipes stated that storm water is often more obvious after development as it is often contained in ditches where previously it had been sheet flow across the property."
11. June 7, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade stated citizens from College Street were instructed to conduct a study regarding storm water and inquired to what the results were. Mr. Neel stated he has not been asked to do work for anyone from College Street regarding storm water and added that as he understood the situation, the citizens were deciding on who would pay for a lawyer and/or the study. Mr. Rice stated that he believed no study will be done at this time. Commissioner Carter asked for clarification of a retention pond versus a detention pond and Commissioner Stipes stated that a detention pond is designed to drain while a retention pond is designed to permanently hold water. Mr. Terpenney stated that retention ponds are generally considered a nuisance."
12. June 15, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade introduced the request and stated that the Planning Commission had four drafted conditions. Commissioner Canada asked for an explanation of what storm water being detained from a 10-year post development rate to a 1-year pre- development rate meant. Commissioner Stipes stated that he would like to point out that in the bigger picture, the property is zoned B-3 General Business now, which would allow 80 percent lot coverage for commercial use by right and that while any development would increase run-off, the drafted condition would limit a storm that has a 10 percent chance of occurring to be released at a rate of a storm that would occur once a year. Mr. Terpenney agreed and stated that a ten-year storm would be released at a one-year storm rate. Mr. Terpenney stated that any storm that is less severe than a ten-year storm would pass through the detention pond. Vice-Chairperson Simmons stated that it would not be released at a greater rate than was occurring before development though and Mr. Terpenney stated that this was correct. Mr. Terpenney stated that the Planning Commission had discussed low-impact develop methods during the work session, which includes methods like underground detention, but stated that

there isn't really a need to tell the developer how to detain the water, just the rate to release it

13. June 15, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade introduced the request and stated that the Planning Commission had four drafted conditions. Commissioner Canada asked for an explanation of what storm water being detained from a 10-year post development rate to a 1-year pre- development rate meant. Commissioner Stipes stated that he would like to point out that in the bigger picture, the property is zoned B-3 General Business now, which would allow 80 percent lot coverage for commercial use by right and that while any development would increase run-off, the drafted condition would limit a storm that has a 10 percent chance of occurring to be released at a rate of a storm that would occur once a year. Mr. Terpenney agreed and stated that a ten-year storm would be released at a one-year storm rate. Mr. Terpenney stated that any storm that is less severe than a ten-year storm would pass through the detention pond. Vice-Chairperson Simmons stated that it would not be released at a greater rate than was occurring before development though and Mr. Terpenney stated that this was correct. Mr. Terpenney stated that the Planning Commission had discussed low-impact develop methods during the work session, which includes methods like underground detention, but stated that there isn't really a need to tell the developer how to detain the water, just the rate to release it."
14. June 15, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade read the drafted conditions: 1) Storm water shall be detained from a 10-year post-development rate to a 1-year pre-development rate. 2) Sidewalks shall be provided on both street frontages. 3) That detention and erosion and sediment control measures shall be constructed and approved by the Town prior to any impervious surfaces being installed. 4) All storm water and erosion and sediment control measures shall be completed to the satisfaction of Town inspectors prior to issuance of any building permits. Chairperson Wade stated that the condition that the development shall substantially resemble the submitted concept plan should be added and the Planning Commission agreed."
15. June 15, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade inquired whether it was legal to condition that the CUP approval be applicable only to Bryan Rice. Mr. Terpenney stated that the Planning Commission could add a condition that the permit is valid only for the agent Bryan Rice and the Planning Commission agreed the condition should be added. Commissioner Canada inquired if the CUP would carry with the property if the project was constructed and Mr. Terpenney stated that the CUP would carry with the property if built and that the conditions would still apply. Commissioner Stipes asked if detaining a 10-year storm to a six-month storm rate was a possibility and Mr. Neel stated that he was not sure and that the size of the orifice may be too small and subject to close with debris."
16. July 26, 2004: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Wade introduced the request. Bryan Rice stated that he had recently purchased the property and would be willing to over detain storm water. Mr. Terpenney read the six conditions that had been drafted: 1) Storm water shall be detained from a 10-year post-development rate to a 1-year pre-development rate. 2) Sidewalks shall be provided on both street frontages. 3) That detention and erosion and sediment control measures shall be constructed and approved by the Town prior to any impervious surfaces being installed. 4) All storm water and erosion and sediment control measures shall be completed to the satisfaction of Town inspectors prior to issuance of any building permits. 5) Development shall substantially resemble the concept plan submitted. 6) This permit is valid only for the owner Bryan Rice. Mr. Terpenney stated that the conditions reflect what Mr. Rice has said regarding over detention of storm water. John Neel of Gay and Keesee, Inc. stated that he was working with Mr. Rice and that he was available if there were any questions."
17. August 3, 2004: Planning Commission: "Vice-Chairperson Simmons introduced the request.

