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Suggested Motions:

Approval
I move that Special Exception application TLSE 2018-0008, The North Star School at CS Monroe Property, be forwarded to the Town Council with a recommendation of approval subject to the conditions of approval as enumerated in the August 1, 2019 Planning Commission Public Hearing Staff Report on the basis that the Approval Criteria of Zoning Ordinance Section 3.4.12 have been satisfied and that the proposal would serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.

Or

Denial
I move that Special Exception application TLSE 2018-0008, The North Star School at CS Monroe Property, be forwarded to the Town Council with a recommendation of denial on the basis that the Approval Criteria of Zoning Ordinance Section 3.4.12 have not been satisfied due to the following reasons:

___________________________________________________.

Or
Alternate Motion
I move that ________________________________.

I. Proposal/Application Summary: The Applicant, Loudoun County Public Schools (LCPS), proposes the demolition of the former CS Monroe Technology Center building to accommodate the redevelopment of the site for a new school facility to be called The North Star School at CS Monroe Property, (North Star School). The North Star School will be the new home for LCPS Alternative Education Program currently located at the former Douglass High School at 407 E. Market Street. In addition, the North Star School will also provide daytime and evening adult education programming.

Figure 2: Special Exception Plan

The LCPS Monroe Advanced Technology Academy that was formally housed at CS Monroe was relocated to the new Academies of Loudoun facility at 42075 Loudoun Academy Drive in the fall of 2018.
The North Star School is proposed as a two-story, 94,633 square-foot building to accommodate 570 students. This total is comprised of 450 students for the Alternative Education Program and 75 - 120 daytime adult education students. Evening adult education attendance will vary depending on the courses offered, and will be limited to the hours of 6 p.m. – 9 p.m.

### Table 1. Property Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>715 Childrens Center Road</th>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>R-4 Single-Family Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIN #</td>
<td>271-39-2180</td>
<td>Planned Density:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>10 acres</td>
<td>Planned Land Use:</td>
<td>Major Institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Alternative Education Program and daytime adult education program will operate between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., with occasional adult education classes in the 3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. timeframe.

II. **Current Site Conditions:** The subject property consists of a single parcel measuring 10 acres and is developed with the 81,500 square-foot one-story former CS Monroe Advanced Technology Academy building and its appurtenances. See Table 2 **Adjacent Land Uses** below for a description of the applicable zoning and current land uses on neighboring properties immediately adjacent to the Subject Property.
III. Zoning History: The CS Monroe Technology Center was constructed in 1977. The Zoning Ordinance in effect at that time did not require special exception approval for a public school use. It was not until the adoption of the Zoning Ordinance revision in 2003 that public schools in residential zoning districts required special exception approval. The Commission will note that the establishment of the school prior to 2003 does not “grandfather” the property from requiring a special exception for the present application. In fact, TLZO Sec 16.2.2 Effect of Procedural Changes establishes the following:

Any use that was legally established at a time when no special form of approval was required for the subject use (e.g., special exception review and approval) shall not be deemed nonconforming merely as a result of not having obtained such approval. Any enlargement or expansion of such use shall be subject to the procedures and standards in effect at the time of such expansion.

Therefore, special exception approval is required for the present application to demolish the former CS Monroe Technology Center and redevelop for The North Star School.
IV. Uses on Adjacent Properties:

![Figure 4: Zoning Map](image)

**Table 2. Adjacent Land Uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th>Town Plan Land Use Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Single-family detached residential dwellings</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Park View Estates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Single-family detached residential dwellings</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Foxridge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Foxridge Park</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Town of Leesburg)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>AR-1 (Loudoun Co.)</td>
<td>Rte. 7 Bypass/Graydon Manor</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. **Staff Analysis:** TLZO Sec. 3.4.12 provides Special Exception Approval Criteria that are applicable to this application. These standards are discussed in the analysis below in Paragraph J.

A. **Review Summary**

1. **Resolved Review Items:** Four reviews of the application were made and items discussed and resolved during the review included:

   a. Landscape and buffering compliance;
   b. Parking and vehicle access and circulation; and
   c. Various Plat Deficiencies

2. **Unresolved Review Items/Outstanding Issues:** Items discussed and remaining unresolved at this time include:

   a. Building architecture and design;
   b. Frontage improvements along Childrens Center Road; and,
   c. Stormwater management

B. **Town Plan Compliance:** TLZO Section 3.4.12 requires an assessment of how the proposed special exception use will comply with applicable provisions of the Town Plan.

