

A G E N D A
JAMES CITY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
January 20, 2021
3:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. This meeting will be held electronically pursuant to the Continuity of Government Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 14, 2020 and readopted on September 8, 2020. The meeting will be accessible through a Zoom audio meeting. Please go to <https://zoom.us/j/99214800408> or call 301-715-8592 and enter the meeting ID 992 1480 0408. Citizen comments may be submitted via U.S. Mail to the Planning Commission Secretary, P.O. Box 8784, Williamsburg, VA 23187, via electronic mail to community.development@jamescitycountyva.gov, or by leaving a message at 757-253-6750. Comments must be submitted no later than noon on the day of the meeting. Please provide your name and address for the public record.

B. ROLL CALL

1. Electronic Meeting Resolution

C. MINUTES

1. October 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes

D. OLD BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. C-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

F. ADJOURNMENT

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 1/20/2021

TO: The Development Review Committee

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: January 20, 2021 Meeting Details

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
	Zoom Instructions	Backup Material

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Development Review Committee	Baruch, Alex	Approved	1/11/2021 - 8:35 AM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:15 PM
Publication Management	Burcham, Nan	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:16 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:17 PM

Zoom Instructions for Participants before a Meeting

1. You will need a computer, tablet, or smartphone with speaker or headphones. You will have the opportunity to check your audio immediately upon joining a meeting.
2. You will receive notice for a videoconference or conference call via email. The notification will include a link to “Join via computer” as well as phone numbers for a conference call option. It will also include the 9-digit (usually) Meeting ID.

Join the Videoconference

1. At the start time of your meeting, click on the link in your invitation to join via computer. You may be instructed to download the Zoom application.
2. You have an opportunity to test your computer’s audio and microphone at this point by clicking on “Test Computer Audio.” Once you are satisfied that your audio works, click on “Join audio by computer.”

You may also join a meeting without clicking on the invitation link by going to join.zoom.us on any browser and entering the Meeting ID provided by your committee analyst.


Join Audio via Phone (Recommended for best connection)

If you have sluggish internet connection, your computer or phone lacks a microphone, or for issues with hearing the audio, you can join via telephone while remaining on the video conference:

1. On your phone, dial the teleconferencing number provided in your invitation.
2. Enter the Meeting ID number (also provided in your invitation) when prompted using your touch-tone keypad.
3. If you have already joined the meeting via computer, you will have the option to enter your 2-digit participant ID to be associated with your computer.

During the Meeting

Using the participant controls in the lower left corner of the Zoom screen you can:



- Mute/Unmute your microphone (far left)
- Turn on/off camera (“Start/Stop Video”)
- Invite other participants
- View Participant list – opens a pop-out screen that includes a “Raise Hand” icon that you may use to raise a virtual hand
- Change your screen name that is seen in the participant list and video window
- Share your screen

On your Zoom screen you will also see a choice to toggle between “speaker” and “gallery” view. “Speaker view” shows the active speaker. “Gallery view” tiles all of the meeting participants (like a grid).

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 1/20/2021

TO: The Development Review Committee

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: Electronic Meeting Resolution

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
	Resolution	Resolution

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Development Review Committee	Baruch, Alex	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:11 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:20 PM
Publication Management	Burcham, Nan	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:21 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/11/2021 - 4:24 PM

RESOLUTION

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE ELECTRONIC MEETING

- WHEREAS, on March 24, 2020, the James City County Board of Supervisors (the “Board”) adopted an emergency Ordinance to ensure the continuity of government in response to the coronavirus pandemic negatively affecting the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of James City County (the “County”); and
- WHEREAS, on April 14, 2020 and September 8, 2020, the Board readopted the continuity of government Ordinance (the “Ordinance”), which, under certain circumstances, permits the Board and its subordinate boards, committees, and commissions to conduct regularly scheduled, special, or emergency meetings solely by electronic or telephonic means without a quorum of members physically present (a “Virtual Meeting”); and
- WHEREAS, the Development Review Committee is a committee of the Planning Commission, a subordinate appointed commission of the Board, and is therefore eligible to conduct a Virtual Meeting; and
- WHEREAS, the Development Review Committee desires to conduct a Virtual Meeting on January 20, 2021, at which time those items listed on the agenda attached hereto (the “Agenda”) will be considered; and
- WHEREAS, each of the members of the Development Review Committee have reviewed each of the items listed on the Agenda and have determined that consideration of each is necessary to ensure the continuation of the essential functions of the government during the emergency described in the Ordinance.
- NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Development Review Committee of James City County, Virginia, hereby finds and declares that immediate consideration of each of the items set forth in the Agenda is necessary to ensure the continuation of essential functions of the government during the emergency declared by the Board and further described in the Ordinance.

Jack Haldeman, Jr.
Chairman, Development Review Committee

ATTEST:		VOTES		
		<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>
	HALDEMAN	_____	_____	_____
	LEVERENZ	_____	_____	_____
	NULL	_____	_____	_____
	POLSTER	_____	_____	_____
	KRAPF	_____	_____	_____

Paul D. Holt, III
Secretary to the Planning Commission

Adopted by the Development Review Committee of James City County, Virginia, this 20th day of January, 2021.

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 1/20/2021

TO: The Development Review Committee

FROM: Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary

SUBJECT: October 21, 2020 Meeting Minutes

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
	Minutes of the October 21, 2020 DRC Meeting	Minutes

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Development Review Committee	Baruch, Alex	Approved	1/13/2021 - 1:26 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/13/2021 - 2:00 PM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	1/13/2021 - 2:04 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/13/2021 - 2:05 PM

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
October 21, 2020
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. This meeting will be held electronically pursuant to the Continuity of Government Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 14, 2020 and readopted on September 8, 2020. The meeting will be accessible through a Zoom audio meeting. Please go to <https://zoom.us/j/98796861823> or call 301-715-8592 and enter the meeting ID 987 9686 1823. Citizen comments may be submitted via U.S. Mail to the Planning Commission Secretary, P.O. Box 8784, Williamsburg, VA 23187, via electronic mail to community.development@jamescitycountyva.gov, or by leaving a message at 757-253-6750. Comments must be submitted no later than noon on the day of the meeting. Please provide your name and address for the public record.

B. ROLL CALL

1. Electronic Meeting Resolution

Mr. Jack Haldeman called the Development Review Committee (DRC) meeting to order at 4 p.m. He called the roll and read the electronic meeting resolution.

Ms. Barbara Null made a motion to Adopt the electronic meeting resolution.