Mr. Terpenney stated the Town had received a letter from Montgomery County Public Schools. Vice-Chairperson Simmons requested the conditions be reviewed and Mr. Terpenney read the six conditions that had been drafted: 1) Storm water shall be detained from a 10-year post-development rate to a 1-year pre-development rate. 2) Sidewalks shall be provided on both street frontages. 3) That detention and erosion and sediment control measures shall be constructed and approved by the Town prior to any impervious surfaces being installed. 4) All storm water and erosion and sediment control measures shall be completed to the satisfaction of Town inspectors prior to issuance of any building permits. 5) Development shall substantially resemble the concept plan submitted. 6) This permit is valid only for the owner Bryan Rice."

18. August 3, 2004: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Carter inquired about the conditions for over detention of storm water and asked if they are adequate. Mr. Terpenney stated he believed the condition addressed storm water adequately. Mr. Neel stated if the size of the pond were increased, a unit may need to be eliminated to add to the pond. Mr. Rice stated the storm water engineering has not been completed, but the Town will not allow the construction unless the detention pond meets the conditions set. Mr. Terpenney stated Low Impact Development (LID) ideas can also assist in meeting the conditions."
19. August 3, 2004: Planning Commission: "A Conditional Use Permit request by Bryan Rice for property at the corner of Moose Drive and Buffalo Drive (tax parcels 556 - ((A)) - 5 and 7) for multi-family residential use in the B-3 General Business District. Commissioner Canada stated under the current zoning the property could allow for 80% of asphalt and that with this request there is a tremendous effort to control drainage on College Street. Mr. Terpenney stated the zoning allows for 80% of impervious coverage. Commissioner Booth made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council with conditions. Commissioner Lawless seconded the motion which passed 5-0."

From 2004 Town Council Minutes:

1. February 17, 2004: Town Council: "1. Rezoning request by the Reva Mae Huff Family Trust for property at 605 Falling Branch Road located between Falling Branch Road and Hemlock Street (tax parcels 529-((A))-27, 35, and 36 and 529-((19))-8 from A Agricultural to R-2 Two-Family Residential to R-3 Multi-Family Residential. The property contains approximately 11.743 acres and is scheduled as Residential in the Future Land Use Map of the Christiansburg Comprehensive Plan. Tim Wimmer, Gary Cox, Rene Cox, Stephen Hiner, and Paul Flenor spoke in opposition to this rezoning request. The main concerns of those who spoke are that a plan for developing this property has not been submitted, and the intended property use and type of housing is not known at this time. The Adjoining neighbors are concerned with an increase in traffic which would result from multi-family housing. Those who spoke believe the existing drainage issues will increase with construction. Mr. Wimmer asked Council for additional time to notify residents of the entire neighborhood, not just adjoining property owners, and to gather petitions to bring to Council. Rene Cox wants to maintain the good quality of life for her children in this neighborhood, and doesn't want additional neighbors. She has large trenches dug along the back and side of her yard to help control drainage and the field behind her home, which is the property to be developed, also helps absorb excess stormwater. She commented on the dangers of traffic pulling out onto Roanoke Street, which is the only entrance to the neighborhood. She asked council to consider the impact of this development on the entire neighborhood. Stephen Hiner commented on the potential decrease to property values as a result of multi-family housing in the area. He is not opposed to property development, but wants to keep development in conformity with the surrounding area. Paul Flenor is not

opposed to the development of single-family housing, but is opposed to multi-family housing in this area. Mr. Mike Bird, administrator for the Huff family, said the family primarily wants to sell the property to settle the estate. The family has in mind to develop single, patio type housing in the \$200,000 price range. The development would include a retention pond, greenspace and parks. He will encourage any buyer to follow this plan, but can not guarantee that this will be developed. He does have several potential buyers, and initially the family - wanted to sell the property as a parcel, it may subdivide and sell as lots. Councilman Ballengee is uncomfortable with the request to rezone from A Agriculture to R-3 Multi-Family Residential and suggested delaying action for further review."