**Planning Area:** The Subject Property (Property) is located in the Leesburg Town Plan’s Central Planning Policy Area, and the Planned Land Use Policy Map further designates the subject property for “Major Institutional” uses. There are no specific area objective policies for the Property. Major Institutional policies are discussed beginning on Page 6-32 of the Town Plan. The primary intent of the Major Institutional is to provide a variety of public-based community services on properties measuring at least 10 acres. The proposed use is a qualifying public-based community service (public school) on a lot measuring 10 acres in area.

1. **Land Use, General Objectives:** On page 6-5 of the Town Plan, reference is made to general objectives to protect residential areas, preserve and expand town character, and accommodate growth. Specific comments relating to these stated objectives are provided below:

   a. **Land Use, General Objective 2:** “Development and redevelopment should be compatible with the Town’s character in terms of land use and design.” (Town Plan pg. 6-7).

      i. Existing School Use. The Property has been used for education purposes since 1977. The current project intends to maintain the public school use and to intensify the nature of the use by redeveloping the Property with a new school building (The North Star...
School) having two-stories and 94,633 square feet compared to the one-story 81,532 former CS Monroe Advanced Technical Academy. The design capacity of The North Star School is 570 students comprised of 450 students in the Alternative Education Program, plus a maximum of 120 daytime Adult Education Program students. Nighttime adult education numbers will vary based on the number and type of courses being offered. The table provided below provides a summary comparison of the CS Monroe facility compared to the proposed North Star School facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Summary of Existing Facilities and Proposed Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Monroe Technology Center</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. Size and Architecture. In order to mitigate the increase in gross floor area of the proposed North Star School, the building is planned as a two story structure. By increasing the height of the building, the footprint of the new building (48,425 sq. ft. +/-) will be less than the existing one-story 81,532 sq. ft. CS Monroe facility.

Conceptual architectural elevation and floorplan renderings were submitted with the second submission of the application dated December 13, 2018 prepared by Stantec. These renderings were revised and resubmitted with the third submission of the application dated May 10, 2019.

Town Plan Central Planning Area Objective 1 recommends, “[E]nsure development reinforces the desired character of the Central Planning Area”, i.e., the pattern of the Old and Historic District as a guide for new development. (Town Plan pg. 6-11). In addition, Objective 1 goes on to provide, “Design buildings, including size, height, location, scale, massing, color, roofline, and materials to enrich the character of Leesburg” (Town Plan pg. 5-3). This is the guiding language staff used to measure the elevation renderings submitted for review. See Paragraph E. Architecture below for a full discussion on the review and comments on the architectural renderings submitted with this application.

b. Land Use, General Objective 11: This objective states, “encourage infill development that is compatible with the character of existing or planned development in the vicinity.” (Town Plan pg. 6-9). Given the proposed increased intensity of the school use and the fact that it is not intended as just a local neighborhood school but will serve students throughout Loudoun County and Leesburg, compatibility is achieved through site design that includes the location of facilities and access, building height, scale and massing, and buffering between different uses. Some comments about aspects of compatibility are made below and others will be made after review of the required architectural elevations.

c. Land Use General Objective 12: Provide institutional uses, such as schools, libraries, and government facilities throughout the Town. In pertinent part:

i. Facilities should be compatible in scale and design with existing or planned development in the vicinity.
See Paragraph E below for an analysis of the building design and architecture and its compatibility with the neighboring uses.

ii. **Facilities should not have a negative impact in terms of automobile traffic, noise, lighting, and visibility.**

   See responses to Special Exception Approval Criteria provided in Paragraph G below.

See staff review comments 11 – 15 and Section VII Transportation for relative comments on traffic and parking.