The resolution was adopted by a voice vote of 5-0.

Present:

Jack Haldeman, Chair
Rich Krapf
Julie Leverenz
Barbara Null
Frank Polster

Staff in Attendance:

Alex Baruch, Acting Principal Planner
Thomas Wysong, Senior Planner
Katie Pelletier, Community Development Assistant

C. MINUTES

1. September 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Julie Leverenz motioned to Approve the September 23, 2020 DRC meeting minutes.

On a voice vote, the Motion passed 5-0.

D. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. C-20-0079 Forest Heights Phase III

Mr. Thomas Wysong addressed the Committee and stated that Mr. Greg Warren of Landtech Resources, Inc. has submitted a conceptual plan for Phase III of Forest Heights consisting of 46 affordable townhouse units on the property formerly owned by the Salvation Army. Mr. Wysong noted that the Board of Supervisors initiated and approved a rezoning for this parcel and the rest of the Forest Heights neighborhood from Mixed Use to Residential Redevelopment with Proffers in 2019, along with the approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) for a 50-unit independent living facility adjacent to Richmond Road.

Mr. Wysong stated that the proffers, approved by the Board of Supervisors as part of the rezoning, require development of the property to be as shown on the amended master plan. He explained that the current application for 46 affordable townhouses includes several changes from the adopted master plan, including: changes to parking locations and counts; the location of several townhouse units; and the scale and size of stormwater management facilities. Mr. Wysong told the Committee that staff does not find the proposal consistent with the master plan, and the applicant has appealed to the DRC.

Mr. Wysong stated that, in particular, staff considers the size, scale, and the significant grading and depth of Best Management Practice (BMP) No. 3 to be significant alterations to the character of land uses for this development. He explained that the proposed BMP replaces the previously approved location of residential units and breaks up the continuity of the proposed residential structures facing the road. He added that the scale and depth of the BMP and its proximity to adjacent homes could have a detrimental effect on the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Wysong said this is especially notable when compared to the approved master plan, which shows the BMP with low impact design and screened behind these units.

Mr. Wysong said that staff also finds the elimination of the off-street parking adjacent to Forest Heights Road potentially problematic. He said this could result in an increase of on-street parking and traffic congestion, two areas of concern from citizens during the public hearing process for the Forest Heights rezoning and SUP. He stated that the location of the dry swale in the landscape buffer on the southern portion of the property also has the potential to negatively impact residential property in the existing Forest Heights neighborhood.

Mr. Wysong summarized that staff recommends that the DRC find the proposed conceptual plan to be inconsistent with the master plan approved by the Board of Supervisors as part of Case No. Z-19-0012 and Case No. SUP-19-0020. He said that if the DRC were to find the alternate layout consistent, staff recommends they require fencing for BMP No. 3 to ensure safety. Mr. Wysong said he would be happy to answer any questions from the Committee, and the applicant team is also available.

Ms. Leverenz asked if garages were included with the units.

Mr. Wysong replied yes, garages were included in the elevations submitted with the rezoning and proffers.

Mr. William Felts from Landtech Resources, Inc. replied yes, most of the units will have garages.

Mr. Frank Polster asked if anyone from the Stormwater Resource Protection Division (SRP) was present at the meeting.

Mr. Alex Baruch replied no.

Mr. Polster commented on the unfavorable stormwater considerations mentioned by Mr. Wysong. He asked the applicant about any mitigation of the factors.

Mr. Felts replied yes, they submitted the detailed conceptual plan to address stormwater concerns, and SRP was satisfied from a regulatory standpoint.

Mr. Polster said he had heard from Ms. Deirdre Wells that SRP was satisfied with the revised master plan. He asked about landscape screening, fencing, and buffering with shrubbery around BMP No. 3.

Mr. Felts said they will add a retaining wall around Lot No. 1 to fix the grading, and there would be a decorative fence in the area for safety purposes, as well as landscape screening.

Mr. Polster asked how many of the large trees they would be able to retain in that area.

Mr. Felts replied at least 15, but they have not yet located individual trees. He said there are existing and required buffers, and landscaping can be put back onto the slopes.

Mr. Polster said he did not think the loss of visitor parking was a big problem, since some housing units were removed. He thanked Mr. Felts for answering his questions.

Mr. Rich Krapf asked about potential safety concerns regarding the slope to BMP No. 3 near the retaining wall location by Lot No. 1.

Mr. Felts replied the slope for the detention basin is relatively shallow and not severe, and maximum potential water from heavy rains would be 30-40 feet away from the base of the wall.

Mr. Krapf asked about the topography shown above Unit No. 4.

Mr. Felts replied it was grading detail associated with the lots.

Mr. Krapf said he was initially concerned with the removal of parking spaces. He asked if Units No. 1-4 will all have garages.

Mr. Felts replied it would depend on how buyers choose to finish the designs, if they would like a garage.

Mr. Krapf asked about the decision to take out units and parking. He asked why the changes were needed, and if the decision was driven by the Salvation Army sale.

Mr. Felts replied there is no change to the total number of units proposed as some were only relocated. He said the decision was driven by stormwater considerations. He noted a very tall retaining wall would have been required behind the units at a large cost, so the units were moved to alleviate that issue. Regarding the parking, Mr. Felts replied that they simply ran out of room. He noted that making driveways wider to accommodate two cars would not be a big change, and a visitors' parking lot often fills up with trailers or inoperable vehicles.

Mr. Doug Harbin, Forest Heights applicant from Wayne Harbin Builders, Inc., commented that they did not have the full topography initially, and they are trying to make the project both affordable and safe. He said they are trying to exceed the stormwater management standards.

Mr. Felts added they are exceeding the minimum stormwater requirements, and there will also be drainage to the wet pond located in Phase I of Forest Heights. He said cost is also a

factor.

Mr. Harbin noted the safety concerns having a larger, taller retaining wall behind units with likely first-time homeowners with small children.

Mr. Haldeman asked about the roads, if they are two-lane roads with any room for on-street parking.

Mr. Felts replied the roads are two lanes, with no room for on-street parking.

Mr. Haldeman asked if two cars fit at each property.

Mr. Felts replied yes, a car would fit in the garage and in the driveway, out of the way of sidewalks.

Mr. Krapf asked if this was definite.

Mr. Felts said those are the established measurements, and most buyers choose designs with garages.

Mr. Haldeman asked how the other units would be affected by the relocation of the four units.

Mr. Felts said the units were added on to existing planned units, so a four-plex turned into a five-plex for example.