2. June 15, 2004: Town Council: "2. A Conditional Use Permit request by Bryan Rice (agent for Sam Simpkins) for property at the corner of Moose Drive and Buffalo Drive (tax parcels 556-((A))-5 and 7) for multi-family residential use in the B-3 General Business District. Mr. Bryan Rice passed out information to Council showing his preliminary site plan of six townhomes, as well as several sites he has developed in Town. He explained that his townhouse plan is a less invasive use of the property as opposed to the possible uses allowed in the B-3 General Business District. He spoke with several residents in the area and all agreed that the six townhomes would be a better usage of the property, rather than commercial development. He said that drainage was a concern with the residents in the area; however, his proposed land usage would create less of a problem than the current allowable uses. He said he will comply with the Town's restrictive guidelines regarding development in that area. Mr. Rice is also a College Street property owner and he wants to develop the property in a way that it will be an asset to College Street. Ms. Beth Umberger, a College Street resident, supports Mr. Rice's request. She said he is ethical and will develop the property according to guidelines. Her concern is with existing drainage issues. She believes Sam Simpkins may use this as an opportunity to avoid fixing the drainage problems on his College Street property. Andrew Nixon stated his opposition to the request because of current drainage problems along College Street. Mary Lucas said she owns a townhouse built by Sam Simpkins, and while she likes her townhouse, she does have drainage problems along her property. She said Mr. Simpkins has made several attempts to correct the drainage problem by digging ditches along her property lines, however drainage from her yard is eroding her neighbor's yards. Mr. John Neel of Gay and Keesee is working with Mr. Rice on a site plan for the property. He commented that the Town could put conditions on the site to regulate development. He said that townhouse development is a less invasive use of the property as opposed to the allowable uses for the current B-3 zoning. The townhomes would also be in keeping with the neighborhood. Councilman Barber asked where the water would flow from the retention pond. Mr. Neel said the water would leave the pond to a roadside ditch. The retention pond, he said could be made to detain water to the ten (10) year pre-development rate. Mr. Rice clarified that he has a contract to buy the property from Sam Simpkins, and that Mr. Simpkins would have no part in developing the land. Beth Umberser said the improvements made to College Street have improved the drainage problems."
3. June 15, 2004: Town Council: "2. A Conditional Use Permit request by Bryan Rice (agent for Sam Simpkins) for property at the corner of Moose Drive and Buffalo Drive for multi-family residential use in the B-3 General Business District Councilman Lester made a motion to accept the Planning Commission's recommendation to approve the CUP, seconded by Councilman Barber. Councilman Ballengee commented that Council has heard many times from the College Street residents regarding existing drainage problems. The last time the matter was brought before Council, the residents were instructed by Council to do a drainage study. The study has not been completed and Councilman Ballengee believes the study should be completed before

additional construction is allowed in the area Councilwoman Carter stated that this has been a difficult decision because of the type of construction currently allowed versus the type of construction being requested, however, she has questions regarding water retention that have not been answered at this time. She commented that while the Town will hold the development to high standards, she does not believe now is the right time for additional construction along College Street. Councilman Barber commented that he is not comfortable denying this request based on the lack of a community water study. He believes the developer's reputation and the Town's strict guidelines should be considered. Councilman Lester pointed out that if this CUP is issued, the Town could restrict development by adding conditions to the CUP. However, if denied, the property owner by right can develop the property commercially, without additional controls put in place by the Town. Manager Terpenney commented that no matter what is developed on this site, the developer must comply with Town guidelines; however, those guidelines would be more stringent if the requested CUP is issued. Council voted on the motion to approve as follows: AYES: Barber and Lester. NAYS: Ashworth, Ballengee, and Carter The CUP request is denied."

4. July 6, 2004: Town Council: "2. A rezoning request by John D. Elmore for property at 710 Peppers Ferry Road, NW (a 1.378 acre portion of the total 3.268 acre tax parcel 435 - ((A) - 23) from A Agricultural to B-3 General Business. The property is scheduled as Mixed Use - Residential/Limited Business in the Future Land Use Map of the Christiansburg Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Ann Hess addressed Council in opposition of this request. She believes that since the property is scheduled as Mixed Use, B-3 General Business is not the best zoning choice for this particular property. She said the applicant was not advised of the new-"Mixed Use" zoning, and if the property is rezoned B-3 General Business, any business will be allowed on the property. She asked that Council table the request for further review. Mr. James Van Heusen, representative for Mr. Elmore read a letter from Mr. Elmore explaining his intentions for the property. There are currently seventy-eight storage units on the property and Mr. Elmore is requesting the rezoning to allow additional storage units. Mr. Elmore is turning away potential customers every day due to a shortage of storage units. Not much traffic is generated by the storage unit business, and the storm water management pond has already been constructed so drainage is not an issue."
5. July 20, 2004: Town Council: "MANAGER TERPENNEY reported that the Town has received a request from Danny Sowers and Thelma Davis of Dunlap Drive for the Town to consider drainage improvements along their property. The property floods often and they are willing to dedicate an easement to the Town for improvements. Mayor Linkous turned the matter over to the Street Committee for its review and recommendation."
6. August 17, 2004: Town Council: "MR. ELMER LANG of Lester Street addressed Council concerning a drainage ditch that runs along the front of his property. He requested the Town place a catch basin at the end of the pipeline to prevent animals from entering his property through this ditch. He showed Council pictures of the drain line and his property. Manager Terpenney said he would have the Public Works department contact him concerning this matter."
7. September 21, 2004: Town Council: "MR. LESTER AND MS. CARTER- Street Committee recommendations on: 1. Dunlap Drive drainage. This property is located across from a church on Roanoke Street that is in the process of developing a holding pond. Councilman Lester recommends deferring this request until the holding pond is completed and it is determined if the pond would alleviate some of the overflow on Dunlap Drive. Councilman Lester made a motion to defer this request, seconded by Councilman Ashworth. Council voted on the motion as follows: AYES: Ashworth, Ballengee, Barber, Carter, Huppert, and Lester. NAYS: None."

8. October 19, 2004: Town Council: "MANAGER TERPENNY updated Council on the status of various current engineering and public works projects. Projects and progress are as follows: ... Hans Meadow Drainage Improvements, Phase 1, SWM Facility – Under construction. ... Glade Drive Drainage Improvements – Final site stabilization and fine grading."
9. October 19, 2004: Town Council: "MANAGER TERPENNY reported that the Town has received a request from Pentecostal Holiness Church. The basement of the church flooded during a severe storm and the Church believes the Town is responsible for the sewer back up that resulted from the flooding."