![Figure 5 Planned Land Use](image)

**Figure 5 Planned Land Use**

C. **Zoning and Building Setbacks:** Whereas the exiting building provides setbacks far in excess of the R-4 District minimums, the smaller building footprint presented by the proposed two-story design would actually increase setbacks from all property lines:
Table 4: Building Setbacks Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R-4 District</th>
<th>CS Monroe Setbacks</th>
<th>The North Star School Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front: 15’</td>
<td>Front: 132’</td>
<td>Front: 203’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side: 10’</td>
<td>Side E: 66’</td>
<td>Side E: 76’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side W: 233’</td>
<td>Side W: 303’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear: 20’</td>
<td>Rear: 129’</td>
<td>Rear: 209’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Zoning Modifications: No zoning modifications have been requested for this application.

E. Architecture: A waiver was allowed to delay the submission of elevation drawings as required by TLZO Sec. 3.4.6.E.11 to the 2nd submission of the application. With the 2nd submission, The Applicant provided architectural renderings entitled, New School on the CS Monroe Site Concept Design Presentation, dated December 13, 2018, prepared by Stantec showing floorplans, elevations and materials proposed for the new school facility. (Attachment 3) Those exterior elevations included the designs shown here:

Figure 6: View from bus drop-off
In the review of these architectural renderings, staff acknowledged that the subject property lies outside of either the H-1 or H-2 Overlay Districts. Thus, design review by the BAR is not required for this project. However, staff pointed out that the Town Plan Central Sector objectives guide new construction to model
design elements of the Old and Historic District (H-1), and to strive for human-scaled architecture and public space.

As the North Star School is proposed to be over 90,000 square feet and two-stories tall, staff was concerned with the potential impacts a building of this size could have on the primarily residential neighborhood where it is proposed. Turning to the recommendation of the Central Sector objectives to model new construction from the H-1 Design Guidelines, staff pointed out how the H-1 Guidelines seek to achieve human-scaled architecture for large institutional buildings through techniques to reduce massing. Those specific techniques that appear to be most effective, in the present case, are: (H-1 Guidelines, Chapter VII.F Massing and Complexity of Form):

a. **Vary the surface planes of the elevations.** Varying the surface planes of a large building may be a way to make structures more consistent with the design of smaller historic buildings. The differences in surface planes may be as little a one or as great as ten feet

b. **Break up the roofline.** Breaking up the roofline of larger buildings into smaller components may help reduce perceived mass of large buildings

c. **Use bay divisions on the elevations.** Create bay divisions on the façade of large buildings to allow the building to reflect the massing of smaller-scaled historic structures

d. **Vary the materials.** Use variations in materials, textures, patterns, colors, and detail to reduce the visual impact of the mass of large buildings.

Examples of these techniques are found in the architecture of institutional buildings throughout town. Some specific examples include Douglas Elementary School, Old Loudoun County Courthouse, Loudoun County Courthouse expansion, and the Loudoun County Courthouse Law Library. See Attachment 4 for pictures and illustrations describing how these same techniques might be employed on the proposed facility.

In response, the Applicant submitted revised conceptual elevations prepared by Stantec and dated May 10, 2019. (Attachment 5) Those revised exterior elevations included the designs shown here:
Figure 9: View from bus drop-off

Figure 10: View from parent drop-off
The Applicant states the May 10, 2019 revised conceptual design addressed staff’s comments by “breaking up the mass of the building into four smaller blocks. . . Each of the four blocks now sit on different planes…The once continuous roofline has been broken by the second story block rising higher than the rest.”, and “Additionally, the gym volume located in the middle building also punctures the roofline”. Next, the Applicant explains the glazing on the revised façade was intended to reduce the amount of glass expanse into “human scaled punched openings” that relate to the surrounding housing development. Lastly, the Applicant offers materials have been adjusted to horizontally cut the building in half: “The revised elevation has discernable levels as well as smaller massing blocks which should fit in well with the adjacent two-story houses”.

Staff finds that that when comparing the two design concepts presented for this project, the December 13 Concept Design better illustrates the massing and complexity of form techniques expressed in the H-1 Design Guidelines. The newer design lacks the detail of the previous design and does not contain the clear foundation – middle – cap, tripartite arrangement that is called for in both the H-1 and H-2 Design Guidelines. Staff believes this new concept moves the design further away from the traditional than the original design. Staff had commented on the first design that more traditional elements in the building would make it fit in better with the surrounding single-family detached residential neighborhood. The plainer, less adorned appearance of the May 10 design seems too severe given the context of this surrounding neighborhood. Provided below are staff’s specific
comments on the May 10 architectural renderings. The Applicant’s response to each follows in italics:

- The December 13 Concept shows better and more complex variation in surface planes through horizontal and vertical architectural elements and changes in building materials;
  - Each of the current elevations in the May 10 conceptual design has a minimum of two distinct planes of varying depths – the south and east elevations each have four planes and the north (front) elevation has five planes. There remain opportunities in the current concept to further develop the surface planes of the building while weighing constructability and cost. Refinement and detailing of the materials will be continued with consideration to further variation.