Mr. Haldeman asked if they had spoken with current residents in the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Harbin replied no. He said moving new units further away and lowering the potential for traffic seem to be positive changes.

Mr. Felts said the new houses abutting the existing neighborhood will not be noticeable given the landscape buffering.

Mr. Haldeman thanked Mr. Felts and Mr. Harbin and asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Polster said he read the extensive stormwater comments. He said they help to understand the changes. He said he had no other questions.

Ms. Leverenz commented her biggest concern is the loss of 17 parking spaces. She asked about the possibility of two parking spaces in some of the driveways, since many people do not park vehicles in their garage. She said extra driveway space is also ideal for families with children and play or sport equipment.

Mr. Krapf said he is not concerned about replacing all 17 lost parking spaces, since many residents would rely on public transportation or carpooling. He said he would like to see some parking reinstalled if possible as an enhancement. Mr. Krapf said, regarding master plan consistency, he understands there were significant but necessary changes due to stormwater requirements. He said the project is very important and recommends there is master plan consistency. He asked if they would have to go back through the legislative process otherwise.

Mr. Wysong replied yes.

Ms. Leverenz said for consistency, it would be important to reinstate the 17 parking spaces.

She said the stormwater BMP changes and consolidation of units make sense, creating higher density and larger greenspace.

Mr. Haldeman asked if adding the parking spaces would affect the number of units.

Mr. Felts replied the most practical solution is to widen driveways for two vehicles.

Mr. Wysong remarked that the Planning Director would want to look at such a proposed change as a master plan consistency issue with changes to character and amount of impervious surface.

Mr. Baruch added the proposed widening of driveways would affect the greenspaces between driveways and overall design character approved during the legislative process. He said there would need to be a Planning Director determination, with a possible appeal to the DRC of that decision. He noted today the DRC narrow scope is looking at the removal of the 17 parking spaces and other changes noted.

Ms. Leverenz said they do not need double the amount of parking and do not want to lose all the greenspace. She remarked homeowners will have some say in the configuration and asked if they could remain flexible, if it is likely that at least 17 homeowners would prefer the extra parking space.

Mr. Harbin noted the extra width for additional parking would not be a major change, and some greenspace and shrubbery would remain between units. He said they would be happy to return and present information to the Planning Director.

Mr. Haldeman asked about their latitude to determine consistency. He said he agrees this is an important affordable housing project, though master plan consistency issues remain. He said he believes the project would work without the 17 parking spaces.

Mr. Krapf suggested the applicant work with staff to lessen the impact of existing changes, then come back to the DRC to determine consistency.

Mr. Haldeman asked if they could provide the applicant with consistency guidelines so they would not need to return to the DRC.

Mr. Krapf said yes, and it would go through the Planning Commission as a Consent Agenda item.

Mr. Polster asked if they could determine consistency now with a new parking proposal.

Mr. Baruch replied it would first need to be considered by the Planning Director.

Mr. Polster asked if they could recommend consistency if staff examines and accommodates as best possible the reinstatement of 17 parking spaces with the applicant.

Mr. Baruch replied yes, and the Planning Director would appreciate specifics to give staff direction or conditions.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Leverenz motioned that the DRC finds the revised plan inconsistent with the master plan, but they would find it consistent if the applicant can find a way with County staff to reinstate the 17 parking spaces removed from the plan.

Mr. Krapf asked what would happen if staff and the applicant cannot find a compromise or can only reinstate 14 parking spaces.

Ms. Leverenz said they could rephrase the motion to reinstate “a substantial number” of the lost 17 parking spaces.

Mr. Haldeman said he would vote no on the motion, since he finds the existing changes consistent with the master plan.

Mr. Polster said he is fine letting the applicant and staff work it out and would not want the issue of parking to hold up the project.

Mr. Krapf agreed and said he liked the reworded motion to give flexibility.

Mr. Polster agreed.

Mr. Baruch asked if substantial meant more than 50 percent of the lost 17 parking spaces.

Mr. Polster clarified, at least 50 percent.

Mr. Haldeman restated the motion that they find the proposal consistent with the master plan, with the condition that the applicant work with staff to reinstate at least 50 percent of the removed parking spaces.

The motion passed on a voice vote of 5-0.

Mr. Haldeman asked if there were any further comments.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haldeman thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

Ms. Null motioned to Adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m. after a unanimous voice vote of 5-0.

Mr. Jack Haldeman, Chair

Mr. Paul Holt, Secretary

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 1/20/2021

TO: The Development Review Committee

FROM: Thomas Wysong, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: C-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
▣	Staff Report	Staff Report
▣	Attachment 1: Conceptual Plan	Exhibit
▣	Attachment 2: Stonehouse Master Plan	Exhibit
▣	Attachment 3: Proffers	Exhibit

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Development Review Committee	Baruch, Alex	Approved	1/13/2021 - 4:45 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/13/2021 - 4:46 PM
Publication Management	Daniel, Martha	Approved	1/13/2021 - 4:50 PM
Development Review Committee	Holt, Paul	Approved	1/13/2021 - 4:50 PM

CONCEPTUAL PLAN-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

Staff Report for the January 20, 2021, Development Review Committee Meeting

SUMMARY FACTS

Applicant:	Mr. William Felts
Land Owner:	SCP-JTL Stonehouse Owner 1 LLC
Proposal:	New construction of 116 single-family detached lots and 64 single-family attached lots for a total of 180 units. Proffer 10, approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 12, 2019 per Case No. Z-19-0010 requires a conceptual plan to be submitted to the Planning Director and the Development Review Committee (DRC) for review at least 60 days prior to submittal of a development plan for the tract (or Land Bay). The purpose of this review is to determine general consistency with Zoning Ordinance requirements, the adopted master plan, and other applicable County policies.
Locations:	9370 Fieldstone Parkway, 9354 Fieldstone Parkway, and 9360 Fieldstone Parkway
Tax Map/Parcel Nos.:	0530100009, 0440100025, and 0440100030
Project Acreage:	72.42. acres
Current Zoning:	Planned Unit Development Residential (PUD-R) with Proffers
Comprehensive Plan:	Mixed Use-Stonehouse
Primary Service Area (PSA):	Inside
Staff Contact:	Thomas Wysong, Senior Planner

REASON FOR DRC REVIEW

Proffer 10, approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 12, 2019 per Case No. Z-19-0010, requires a conceptual plan to be submitted to the Planning Director and the DRC for review at least 60 days prior to submittal of a development plan for the tract (or Land Bay). The purpose of this review is to determine general consistency with Zoning Ordinance requirements, the adopted master plan, and other applicable County policies.