From Planning Commission Minutes 2005:

1. March 14, 2005: Planning Commission: "Mr. Terpenney read the four conditions: 1) The Conditional Use Permit approved on December 3, 2002 shall be considered void in regards to its approval for the allowance of contractor equipment storage. The use for apartments shall be allowed with the conditions: "This permit shall not be effective until a site plan prepared showing the required 20% greenspace and landscaping, paved parking areas, underground utilities, driveway entrance, drainage areas, etc. is approved by the Town" and "This permit shall not be effective until completion of the applicant's building and issuance of a certificate of occupancy by the Town." 2) This permit shall not be effective for the mobile home park until a site plan prepared showing compliance with Article XVIII. Mobile Home Parks of Chapter 30 "Zoning" of the Christiansburg Town Code, the required 20% greenspace and landscaping, underground utilities, driveway entrance, drainage areas, etc. is approved by the Town. 3) The mobile home park shall have paved driving aisles and paved parking areas. 4) This permit shall be revocable for violations of Chapter 3 "Advertising" of the Christiansburg Town Code occurring on the property."
2. May 3, 2005: Planning Commission: "Vice-Chairperson Simmons introduced the request. Mr. Terpenney stated the conditions reflect the changes requested by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Carter inquired if the property owner was aware of the conditions. Mr. Terpenney read the eight conditions:" ... "7. This permit shall not be effective until a site plan prepared showing compliance with the required greenspace and landscaping, paved parking areas, underground utilities, driveway entrance, drainage areas, etc. is approved by the Town."
3. June 6, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada stated he would like to make an addition to the conditions, that the materials shall be stored inside and equipment behind the building. Mr. Helms stated that the conditions should specify that the trees should be six feet in height at time of planting. Mr. Helms inquired as to whether it would be a violation if there were a trailer with materials on it and Commissioner Canada stated that the materials would be in transit if going to a job site and not be considered storage."
4. June 6, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada inquired about how the storm water will be handled. Mr. Rutledge stated the water has to stay on site and the developer and engineers do not want a pond. Mr. Rutledge stated the developer is looking at infiltration pits, gravel pits, reduced road widths, and storage pipes. Mr. Rutledge stated water naturally goes to the low area. Mr. Terpenney stated the water does not have to stay on site if it goes to an adequate channel. Mr. Neel stated that his idea of success would be not having a pond."
5. July 1, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada inquired about the drainage plan and Mr. Terpenney stated he has not seen the drainage plan. Mr. Terpenney stated the drainage could be addressed with a pond or underground means, so long as state regulations are met. Mr. Rutledge stated the developer would like to address storm water off site without utilizing an

unsightly pond. Mr. Rutledge stated that the desire to use reduce pavement widths is in part due to the desire to not have a storm water pond. Mr. Terpenney stated houses in the drainage path concern Commissioner Canada."

6. July 12, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada stated that he applauds the rolled curb, but that he would like to address stormwater drainage toward Henley Drive. Mr. Terpenney stated that they must meet state erosion and sediment control requirements. Mr. Rutledge stated that the seven to nine foot grass strip between the street and sidewalk will help to address parking concerns and added that they don't desire parking in front, but that it can be accommodated."
7. July 12, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada stated that he would like to go back to the water issue and inquire if the N. Franklin Street - Peppers Ferry Corridor Route could be crowned and added that he assumed it would be centered to allow left turns to go to N. Franklin Street and right turns to go toward Henley Drive. Mr. Terpenney stated that the Connector Route is not far along in the planning stages, but that VDOT may not increase run-off. Mr. Terpenney added that VDOT must detain their increase in stormwater and that there will be an increase. Commissioner Canada stated that a concern for the elevation of Phase I of Windmill Hills led to a drop inlet being installed between the second and third house on Henley Drive. Commissioner Canada stated that if all the water from the proposed development were to go this direction, he was not sure that a drain could control it. Commissioner Canada stated that he hears engineering can prevent situations like College Street, where water can get as high as people's waist, or the Falling Branch area. Commissioner Canada stated that if planning can prevent situations like these, he would feel better. Mr. Terpenney stated that both of these scenarios were created prior to current stormwater management requirements. Mr. Terpenney stated that engineers have to use the most conservative numbers considering perk rate, flow rate, slope, and other variables. Mr. Terpenney stated that these requirements were not in effect when College Street or Falling Branch were developed. Mr. Terpenney stated that he has dealt with every drainage situation in Town at some point, but that the Town can't fix everything that was developed before there were regulations to address them."
8. July 12, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Poff stated that the 18 foot front setback had been changed to 10 feet to accommodate covered porches and steps. Vice-Chairperson Stipes stated that the density does not negatively affect the setbacks and Mr. Terpenney stated that this is correct. Vice-Chairperson Stipes stated that the overall density could not be over the maximum allowed density of ten units per acre and Mr. Terpenney stated that this is correct. Commissioner Poff inquired as to when stormwater management plans are submitted and Mr. Terpenney stated that they are required prior to subdivision approval and that drawings for the streets, drainage, and water and sewer are usually submitted together. Commissioner Poff inquired as how calculations are done if the type of construction is not known and Mr. Terpenney stated that the worst case scenario is used, assuming all duplexes in single-family and duplex areas and assuming multi-family uses in the areas that allow them. Commissioner Canada inquired if the Town's approval of the use was therefore an approval of the stormwater and Mr. Terpenney responded that the stormwater is a consequence of the use. Mr. Terpenney stated that the Planning Commission and Town Council are responsible for approval of the concept plan, but that the Town staff reviews the stormwater."
9. July 12, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada stated that he had concerns for downstream and that he knew it could be piped or a pond installed, but that he understood that engineering would take care of his concerns. Mr. Terpenney stated that he could go into more details if they were needed and Commissioner Canada stated that he thought his questions had