- There is not much difference in the variation of the roofline between the two Concepts. But what are now minor variations in the roofline can be made greater when the December 13 Concept is revised to accommodate the additional gfa proposed in this latest submission;
  - In the current May 10 concept, there is less area of raised roofline when compared to the December 13 concept; this has been isolated to the portion of the plan where the gym is located and is focused on the portion of the building that orients towards the Route 7 Bypass. Effort was made to minimize the massing relative to roofline on the portions of the building that orient toward residential neighbors. At this point in the project development, the footprint of the building has generally been fixed; adjusting the location of the larger volume spaces that influence the roofline will be challenging, however, LCPS will continue to look at options.

- Bay divisions expressed in the December 13 Concept are more clearly defined, more interesting and have the effect of breaking up the mass of the building into a more human-scale than the May 10 Concept;
  - In the current May 10 concept, bay divisions on the elevations have a more horizontal approach when compared to the December concept. This approach is rooted in the functional floor plan with the administrative functions now oriented along the front elevation with smaller scaled window openings allowing for observation of the site as well as creating an approachable human scale at the entry. The horizontal division of the two stories through a portion of the building also breaks the massing down in scale when compared to the verticality of the December concept. Variation through the detailing of surface planes will continue to be studied relative to this objective.
• Material variations in the December 13 conceptual design are more complex, more interesting, and more indicative of a traditional institutional building versus the May 10 Concept; and,
  
  o Materials will continue to be studied as the project develops to include consideration of expanses of glazing, varying planes of the elevation and utilization of textures and colors to further break down the massing of the building. At the current conceptual level of development, the proposed materials include brick, phenolic, polycarbonate and metal panels with glazing in varying textures and color to create interest and reduce the scale of the building. The exterior details will also work to further reduce the visual impact in the larger planes of the building.

• The design change that creates a second story that cantilevers beyond the outer walls of the first story is completely opposite the H-1 massing reduction technique to step upper stories back where appropriate.
  
  o With the revisions required for the onsite vehicular circulation and the additional LPN class, care was taken to not enlarge the overall footprint of the building. By creating a step back on the first floor level for a portion of the building, the footprint was minimized. Functionally, with the revisions required for the bus loop relative to the site, the overhang of the cantilevered second floor provides coverage from inclement weather for student arrival and dismissal. The site does not have an urban streetscape where stepping back upper stories may be a more powerful strategy to reduce the perception of mass. The set back at the first floor level for a school provides a human scale entrance and practical coverage for weather.
  
  o In addition to the architectural elements, the building itself is set back more than 200’ from the Foxridge community and over 300’ from the Park View Estates community.

The latest response by the Applicant explains the design of The North Star School is presently at the conceptual level, and LCPS remains open to comments on design as the application progresses through the Town’s approval process. Staff believes more analysis and collaboration on the school design is necessary given its context surrounded by three single-family detached neighborhoods.

F. Site Design:

Frontage Improvements: Variation Request: The Subdivision and Land Development Regulations (SLDR) Sec. 4.02(g) requires full frontage improvements to be made along the street frontage of a property that is subject to a land development application. In the present case, Childrens Center Road along
the frontage of the Subject Property does not have full curb, gutter and/or sidewalk improvements in place.

Because of specific conditions/constraints existing along the Children Center Road frontage, it is impractical to complete certain frontage improvements at present as described in Attachment 7.

Thus, pursuant to SLDR Sec. 6.03 Variation, the Applicant has submitted a request for variation of Sec. 4.02(g) to the Commission to allow a waiver and/or modification of specific frontage improvement requirements described in the July 24, 2019 Variation Request Letter. (Attachment 6)

The Commission shall note that pursuant to SLDR Sec 6.03(g), the Planning Commission shall determine whether the potential public impacts of the variation being requested warrant a public hearing. Such a public hearing would be separate from the present public hearing on the public school use special exception. Due to the nature of this particular variation request, staff recommends that a separate public hearing is not warranted as explained in Attachment 7.