FACTORS FAVORABLE

1. This conceptual plan complies with the approved master plan for Stonehouse, aligning with the land use designations, maximum units permitted, and permitted density for Land Bay 5.
2. This conceptual plan layout complies with the zoning requirements for PUD-R and the majority of applicable proffers.
3. The conceptual plan layout complies with other applicable County policies, which were evaluated during the course of the 2019 rezoning and master plan and proffer amendment for Stonehouse (Case Nos. Z-18-0002, MP-18-0002, and Z-19-0010).
4. The proposed units proposed for this conceptual plan comply with the unit caps proffered for the Stonehouse development.
5. The conceptual plan complies with the approved proffers applicable to Land Bay 5.

FACTORS UNFAVORABLE

1. None.

This staff report is prepared by the James City County Planning Division to provide information to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to assist them in making a recommendation on this application. It may be useful to members of the general public interested in this application.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

Staff Report for the January 20, 2021, Development Review Committee Meeting

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the DRC find the proposed conceptual plan to be generally consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, adopted master plan, adopted proffers, and other applicable County policies.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This proposal is for new construction of 116 single-family detached lots and 64 single-family attached lots for a total of 180 units on Land Bay 5 within the Stonehouse development. This property is governed by the approved Stonehouse Master Plan and proffers (Case Nos. MP-18-0002 and Z-19-0010).

PROJECT HISTORY

The Stonehouse PUD was originally approved in November 1991 as a mixed residential/commercial community with a proposed reservoir. Since the original approval, a number of changes have been made including a number of minor proffer amendments between 1991 and 1994, the removal of language pertaining to the Ware Creek Reservoir after permitting did not succeed in 1995, and a rezoning in 1999 that incorporated a 75-acre tract into the development. The existing development in Stonehouse, including the golf course and neighborhoods on Mill Pond Run and the Stonehouse Glen neighborhood on Fieldstone Parkway, occurred over the years by several corporations including Stonehouse Development Corporation and Stonehouse at Williamsburg. In 2006, the majority of the undeveloped land was sold to GS Stonehouse Greenland Sub, LLC ("GS Stonehouse"). In 2008, GS Stonehouse received approval for comprehensive changes for this remaining land, thoroughly revising both the Master Plan and proffers. The area that was not owned by GS Stonehouse in 2008 has continued forward under the 1999 Master Plan and proffers, while the land owned by GS Stonehouse has continued forward under the 2008 Master Plan and proffers.

In 2012, the Board of Supervisors approved an amendment relating to the dedication of conservation easements within the property. In 2015, the Board of Supervisors approved amendments to the Transportation and Economic Development proffers; of most significance, the Transportation proffer was amended to re-sequence the order of the proffered improvements by focusing on the transportation improvements necessary to support the western/southern portion of the development and waiting to determine the triggers and/or schedule for the proffered transportation improvements needed to serve the eastern and northern portions of the property, including the major new internal road (the "Bridge Road"), by providing an updated traffic study to the County that would specify this information prior to any development occurring in that area.

In addition to these legislative cases, the Planning Commission's DRC has approved a number of modifications and unit location transfers over the years that were deemed to not change the overall concept or character of the development.

In 2019, the Board of Supervisors approved the rezoning of an approximately 2,659.6-acre portion of James City County Real Estate Tax Map Parcel No. 0630100005 from PUD-R, to A-1, General Agricultural, along with the granting of restrictive use easements over this area. Additionally, the Board approved amendments to the Stonehouse proffers and Master Plan, reduced the size of the PUD by approximately 2,659.6 acres, reduced the maximum permitted number of dwelling units and non-residential square footage, changed land use designations within the development, revised the approved proffers related to traffic improvements, community and recreational facilities, public sites, environmental protections, and other matters and adjusted the boundary line between PUD-Commercial (PUD-C) and PUD-Residential, including a small portion of Land Bay 5.

This staff report is prepared by the James City County Planning Division to provide information to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to assist them in making a recommendation on this application. It may be useful to members of the general public interested in this application.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

Staff Report for the January 20, 2021, Development Review Committee Meeting

SURROUNDING ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT

North: PUD-R with Proffers, Stone House Presbyterian Church/undeveloped land.

South: PUD-R and PUD-C, Route 30 and I-64.

East: PUD-R, undeveloped land.

West: PUD-R, undeveloped land.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The reason for this conceptual review is found in Proffer No. 10 of Case No. Z-19-0010, which states the following: “At least 60 days prior to submission of a development plan for all or any portion of a Tract, Owner shall submit a conceptual development plan for the development of the entire Tract to the Planning Director for review and comment by the Planning Director and the Development Review Committee. The conceptual development plan shall show the layout of lots/units or commercial buildings, density in units or square footage, road locations, amenity areas and improvements, trails and pedestrian paths, common and natural open space, required or proffered buffers, proposed clearing limits and any archaeology or natural resource preservation areas within the tract. Such review shall be for the purposes of determining general consistency with Zoning Ordinance requirements, the Master Plan, these proffers, and other applicable County policies.”

Accordingly, staff has reviewed: a) the conceptual plan, to ensure it is sufficiently detailed pursuant to Proffer No. 10; b) the Zoning Ordinance requirements for the PUD-R; c) the approved Master Plan; and d) other applicable County policies.

Conceptual Plan

Staff finds the conceptual plan provides sufficient detail pursuant to the language of Proffer No. 10. Details shown on the plan include the lot layout, proposed unit amount and site acreage (which allows for density calculations), road locations, amenity areas, trails and pedestrian paths, common and natural open space, proposed clearing and grading, and archaeological or natural resource preservation areas (none present, as confirmed by DCR). No buffers are proffered for Land Bay 5, although PUD-R does require a 75-foot planted buffer be located adjacent to external, non-community character roads, which this site design permits.