already been taken care of. Mr. Rutledge stated that they had considered infiltration trenches, piping, ponds, and other alternatives, but that if the Town is not satisfied with what is proposed, it will not be approved. Mr. Neel stated that typically development provides a pond at a low point, but that the developer does not desire a detention pond at the bottom of the hill. Commissioner Canada stated that with that much water behind a house, people get concerned and added that a large pond getting a big storm would make him nervous. Mr. Neel stated that the engineers will try to keep water at the top of the hill and Mr. Rutledge stated that the developer will install oversized pipes if necessary. Vice-Chairperson Stipes stated that if a storm that has a volume of a storm that would be expected with frequency of less than two years, it should infiltrate. Vice-Chairperson Stipes stated that if the stormwater management system does not work, it is the staff's fault."

10. July 18, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Canada stated he has been most vocal about storm water run-off and added he has spoken to Mr. Terpenney and is reassured Engineering will see to the control. Commissioner Canada stated he is not sure if a pond is needed or not, but engineering design will determine the need. Commissioner Canada added he has been vocal about the density and knows that by right the developer could build approximately 105 duplexes. Mr. Terpenney stated approximately 210 units could be developed. Commissioner Canada stated he likes the planned development much better than the possibility of duplexes and added that amenities such as benches and greenspace help the development. Commissioner Canada stated with VDOT and Town staff planning for a boulevard, he believes the area at Providence will be lowered to assist with sight distance. Commissioner Canada stated he reviewed the MU-1 uses and if he is not mistaken those would have to come back for a Public Hearing. Mr. Terpenney stated that essentially all business uses would require a Public Hearing."
11. August 29, 2005: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Simmons stated that the Planning Commission should review the drafted conditions. Mr. Terpenney read the conditions: ... "(11) This permit shall not be effective until a site plan prepared showing landscaping, paved parking areas, underground utilities, driveway entrance, drainage areas, etc. is approved by the Town."...
12. September 6, 2005: Planning Commission: ""(11) This permit shall not be effective until a site plan prepared showing landscaping, paved parking areas, underground utilities, driveway entrance, drainage areas, etc. is approved by the Town."...
13. September 6, 2005: Planning Commission: "Commissioner Vanhoozier asked if materials would be stored in the building. Mr. Terpenney stated the contractor equipment would be behind a fence. Commissioner Booth asked if there have been any complaints. Mr. Terpenney stated there has been a drainage issue with a neighbor and hop the development will help. Commission Poff asked if Mr. Smith has to build the building. Mr. Terpenney stated one of the conditions is to build the building. Vice-Chairperson Stipes asked it the time limit could be shortened to 3 months. Commissioner Canada stated it would be difficult to develop the property in such a short time. Commissioner Canada stated he agreed with developing the property and the conditions are in place to insure the protections of the neighbors."
14. October 17, 2005: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Simmons introduced the request. Mr. Terpenney detailed the location and stated thqt Quesenberry Street, which is to the right of this property, is private. Mr. Terpenney stated the property is either under contract or has been purchased. Mr. Terpenney stated the development would have business use on the first floor and apartments on the second floor, but the building location would be behind the current B-3 line. Chairperson Simmons stated businesses are not allowed in the R-3 District and Mr. Terpenney stated that was correct. Commissioner Vanhoozier inquired to the size of the building. Mr. Steve

Semones stated the building would be approximately 12,000 square feet with storm water management at the front of the lot. Chairperson Simmons asked if the upstairs would be a ground level entrance based on the topography of the property and Mr. Terpenney stated the second level would be a ground entrance."