Transportation:
1. Frontage improvements shall be provided per the results of the pending Planning Commission Frontage Improvements Variation Request.

2. In coordination with the Town Transportation Engineer, additional pavement markings shall be provided adjacent to the cross walk at the entrance of the site that meet applicable MUTCD criteria to clearly delineate the center lane as "Bus Lane Only".

Stormwater Management:
1. As previously coordinated with the July 11th PDFs, and discussed with DPR engineers, the Bioretention designs (plan/profiles) and calculations shall be revised to meet the following criteria:
   a. Minimum Surface Area and Treatment Volume provided per the 2013 VRRM BMP Clearinghouse Specification No. 9 criteria.
   b. Top width of Bioretention B shall be shown with additional spot shots, labels, and/or half contours to provide the required 2 feet of freeboard in the maximum design storm (25 yr. for Town Branch Watershed).

2. As previously coordinated with the July 2411 PDFs, the Overland Relief design shall provide a pre and post development analysis of the On Site Contributing Drainage Area to the Southern property line am/ South Eastern Outfall as depicted by cross section A-A on the attachment. The site plan shall not have any adverse overland relief impacts to any downstream properties due to this development.
3. At the time of site plan, provide a pre and post development analysis to verify there are no downstream impacts in the 25 yr. storm due to the addition volume of water routed through the bioretention and into the storm sewer system.

G. **Traffic Impact Analysis:** Staff is satisfied with the results of the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Gorove/Slade and submitted with the application that shows no diminishment on the Levels of Service (LOS) at the site entrances or on the streets leading to/from the Property.

H. **Parking:** The total number of required parking spaces for the use has been calculated utilizing a combination of the minimum parking calculations for School, High School and University, College and Similar Institutions. The decision to do this is based on the different natures of the daytime uses of The North Star School.

The Alternative Education Program serves high school and middle school students who are required to report to their home schools each morning and bus transportation is provided from each high school/middle school to the North Star School. LCPS calculates that the majority of the anticipated Alternative Education students will not be of driving age. Based on observations of student driving at the current Alternative Education Program, LCPS anticipates approximately 150 students might drive to school regularly. Because of the lower rate of anticipated daily drivers compared to total student population, it is reasonable to apply the parking standard for School, High School from TLZO Sec. 11.3 to the maximum programmed student population at the facility.

The Adult Education Program will not provide enrollees with LCPS transportation services. Thus, it is safe to assume that 100 percent of all enrollees may drive to the facility on class days. As such, the higher parking standard University, College or Similar Institution is reasonable for use to calculate Adult Education Program parking demands.

School, High School standard requires one space per 2.5 classroom seats yields the following: (450 students/1 space for every 2.5 classroom seats = 180 spaces plus 20 visitor spaces) for 200 spaces. The University/College standard applied to the 120 adult education students yields (120 students/1 space for every 1.67 students = 71 spaces plus 20 visitor spaces) for 91 spaces total.

Combined, the two standards result in 291 spaces. The off-street parking facility shown on the Plat provides a total of 367 parking spaces on the Property. The proposed number of spaces, although greater than the minimum required by the Zoning Ordinance parking regulations, reflects the actual anticipated need at full enrollment as provided below:
### Student Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+/- 150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Daytime Adult Ed Enrollees</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parking spaces needed to meet daily anticipated demand at the planned facility</td>
<td>+/- 370 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff is satisfied that the proposed parking facility will adequately address the anticipated parking demand generated by the daytime use of the facility. Nighttime class programming will generate parking demands significantly less than the daytime operations.

### I. Specific Special Exception Use Standards

There are no specific use standards established in TLZO Article 9 for School, Public uses.