Planned Unit Development Residential Zoning Requirements

Staff finds the conceptual plan shows compliance with all applicable zoning requirements able to be assessed at this stage in the process. The major zoning requirements for this district are listed below:

- a. *Uses*. Single-family detached and single-family attached homes are both permitted within this district and are approved on the master plan for this proposal.
- b. *Minimum lot size*. The minimum lot size for this district is five acres. This proposal is part of the larger Stonehouse development, which well exceeds this minimum requirement, as does this portion of Land Bay 5.
- c. *Gross density*. The base density for single-family dwellings is two units, though this proposal permits four units per acre due to density bonuses achieved by the proffers and the Stonehouse Master Plan. Per the acreage calculation provided on the conceptual plan, this proposal is for 2.82 units per acre.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

Staff Report for the January 20, 2021, Development Review Committee Meeting

- d. *Open Space.* 35% of the gross area of any PUD District is required to be set aside as open space. This requirement is shown as being met on the conceptual plan, which has approximately 46% of the project area within open space.
- e. *Recreation Area.* A recreation area is required to be provided as part of this proposal. The “Proposed Passive Recreation Area” meets the requirements of the Zoning District as well as the minimum of approximately two acres, as prescribed within *Proffer No. 5.1(f)*.
- f. *Streets.* All dedicated public streets shown on the development plan are required to meet the design and construction requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) standards or the County Subdivision Ordinance, whichever is more stringent. VDOT has requested the parking adjacent to Road “B” and Road “D” be relocated to permit acceptance. This proposal appears to have room to accommodate an alternative parking layout, though this is to be confirmed at the development stage.

Stonehouse Master Plan

Staff finds this proposal to be consistent with the approved Stonehouse Master Plan. These parcels are designated as “Land Bay 5” on the adopted “Stonehouse Master Plan” and are designated for the “A, B, C, I, and J” Land Use Designations, which are “Single-Family” (A), “Attached Structures Containing Two to Four Units” (B), “Attached Structures Less Than Three Stories And Containing More Than Four Units” (C), “Institutional or Public Uses” (I), and “Areas of Common Open Space” (J). The maximum dwelling units permitted for this land bay is 180 dwelling units, with a maximum density of four units per acre. This proposal is for 116 detached single-family dwelling lots and 64 single-family attached townhomes on approximately 72.42 gross acres. This results in a density of 2.82 units per acre, meaning this

proposal complies with the land use designation and the dwelling unit cap for this land bay.

Proffers

Staff finds this proposal to be consistent with the approved proffers applicable for Land Bay 5 and this phase of development in Stonehouse overall. Specifically, this proposal aligns with the proffered unit cap of 2,392 residential units overall for Stonehouse (Proffer No. 2), would not trigger an updated Signal Justification Report since it does not pass the 390-unit threshold (Proffer No. 3.1(b)(i))) and has fulfilled the natural inventory DCR review (Proffer No. 9.4). Additional proffers are to be fulfilled at the time of development plan submittal and are not prevented by this conceptual layout.

Proffer No. 5.1(f) states that “concurrent with the first preliminary site plan or subdivision plan approval for Land Bay 5, a conceptual plan for an approximately 2-acre groomed passive open space, will be submitted to the County. The facility will be required to be open to the homeowners prior to the issuance of more than 80 building permits on Land Bay 5.” This conceptual plan currently shows the “Proposed Passive Recreation Area” as approximately 2.38 acres, which complies with this requirement

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the DRC find the proposed conceptual plan to be generally consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, adopted master plan, adopted proffers, and other applicable County policies

CONCEPTUAL PLAN-20-0129. Stonehouse Land Bay 5

Staff Report for the January 20, 2021, Development Review Committee Meeting


TW/md

CP20-129_StnhsLB5

Attachments:

1. Conceptual Plan Layout
2. Stonehouse Master Plan
3. Z-19-0010 Proffers

This staff report is prepared by the James City County Planning Division to provide information to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to assist them in making a recommendation on this application. It may be useful to members of the general public interested in this application.



LAND BAY 5 STATISTICS							
PARCEL	AREA (GROSS)	UNDEVELOPABLE AREA	AREA (NET)	UNITS PER ACRE	PROPOSED TOTAL DENSITY	OPEN SPACE IN RESOURCE PROTECTION AREAS	OPEN SPACE OUTSIDE RESOURCE PROTECTION AREAS
LAND BAY 5	72.42	22.97 (31.72%)	63.93	2.82	180	22.39	10.7

REVISION / COMMENT / NOTE

DATE

NO.

LANDTECH
RESOURCES, INC.
ENGINEERING • SURVEYING • GPS

200-E Bullitts Boulevard - Williamsburg, VA 23188
Ph: (757) 835-0700
Web: landtechresources.com

SUBDIVISION PLAN
FOR
STONEHOUSE
LAND BAY 5

JAMES CITY COUNTY STONEHOUSE MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT VIRGINIA

Scale: 1"=100'
Date: October 2, 2020
Job Number: 20-224
Designed By: GSW
Sheet Title:
CONCEPTUAL LAYOUT PLAN
Sheet Number:
C1.0



STORMWATER MANAGEMENT NARRATIVE

I. INTRODUCTION
THIS PROJECT IS FOR LAND BAY 5 OF THE STONEHOUSE DEVELOPMENT LOCATED IN THE STONEHOUSE MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT IN UPPER JAMES CITY COUNTY. LAND BAY 5 IS COMPRISED MAINLY OF THREE (3) PARCELS TOTALING A GROSS AREA OF APPROXIMATELY 68 ACRES. THIS PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT SHALL CONSIST OF 116 SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED LOTS AND 64 SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED TOWN HOMES.

II. EXISTING CONDITIONS
THE SITE IS CURRENTLY UNDEVELOPED, MOSTLY WOODED WITH SOME AREAS OF CLEARING. THE SITE IS LOCATED ON MODERATELY SLOPED TERRAIN THAT RANGES BETWEEN ONE (1) AND TWENTY-FIVE (25) PERCENT SLOPES, WITH A FEW OCCURRENCES OF SLOPES OF THIRTY(30) PERCENT OR GREATER IN AREAS ALONG THE EXISTING CHANNELS, PRIMARILY DOMINATED BY WETLANDS. LAND BAY 5 IS SURROUNDED PRIMARILY BY THE EXISTING STONEHOUSE GOLF CLUB.

III. PROPOSED STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM
THE STORMWATER FROM THIS PROJECT WILL BE COLLECTED BY EARTHEN SWALES AND CURB AND GUTTER SECTIONS THAT WILL DIRECT THE RUNOFF TO THE PROPOSED STORM SEWER SYSTEMS. THESE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS WILL THEN BE DISCHARGED INTO PROPOSED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES (BMP'S), ENHANCED SEDIMENT FOREBAYS, AND RIPRAP STILLING BASINS.