15. October 17, 2005: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Simmons inquired if Quesenberry Street would be used for access. Mr. Semones stated the development would have a separate entrance from Radford Street. Commissioner Carter inquired about the storm water management locating at the front of the lot. Mr. Terpenney stated that is the low point of lot and added the development would have to meet state regulations and could over detain to a certain extent. Mr. Terpenney added the engineering had not been done yet. Commissioner Vanhoozier stated that it is a fairly narrow strip that is being requested for the rezoning. Commissioner Vanhoozier inquired if all the residential development would be in the B-3 District and Mr. Terpenney stated that it would just be one building. Commissioner Vanhoozier inquired if the other residential buildings would be up the slope at the rear and Mr. Terpenney stated that this is correct. "
16. October 18, 2005: Planning Commission: "Chairperson Simmons introduced the request. Chairperson Simmons asked if the Town had received any comments. Mr. Terpenney and Mr. Wingfield stated they had not received comments. Chairperson Simmons requested a review of the Planning Commission workshop to inform Commissioner Canada about the request. Mr. Terpenney detailed the location and stated the development would have storm water management in the front with the building behind it. Mr. Terpenney stated a CUP is required for residential use in the 8-3 District. Commissioner Carter asked for the setback requirements. Mr. Wingfield stated the front setback would be thirty feet from street right-of-way and there would be a building setback of twenty feet from any Residential Districts. Chairperson Simmons stated Quesenberry Street is private and inquired about other accesses. Mr. Terpenney stated the property does have access on Radford Street and Underwood Street. Chairperson Simmons asked for any further discussion. Commissioner Poff made a motion to recommend approval to Town Council. Commissioner Vanhoozier seconded the motion which passed 5-0. Commissioner Canada commented that using the upper floor for residential is a good use."

From 2005 Town Council Minutes

1. February 15, 2005: Town Council Meeting: "2. Robin Hood Estates, Phase II 35 lots, Robin Hood Drive, N.E. Councilman Lester explained that all is in order with this plat subject to minor administrative changes and he made a motion to approve. Manager Terpenney explained that this property is located near the Hans Meadow Subdivision, but it will not have an affect on the storm water management in that neighborhood. He said Roger Woody has exceeded the storm water management regulations for the previous subdivision he has planned near Hans Meadow Subdivision. Councilman Ashworth seconded the motion and Council voted as follows: AYES: Ashworth, Ballengee, Barber, Carter, Huppert, and Lester. NAYS: None.
2. November 1, 2005 : Town Council Meeting: " A rezoning request by William H. Price for property on the southwestern side of Merrimac Road (tax parcel 406 - ((A)) - 22) from A Agricultural to R-3 Multi-Family Residential (approximately 4.343 acres) and B-3 General Business (approximately 1.3 acres). The property is scheduled as Residential in the Future Land Use Map of the Christiansburg Comprehensive Plan. Mayor Linkous reported that the Town received a letter of opposition from adjoining property owner, Mr. Lonnie Linkous, which he made available for Council's and Planning Commission's review. Mr. William Price and Steve Semones of Balzer and Associates addressed Council regarding this request. Mr. Price

explained that he invited all adjoining neighbors to a meeting with himself and Mr. Semones to review the plans for *the* property. Approximately ten neighbors attended the meeting. As a result of the concerns discussed at the meeting, Mr. Price submitted to Council a proffer limiting construction to either duplexes or single-family homes for the residential area of the development. He also submitted to Council a drawing indicating the property and surrounding area. When Mr. Price began planning for development of this area many years ago, water drainage and topography was an issue. Many improvements have been made to the area, and further improvements will be made to the water drainage system. Mr. Price commented that many of the neighbors want the area cleaned up and he is committed to doing just that. At the meeting held by Mr. Price, the neighbors also commented that traffic on Merrimac road is heavy and not properly policed. Mr. Price hopes to make the road and surrounding area safer with this development. He stated that this development would be good for the Town, the residents, and the people who purchase homes within the development. Councilman Ballengee commented that the perception is that Mr. Price intends to sell the property once it is rezoned. Mr. Price said he has no intention of selling the property if rezoned. Councilman Huppert asked how the existing water and erosion problems would be handled. Mr. Price responded that currently there is a large, but inadequate, water retention pond located on the property, which he intends to improve so that it will properly contain rainwater and runoff. The pond is a naturally occurring pond not designed as a water retention pond. Councilman Barber asked Mr. Price to clarify the number of homes planned for the site. Mr. Price responded that an exact number has not been specified. Mr. Semones commented that townhomes were originally considered for the site, but topography and other issues prevented townhome construction. Mr. Semones explained that Mr. Price has unsuccessfully worked with Norfolk and Southern for some time to lease this property, and eventually decided to purchase the property. Norfolk and Southern kept a portion of the land over their tunnel as a right-of-way. He and Mr. Price have worked with Town staff to design an adequate drainage system for this area, but have not decided on a specific method to control water drainage. Mr. Semones said the biggest concern is the ditch line that runs along Mr. Linkous' property causing flooding and erosion. Concerning vehicular access, they are currently working with the railroad to lease an additional piece of property for additional access. Mr. Lonnie Linkous commented to Council that he doesn't believe construction can occur on this property without further damage to the existing drainage problems. He believes Mr. Price has misled the residents and that R-3 Multi-Family Residential zoning is the most dense zoning available. Mr. Linkous said that flooding in the area began with the construction of Mr. Price's Midway Plaza several years ago. He refuted Mr. Price's claim to have unsuccessfully attempted to lease the property from the Norfolk and Southern, stating that he is currently leasing his property from the railroad. Mr. Linkous submitted to Council and the Planning Commission a petition from area residents opposing the rezoning, as well as several letters of opposition. Councilwoman Carter asked Manager Terpenney to explain the proffer, which he did, and commented that if the property is sold the proffer still applies to the property. Mr. Price has proffered to build the number of units allowable in an R-2 Two-Family Residential zoning, which is less than allowed in an R-3 Multi-Family Residential zone. Mr. Linkous said that Mr. Price has been vague in his answers and he is concerned that Mr. Price will not make the improvements necessary for an adequate drainage system. Mr. Mike Wood, a nearby resident, said he was not invited to the meeting and wanted to express several of his concerns. His main concern is the existing drainage problems, but he is also concerned because an R-3 Multi-Family Residential zoning is not consistent with the surrounding single-family home developments. Mr. Price commented that there is an existing duplex in the area, as well as a mobile home park. He does not believe the area is suitable for a single-family home development.