### J. Special Exception Approval Requirements

Zoning Ordinance Section 3.4.12 establishes the following criteria for the Planning Commission and Town Council to use, in addition to other reasonable considerations, in making their decision regarding approval or disapproval of a special exception application. Listed below are the specific criteria with Applicant’s answers to each provided in the Statement of Justification revised dated May 15, 2019. The Applicant submitted responses to these criteria found on pages 3 - 7 of the Statement of Justification revised dated May 15, 2019, attached hereto as Attachment 2. Staff’s comments on the Applicant’s responses to each criterion is provided below:

#### a. “The proposed use will not adversely affect the use of neighboring properties”.

The neighboring residential developments have grown up around the former CS Monroe Technology Center. The residents of those developments have become accustomed to the operations of the former school. The proposed North Star School will be over 10,000 square-feet larger, two-stories tall, and serve up to 300 more students per day than the former CS Monroe Technology Center. However, certain economies are realized on the Property that help to provide greater mitigation measures that will work to minimize or eliminate any potential adverse impacts that might have otherwise been created by the introduction of this large of a school facility on this site.

Staff concurs with the response provided by the Applicant in the Statement of Justification (Attachment 2) that explains the use will not adversely affect neighboring properties through:

1. Compliance with the objectives of the Major Institutional land use policies of the Town Plan;
2. Wider setbacks separating the use from neighboring residential developments to the north and south, and from the Foxridge Park on the east of the Property;
3. With wider setbacks, existing tree preservation and buffer and screening enhancements can be provided all around the proposed building. The greatest buffer/screening enhancements will be realized between the use and the Foxridge properties to the south; and,
4. Frontage improvements along Childrens Center Road and the consolidation of the two existing driveways into one will help to make for safer conditions along this segment of the road near the school.

b. “The use shall comply with applicable zoning district regulations and applicable provisions of the adopted Town Plan, including but not limited to the Plan’s Land Use Compatibility policies.”

Staff concurs that the proposed facility is in compliance with all applicable development standards relating to the R-4 Zoning District, parking, lighting and landscaping standards. As expressed previously, the use is also compliant with applicable provisions of the Town Plan. Although, staff still has concerns with the building design as expressed previously under Paragraph “E” above.

Parking. Staff concurs that adequate provision has been made to address the actual parking demands generated by the proposed facility as explained in Paragraph H above.

Landscaping. Staff concurs with the Applicant’s response that landscaping and screening will be provided in accordance with the zoning ordinance standards. Additional evergreen trees have been incorporated along the common property boundary with the Foxridge community to provide a denser, year-round buffer.

Lighting. Staff concurs with the Applicant’s response. That site lighting will be provided for safety and security. Building and parking lot lighting will be full-cutoff, directed downward and inward toward the property. Light pole location will exceed the minimum distance of 10 feet from the property line. The maximum light pole height will be 25 feet.

Highway Noise. Staff concurs with the Applicant’s response explaining how the site will be developed to comply with and/or exceed the established noise mitigation standards of the Noise Abatement Corridor (NAC) overlay zoning district. Specifically, noise attenuation will be achieved through a combination of the building being separated from the Leesburg Bypass by 300 feet. In addition, building construction will incorporate noise attenuation measures to provide a maximum interior background noise level for core learning spaces at or below 35 dB(A).

Energy. Staff acknowledges LCPS’ commitment to and consistent award-winning efforts relating to Energy Star Sustained Excellence Award and Energy
Star Partner of the Year Award. LCPS has been an Energy Star Partner for twenty years and is committed to reducing costs and promoting energy efficiency. LCPS implements a comprehensive approach to sustainability by incorporating measures from leading programs including Energy Star, Green Globe, LEED, and the U.S. Department of Energy into design, construction and operational practices. LCPS has committed to implementing the same practices in the development, and ultimate use, of the proposed facility.

**Community Services.** Staff concurs with the Applicant’s response that the proposed facility will continue to provide services to the community. More specifically, educational opportunities will be provided for LCPS middle and high school students, as well as adults in the Loudoun community.

c. *The location, size, and, height of buildings, structures, walls, and fences, and the nature and extent of screening, buffering, and landscaping shall be such that the use will not hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent or nearby land and/or buildings.*

As more thoroughly expressed previously under Paragraph “E” above, it is staff’s opinion, the architectural elevations presented in the Dec. 13, 2018 Concept Design Presentation (Attachment 3) are more appropriate for the location of the facility within the Central Planning Policy Area, and in a predominately residential portion thereof.

d. “The proposed use will be such that pedestrian and vehicular traffic generated will not be hazardous or conflict with the existing and anticipated traffic in the neighborhood and on the streets serving the site.”