IV. WATER QUALITY AND WATER QUANTITY
THE SITE IS CURRENTLY DIVIDED INTO TWO (2) PRIMARY DRAINAGE AREAS. THE MAJORITY OF THIS DEVELOPMENT FLOWS TO THE SOUTH TO AN EXISTING WET POND (JCC WC033) LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEASTERN PORTION OF THE PROPERTY (THIS SHALL BE CONSIDERED POINT OF ANALYSIS 'A'). THIS WET POND THEN DRAINS ACROSS FIELDSTONE PARKWAY AND DISCHARGES INTO THE SOUTHERN BRANCH OF BIRD SWAMP AND INEVITABLY INTO RICHARDSON MILL POND (WARE CREEK), AND THEN THE UPPER YORK RIVER. ENHANCED SEDIMENT FOREBAYS AND RIPRAP STILLING BASINS WILL BE DESIGNED FOR THE STORM SEWER OUTFALLS FLOWING TO THE EXISTING WET POND TO ASSIST WITH STORMWATER PRETREATMENT AND REDUCE VELOCITIES IN THE RECEIVING CHANNELS. THE EXISTING WET POND IS CURRENTLY BEING ANALYZED TO DETERMINE IF THE EXISTING VOLUME IS ADEQUATE TO RECEIVE THESE NEW FLOWS OR IF THE BMP WILL BE NEED TO BE RETROFITTED TO MEET DEQ AND JCC STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS.

THE REMAINDER OF THE DEVELOPMENT FLOWS TO THE NORTH INTO EXISTING RAVINES THAT CONVERGE BEFORE FLOWING ACROSS FIELDSTONE PARKWAY AND INTO THE NORTHERN BRANCH OF BIRD SWAMP. THE STORMWATER RUNOFF FOR THE NORTHERN PORTION OF THE DEVELOPMENT WILL BE DIRECTED TO A PROPOSED BIORETENTION BASIN AND AN EXTENDED-DETENTION BASIN (LEVEL 1) IN A TREATMENT TRAIN TO ADDRESS WATER QUALITY AND WATER QUANTITY PRIOR TO BEING DISCHARGED TO A PROPOSED RIPRAP STILLING BASIN (THIS SHALL BE CONSIDERED POINT OF ANALYSIS 'B').

REVISION / COMMENT / NOTE	
NO.	DATE
LRI LANDTECH RESOURCES, INC. ENGINEERING • SURVEYING • GPS 200-E Bullitts Boulevard - Williamsburg, VA 23188 Ph: (757) 835-0700 Web: landtechresources.com	
SUBDIVISION PLAN FOR STONEHOUSE LAND BAY 5	
JAMES CITY COUNTY STONEHOUSE MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT VIRGINIA	
Scale: 1"=100' Date: October 2, 2020 Job Number: 20-224 Designed By: GSW Sheet Title: CONCEPTUAL GRADING AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN Sheet Number: C2.0	



STONEHOUSE VIRGINIA

**REZONING AND MASTER PLAN RESUBMITTAL
JAMES CITY COUNTY, VA
JULY 2019
(ORIGINAL SUBMITTAL: DECEMBER 2018)**

SHEET #

SHEET NAME

1

MASTER PLAN (COLOR)

2

MASTER PLAN - TABLE A ENLARGEMENT

3

ZONING MAP

[illegible][illegible]

Table A: Permitted Use Categories By Tract									
Parcel Number	Area ^[0] (Gross Acres)	Area ^[0] (Net Acres)	Open Space in Resource Protection Areas ^[0]	Open Space Outside of Resource Protection Areas ^[0] ^[4]	Maximum Density		Maximum Square Footage of Non-Residential Uses (Not including recreational uses)	Permitted Uses	Zoning
					Units Per Net Acre ^[2]	2018 Total Density	2018 Density FAR		
Land Bay 3	19.13	12.44	1.69	5	2.0	0	NA	A,I,J	PUD-R
Land Bay 5	67.81	50.05	18.34	10.7 ^[4]	4.0	180	NA	A,B,C,I,J	PUD-R
Land Bay 8	18.73	11.43	3.30	4	4.0	8	NA	A,B,I,J	PUD-R
Land Bay 14	70.51	18.68	33.03	18.8 ^[4]	2.0	4	NA	A,I,J	PUD-R
Tract 2	326.84	115.68	165.16	46	4.0	400	NA	A,B,C,D,I,J	PUD-R
Tract 3	264.83	107.72	112.61	44.5	4.0	350	NA	A,B,C,D,I,J	PUD-R
Tract 10A	51.95	24.53	15.92	11.5	8.0	200	NA	A,B,C,D,I,J	PUD-R ^[7]
Tract 10B	47.09	30.77	5.32	11	5.0	100	120,000	A,B,C,D,E,G,I,J	PUD-R ^[7]
Tract 11A	132.46	73.19	37.27	22	4.0	320	NA	A,B,C,I,J	PUD-R ^[7]
Tract 11B	503.51	273.77	189.74	40	6.0	530	200,000	A,B,C,I,J, RV Storage	PUD-R ^[7]
Tract S (School)	178.94	113.38	65.56	0 ^[4]	4.0	300	NA	A,B,C,D,I,J	PUD-R
Tract 1A	254.86	106.97	62.56	449.5	0.33	15	130,000	A1 Ordinance Uses	A1 ^[6]
Tract 1B	97.44	36.36	33.75						A1 ^[6]
Tract 4	189.64	45.66	125.48						A1 ^[6]
Tract 5	493.00	264.99	122.01						A1 ^[6]
Tract 6	1006.16	412.44	429.22						A1 ^[6]
Tract 7	257.14	115.5	95.14						A1 ^[6]
Tract 8	361.31	93.12	231.19	37	0.33	4	NA	A1 Ordinance Uses	A1 ^[6]
Tract 13	95.12	48.86	26.26	20	NA	NA	420,000	E,F,G,H,J	PUD-C
Tract 9	88.73	33.49	41.24	0	NA	NA	School ^[5]	School,I,J	PUD-C
Recreation Areas ^[3]	47.64	28.35	16.36	10.5	NA	NA	NA	Recreation Facility,I,J	NA
TOTAL	4,572.84 acres gross	2,017.38 acres net	1,831.15 acres	730.50 acres		2,411 2,411 maximum permitted ^[1]	870,000 Total maximum square footage shown is 870,000 square feet. 600,000 square feet of floor area exists in commerce park currently.		
PUD / A1 TOTALS	PUD - 1,913.29 ac A1 - 2,659.55 ac	PUD - 942.34 ac A1 - 1,075.04 ac	PUD - 731.8 ac A1 - 1,099.35 ac	PUD - 244 ac A1 - 486.5 ac		PUD - 2,392 units A1 - 19 units	PUD - 740,000 sf A1 - 130,000 sf		
Stonehouse Preserve									
Riverfront Preserve									
Table A Notes: [0] All acreage based on James City County GIS information only. All acreage indicated as presented in approved Master Plan dated January 2008. More detailed information will be provided at the site/subdivision stage. [1] A maximum of 2,411 residential units are allowed. Except the proposed A-1 Tracts, the actual number of units developed on each individual Tract/Land Bay may vary from the numbers listed in the "2018 Total Density" column above, as the number of units may be transferred between Tract/Land Bay in connection with final design, but the number of units on any given Tract/Land Bay will not exceed the corresponding density listed in the "Units Per Net Acre" column. The maximum units for proposed A-1 Tracts shall not exceed the number shown in the 2018 Total Density column. [2] The net acreage of each tract is based on GIS information, and may change when site/subdivision plans are submitted.* [3] Recreation Areas will be provided as outlined in the proffers. Final size and locations of the facilities and their footprints will be defined as the program, amenities and proffers are finalized. [4] Open space outside of RPAs has been reallocated between Land Bay 5 and Land Bay 14. The total acreage of open space outside of RPAs remains 651.50 acres as in the approved Master Plan dated January 2008. [5] Williamsburg - James City County Schools will determine the design of the school site. [6] Land Bay 1 and Tract 12 are excluded from application. Stonehouse Preserve and Riverfront Preserve will be submitted in separate application. [7] Tracts 10A, 10B, 11A and 11B to be amended from a PUD-C zoning classification (per the approved Master Plan dated January 2008) to a PUD-R zoning classification. [-] All roads will be public roads. [-] All common open space areas, private recreation areas, sidewalks outside of the public right-of-way, and other privately owned but common facilities will be maintained by the homeowners' association. [-] Tract 11B will contain RV and boat storage as a recreational use for the Stonehouse HOA. [-] For development phasing, see the sewer and water phasing maps, as well as the proffers and the Fiscal Impact report provided by the Applicant. [-] Tracts 1 and 11 have been divided into two tracts to better reflect the planned use. However, the number of units and the square footage of the non-residential uses remain as one for the entire tract and will be determined at the site/subdivision stage. [-] Mixed use buildings will be permitted in the appropriate areas in Stonehouse should the James City County Zoning Ordinance be amended to permit such buildings in the PUD-C or PUD-R zoning districts. [-]The amount of RPA is based on available mapping data and is subject to change with field delineation. Accordingly, the actual amount of Open Space inside the RPA and the actual amount of Open Space outside of the RPA at the time of development may vary from that shown in the 2 associated columns above, but the total amount of Open Space acreage determined by adding the 2 columns above shall be provided (e.g., if the actual amount of RPA on a particular tract increases with field delineation then amount of Open Space within the RPA shall similarly increase over the acreage shown above and the amount of Open Space outside of RPA will proportionately decrease from the acreage shown above, but the total amount of Open Space determined by adding the 2 columns above shall be provided).									