From 2006 Planning Commission Minutes

1. March 20, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: "Chairperson Simmons stated that the presented concept drawing shows 86 lots and Mr. Dale Smith stated that his original drawings showed 87 lots but that it now shows 86 lots. Commissioner Vanhoozier stated that the development would have 55 foot wide lots and Mr. Dale Smith stated that this is correct, but that in the cul-de-sacs they could be less. Commissioner Canada inquired what would be in the greenspace area and whether it would be usable and Mr. Dale Smith stated that there would be a stormwater management area in the greenspace and that it would be mostly unusable due to relatively steep slopes.
2. March 20, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: "Commissioner Carter inquired if the stormwater management area would belong to the Town and Mr. Terpenney stated that it would belong to the Homeowner's Association. Commissioner Carter stated that she would like trails. Chairperson Simmons inquired if there were any other questions and there were none."
3. March 20, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: " Commissioner Poff inquired as to what greenspace is required in R-1 and Mr. Terpenney responded that in large subdivisions the Town requires ten percent dedication, which would be 2.5 acres in this case, and added that this is the most that could be required without compensation. Commissioner Poff stated that he believed planned housing developments with smaller lots should theoretically be dedicating more greenspace. Commissioner Poff stated that the proposed development is dedicating approximately five percent additional greenspace, but that the additional area is all storm water management area and added that he believed there should be a trade-off of increased greenspace for using smaller lot sizes. Commissioner Carter stated that she believed this has been a question with planned housing developments. Mr. Terpenney stated that if the interest is getting usable land, greenspace or open space including stormwater management areas that are usable as recreational area can be accepted as meeting the requirement. Commissioner Vanhoozier stated that the dedication will preserve the greenspace or open space, but that this could be the only benefit of the Homeowner's Association is their maintenance of the greenspace. Mr. Chris Smith stated that they planned for the Homeowner's Association to take care of yard work, exterior maintenance, and snow removal."
4. March 20, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: "Commissioner Canada asked Mr. Terpenney to make a statement about greenspace and open space. Mr. Terpenney stated that greenspace is an all inclusive term for non-impervious surfaces and can include wetlands, stormwater management area (which are also open space) or greenspace can include passive recreation such as walking trails or active recreation where something is built for recreation. Commissioner Canada stated that he does not like to dictate recreation provisions such as ball fields because the elderly don't need ball fields for recreation, but that they may need walking trails. Commissioner Canada stated that he does believe what is dedicated should be usable and added that he realizes 20 or 25 years from now a developments make-up might change despite the age groups they are marketing. Mr. Terpenney stated that developers cannot discriminate because of age either and added that he recently received a call from a resident of the Villas at Peppers Ferry that was upset that the school buses would not go into the development.
5. March 20, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: "Commissioner Vanhoozier inquired if there was a target market planned for the proposed development and Mr. Dale Smith stated he would probably market to retired individuals or people close to retirement as he had done with Windsong Heights. Mr. Dale Smith stated that he thought it is better to leave the use of greenspace to the Homeowner's Association. Commissioner Canada stated that he agreed, but that the Town should expect the land to be usable. Chairperson Simmons inquired if walking trails were feasible and Mr. Dale Smith stated that he would like to have a 3 foot wide walking

trail around the stormwater management area, but that he would like to have the engineering work done and leave the trail to the Homeowner's Association."