The Traffic Impact Analysis by Gorove/Slade indicates that traffic generated by the proposed North Star School will not degrade the Level of Service (LOS) below acceptable levels along the streets and intersections serving the site. Staff is satisfied that transportation/pedestrian facilities have been satisfactorily addressed by the application.

**Conclusion:** Staff concurs that overall the application is generally consistent with the goals and objectives of applicable chapters of the Town Plan relating to Land Use (Chapter 6) and Community Facilities and Services (Chapter 10). Staff also finds the special exception to be compliant with the applicable special exception approval requirements.

**K. Recommended Conditions of Approval:** Zoning Ordinance Section 3.4.14 grants Town Council the authority to impose conditions and safeguards deemed necessary for the protection of general welfare and individual property rights. Such conditions may relate to topics including hours of operation, noise, and buffering. Staff recommends the Planning Commission move this application on to Council with the following minimum conditions of approval listed below:
1. **Substantial Conformance:** Development of this property shall be in substantial conformance with the plan set entitled “The North Star School at CS Monroe Property TLSE-2018-0008”, dated July 31, 2018, revised through July 12, 2019, prepared by J2 Engineers, Inc. (herein referred to as the “Plat”), with reasonable allowances to be made for engineering and design alteration to meet Town Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, Zoning Ordinance or Design and Construction Standards Manual requirements.

2. **No Waivers Expressed or Implied:** Approval of this special exception does not express or imply any waiver or modification of the requirements set forth in the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations, the Zoning Ordinance, or the Design and Construction Standards Manual, except as may have been approved as part of this application. Final plats, site plans, and construction drawings are subject to the applicable town regulations.

3. **Childrens Center Road Frontage Improvements:** Childrens Center Road frontage improvements required pursuant to DCSM Sec. 4.02(g) shall be provided per the results of the pending Planning Commission Frontage Improvements Variation Request submitted by the letter dated July 24, 2019 by J2 Engineering, Inc.

4. **Pavement Markings:** At the time of site plan review, in coordination with the Town Transportation Engineer, additional pavement markings shall be provided adjacent to the cross walk at the entrance of the site that meet applicable MUTCD criteria to clearly delineate the center lane as "Bus Lane Only".

5. **Bioretention Design:** The Bioretention designs (plan/profiles) and calculations shall be revised to meet the following criteria:
   a. Minimum Surface Area and Treatment Volume provided per the 2013 VRRM BMP Clearinghouse Specification No. 9 criteria.
   b. Top width of Bioretention B shall be shown with additional spot shots, labels, and/or half contours to provide the required 2 feet of freeboard in the maximum design storm (25yr. for Town Branch Watershed).

6. **Overland Relief:** At the time of site plan review, the Overland Relief design shall provide a pre and post development analysis of the On Site Contributing Drainage Area to the Southern property line am/ South Eastern Outfall as depicted by cross section A-A on the attachment. The site plan shall not have any adverse overland relief impacts to any downstream properties due to this development.
7. **Pre/Post Development Analyses:** At the time of site plan review, provide a pre and post development analysis to verify there are no downstream impacts in the 25 yr. storm due to the addition volume of water routed through the bioretention and into the storm sewer system.

VI. **Findings for Approval:**

A. The use is consistent with the goals and objectives of Land Use Policy type Major Institutional found in Chapter 6 of the *Town Plan*; and

B. The use is consistent with the goal of Town Plan Chapter 10, Community Facilities & Services, to serve Leesburg with community facilities and services in a cost-effective, equitable, and environmentally sensitive manner by providing high quality technology and communications services pursuant to Objective 13 and;

C. The use complies with applicable regulations of the R-4 Single-Family Residential Zoning District provided in TLZO Sec. 5.4 and;

D. The proposal would serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.

VII. **Attachments:**

2. Applicant’s Statement of Justification dated July 31, 2018, updated May 15, 2019
3. Concept Design Presentation, dated Dec. 13, 2018, prepared by Stantec
4. Staff review sketches on Dec. 13, 2018 Concept Design Presentation.
5. Concept Design Presentation, dated May 10, 2019, prepared by Stantec
6. SLDR Variation Request, dated July 24, 2019, from J2 Engineers, Inc.
7. SLDR Variation Staff Report, dated August 1, 2019, prepared by DPR