STONEHOUSE MASTERPLAN - TABLE A ENLARGEMENT

AMENDED AND RESTATED
STONEHOUSE PROFFERS

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
RECITALS	1
CONDITIONS	4
1. Community Association	4
2. Density	6
3. Transportation Improvements	6
3.1 Phase 1 Transportation Improvements.....	6
3.2 Phase 2 Transportation Improvements.....	13
3.3 Updated Traffic Study.....	22
3.4 Traffic Signal Warrant Analyses	22
3.5 VDOT Standards.....	22
3.6 FHWA Approvals	22
3.7 Internal Road and Intersection Improvements	23
3.8 External Road Connections.....	24
4. Public Sites	25
4.1 School Site	25
4.2 Public Recreation Trail	25
4.3 Reversion	26
5. Community and Recreational Facilities	27
5.1 Facilities and Phasing	27
5.2 Modification of Facilities.....	28
5.3 Trail System	28
6. Archaeological Sites	29
6.1 Archaeological Sites.	29
6.2 Unexpected Archaeological Discoveries	31
6.3 Qualifications and Standards	32
7. Cash Contributions for Community Impacts	32
8. Water Conservation	34
9. Environmental Protection	35
9.1 Stormwater Management Plans	35
9.2 Stormwater Management Inventory System.....	35
9.3 Building RPA Setback	36
9.4 Natural Resources	36

9.5	Nutrient Management Plan	36
9.6	Water Quality Monitoring Program.....	37
9.7	Low Impact Development Education	37
10.	Conceptual Review	38
11.	Work Force Housing	38
12.	Water and Sewer Master Plans	39
13.	Strip Shopping Centers Prohibited	40
14.	Design Review	40
15.	Tract 10B	40
16.	Headings	41
17.	Severability	41
18.	Successors and Assigns	41
19.	Void if Amended Application not Approved	41
	Exhibit “A” Property Description.....	52

THESE AMENDED AND RESTATED PROFFERS (“Proffers”) are made as of this 7th day of August, 2019, by **SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 1, LLC**, a Delaware limited liability company; **SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 2, LLC**, a Delaware limited liability company; **STONEHOUSE OWNERS FOUNDATION**, a Virginia non-stock corporation; **NVR, INC.**, a Virginia corporation; **MARY CHRISTINA ALLEGRETTO, TRUSTEE** and **JAMES DANIEL ALLEGRETTO, TRUSTEE**, in their capacities as the trustees under that certain **RESTATED REVOCABLE TRUST AGREEMENT OF MARY CHRISTINA ALLEGRETTO dated April 21, 2006 and amended December 4, 2008**; **ANIL JAIN** and **KRISHNAN MENON**; **DAVID CHRISTOPHER FERGUSON** and **TYANNE F. MCDONALD**; **VIANNEY VICTOIRE** and **GLORIA ANN SIMONNET** (all to be indexed as a grantor) (collectively and/or individually hereinafter referred to, together with its successors and assigns, as the “Owner”); and the **COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA**, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia (the “County”) (to be indexed as grantee).

RECITALS

A. Owner is the owner of that certain real property (the “Property”) located in James City County, Virginia, more particularly described on **Exhibit A** attached hereto and made a part hereof, which is a portion of the property commonly referred to as the Stonehouse Planned Unit Development.