6. June 5, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: "Commissioner Vanhoozier stated that there is a spring in the greenspace area and Mr. Smith stated that this was correct. Mr. Smith stated that the stormwater management area is approximately 20,000 square feet of the approximately 165,000 square foot greenspace area. Chairperson Simmons inquired if anyone saw anything in the proffers that might come back to haunt the Town. Mr. Terpenney stated that townhouses are often thought of as single-family residences, but that the Town considers a townhouse building as a multi-family building. Commissioner Vanhoozier inquired if the proffers were intended to be detached single-family residences and Mr. Smith stated that this was the case and added that the units would be similar to Windsong Heights only slightly larger. Mr. Terpenney stated that the minutes will reflect that Mr. Smith understands the single-family residences must be detached single-family residences"
7. November 6, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: "Commissioner Carter inquired what percent of the participants own their own paintball gun and Mr. Maxwell responded that just about all of the participants would have their own gun, but that he would have rentals available. Mr. Maxwell stated that the paintball guns are not that expensive and that they are sold at Wal-Mart. Vice-Chairperson Vanhoozier inquired if the grading on the site had been completed and Mr. Maxwell stated that it was not complete. Mr. Maxwell stated that he was still planning on installing some drainage pipes and that what was done was mainly to clean up the mess. Mr. Maxwell stated that he would like to begin operating in March and that he understood that the request would be subject to review after the first six months. Mr. Terpenney stated that this is one of the drafted conditions. Mr. Maxwell stated that he felt as though the parking would be sufficient and that there was room in the back of Fire Safety Products for overflow. Vice-Chairperson Vanhoozier inquired if there were plans to grade on the rear of the property more and Mr. Maxwell stated that this was the case and that he planned drainage extensions for this area."
8. November 7, 2006: Planning Commission Meeting: (not a typo, it is exactly the same as the previous entry) "Commissioner Carter inquired what percent of the participants own their own paintball gun and Mr. Maxwell responded that just about all of the participants would have their own gun, but that he would have rentals available. Mr. Maxwell stated that the paintball guns are not that expensive and that they are sold at WalMart. Vice-Chairperson Vanhoozier inquired if the grading on the site had been completed and Mr. Maxwell stated that it was not complete. Mr. Maxwell stated that he was still planning on installing some drainage pipes and that what was done was mainly to clean up the mess. Mr. Maxwell stated that he would like to begin operating in March and that he understood that the request would be subject to review after the first six months. Mr. Terpenney stated that this is one of the drafted conditions. Mr. Maxwell stated that he felt as though the parking would be sufficient and that there was room in the back of Fire Safety Products for overflow. Vice-Chairperson Vanhoozier inquired if there were plans to grade on the rear of the property more and Mr. Maxwell stated that this was the case and that he planned drainage extensions for this area."

From 2006 Town Council Minutes

1. January 17, 2006: Town Council Meeting: "2. 2. A rezoning request by Winston Underwood for property located at 1660 S. Franklin Street (tax parcel 558 - ((A)) - 8) from, A Agricultural to R-1 Single-Family Residential. The property contains 1.45 acres and is scheduled as Residential in the Future Land Use Map of the Christiansburg Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Winston Underwood was present to answer questions. Mr. Underwood hopes to divide his property and develop the

front portion residential. There is a residence currently existing on the back portion of the property. Mr. Mike Sowers of Hilltop Farms, adjacent to Mr. Underwood's property has several concerns and wants the property to remain A Agricultural. Farms, he explained, generate noise, odor, and occasionally free roaming livestock, which makes property next to a farm undesirable for residential use. Mr. Sowers also believes it will be difficult to develop the land residential because of flooding through the area during rains. The property located between the existing house and the road is swampy because of inadequate drainage."

2. May 16, 2006: Town Council Meeting: "2. Request for sidewalk, drainage, and retaining wall on Lester Street. Councilman Ashworth asked Town Manager Terpenney to report on this request. Manager Terpenney reported that the Street Committee and Town Engineering Department studied this request, and the Engineering Department provided an estimate for the project. The project would include capping the sidewalk, installing a handrail, and paving to control water drainage, and the Engineering Department estimates a cost of three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) to complete the project. Councilman Barber made a motion to proceed with the project. seconded by Councilwoman Carter. Council voted on the motion as follows: AYES: Ashworth, Ballengee, Barber, Carter, and Wade. NAYS: None."
3. September 5, 2006: Town Council Meeting: "1. Vacation of Lot Line & Utility and Drainage Easement Dedication for Dale & Freda Teel Family Limited Partnership and Tony Ross Harris & Sarah Teel Harris, creating 1 lot, McDaniel Drive and Glade Drive, S. Councilman Barber reported that this vacation request is for a small two-foot wide portion of the lot to be dedicated for drainage. All is in order with the plat and Councilman Barber made a motion to approve the request, second) by Councilman Wade. Council voted on the motion as follows: AYES: Barber, Carter, Stipes, and Wade. NAY None."
4. September 19, 2006: Town Council Meeting: " 1. Vacation/relocation of lot lines, lots 1 and 2, Thurman Oaks Subdivision and subdivision of Lot 1. Thurman Oaks Subdivision, creating 3 lots, Ellett Road, N.E. Councilman Barber explained that this property is currently two lots and the owner wants to create three lots. The boundary line adjustment will essentially clean up the lots. The existing drainage easement will be move to the center of Lot B. This property will be development single-family residential. All is in order with the plat and Councilman Barber made a motion to accept the plat, seconded Councilwoman Carter. Council voted as follows: AYES: Barber, Carter, Huppert, Stipes, and Wade. NAY None."
5. October 3, 2006: Town Council Meeting: "1. Easement vacation request, Christiansburg Industrial Park. Town Manager Terpenney said this small, 1.5 +/- acre lot is a residual lot created by the development of the stormwater management system. A drainage easement runs through the lot; however, the Town has redirected the drainage flow and the easement is no longer needed."