B. The Property constitutes all of the real property owned by Owner located within the Stonehouse Planned Unit Development. The Property is presently zoned PUD and is subject to (i) a conceptual plan of development entitled “STONEHOUSE VIRGINIA REZONING AND MASTER PLAN RESUBMITTAL”, dated January 2008, prepared by Chas. H. Sells, Inc., a copy of which is on file with the County Planning Director (the “Existing Master Plan”), and (ii) those

certain Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers dated November 27, 2007, which Proffers are recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for the City of Williamsburg and County of James City (the "Clerk's Office") as Instrument No. 080007838, as amended by First Amendment to Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers dated May 31, 2012 and recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 120013165, and as amended by Second Amendment to Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers dated April 20, 2015 and recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 150009210 (collectively, the "Existing Proffers").

C. Currently there are two master residential property owner associations within the Stonehouse Planned Unit Development: the Association at Stonehouse, Inc., a Virginia non-stock corporation and the Stonehouse Owners Foundation, a Virginia non-stock corporation. The Association at Stonehouse, Inc. is the master residential property owners association for the portions of the Stonehouse Planned Unit Development described in the Declaration of Covenants, Restrictions, Rights Affirmative Obligations and Conditions recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 970015414, as amended and supplemented. The Stonehouse Owners Foundation is the master residential property owners association for the portions of the Stonehouse Planned Unit Development described in the Amended and Restated Declaration of Protective Covenants and Restrictions Stonehouse Owners Foundation recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 100024411, as amended and supplemented.

D. Owner has applied to amend the Existing Master Plan and Existing Proffers. In connection therewith, Owner has filed a master plan amendment application and proffer amendment application with the County which have been assigned case numbers MP-18-0002, Z-18-0002 and Z-19-0010 respectively, by the County Planning Department (collectively, the "Application").

E. Owner has submitted to the County an amended plan of development entitled “Stonehouse Master Plan” prepared by Cole, Jenest & Stone, dated July 26, 2019 (the “Master Plan”) in accordance with Section 24-484 and Section 24-23 of the County Zoning Ordinance.

F. Owner has submitted to the County a community impact statement entitled “Community Impact Statement Stonehouse Master Plan Amendment”, dated July 25, 2019 (the “Community Impact Statement”) in accordance with Section 24-23 of the County Zoning Ordinance.

G. A traffic impact study entitled “Traffic Impact Study Stonehouse Master Plan Amendment, James City County, Virginia” prepared by Gorove Slade Associates, Inc., dated December 10, 2018 and Traffic Impact Study Addendum dated August 8, 2019 (the “Traffic Study”) has been submitted to the County in accordance with Section 24-484 and Section 24-23 of the County Zoning Ordinance. The Traffic Study has been reviewed and approved by the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation (“VDOT”).

H. Owner has submitted to the County (i) a listing of previous archaeological studies performed on the Stonehouse development, including on the Property, entitled “Previous Archaeological Excavations, Dated May 23, 2007” compiled by Carol Tyrer of Circa-Cultural Resource Management, LLC, (ii) a table listing all identified archaeological sites at the Stonehouse development, including the Property, entitled “Archaeological Sites at the Stonehouse Development, Dated March, 2007” compiled by Carol Tyrer of Circa-Cultural Resource Management, LLC, and (iii) a map identifying the approximate location of each of the identified archaeological sites entitled “Stonehouse Archaeological Exhibit” made by Chas. H. Sells, Inc. and dated April 3, 2007 (together, the “Archaeological Documents”). The Planning Director has reviewed and approved the Archaeological Documents and each of the studies listed therein.

I. It has been established that through the existing zoning of the Property, that the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance are inadequate for protecting and enhancing orderly development of the Property in accordance with the County Comprehensive Plan. Accordingly, the Owner, in furtherance of the Application, desires to amend and restate the Existing Proffers as set forth herein in addition to the regulations provided for by the Zoning Ordinance for the protection and enhancement of the development of the Property, in accordance with the provisions of Section 15.2-2303 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended (the “Virginia Code”) and Section 24-16 of the County Zoning Ordinance.

J. The County constitutes a high-growth locality as defined by Section 15.2-2303 of the Virginia Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the approval by the County of the Application and the Master Plan and the acceptance of these Proffers, the Existing Proffers are hereby amended and restated insofar as they relate to the Property as set forth below. The Existing Proffers and Existing Master Plan shall continue to govern the portion of the Stonehouse Planned Unit Development not included within the Property; provided, however, these Proffers shall be deemed to satisfy Proffers 3 and 13 in the Existing Proffers. Owner agrees that the following conditions shall be met and satisfied in connection with the development of the Property.

CONDITIONS

1. **Community Association.** Owner, with the concurrence of the Association at Stonehouse, Inc., shall subject Land Bay 3, the portion of Land Bay 8 consisting of James City County Parcel Identification Number 0530100025, and Land Bay 14 (collectively, the “Mill Pond Areas”) to the existing Declaration of Covenants, Restrictions, Affirmative Obligations and Conditions for Stonehouse recorded in the Clerk’s Office as Instrument Number 970015414 including, without limitation, the architectural review process and guidelines. In the event the

Association at Stonehouse, Inc. does not agree to the above, the Mill Pond Areas shall be subject to the existing Amended and Restated Declaration of Protective Covenants and Restrictions Stonehouse Owners Foundation recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 100024411. Owner shall organize a community association or associations (the "Community Association") in accordance with Virginia law in which all property owners in the development on the Property (other than the Mill Pond Areas), by virtue of their property ownership, shall be members, provided, however, Owner may subject by the recordation of supplemental declaration(s) all or portions of the Property to existing property owners association(s) (individually and collectively, considered the "Community Association") and restrictive covenants in satisfaction of this requirement. There shall be one master Community Association for all residential portions of the Property (including the existing Stonehouse Glen subdivision). The Governing Documents (hereinafter defined) shall (i) require that the Community Association adopt an annual maintenance budget and assess members for the maintenance of all properties owned or maintained by the Community Association and (ii) shall grant the Community Association the power to file liens on members' properties for non-payment of such assessments and for the cost of remedying violations of, or otherwise enforcing, the Governing Documents. The Governing Documents shall also provide for one or more design review committee(s) with the power to review and approve all site development and architectural plans within the development. Owner may organize separate neighborhood or commercial associations and impose supplemental or different restrictive covenants on individual sections of the Property. The articles of incorporation, bylaws and restrictive covenants (together, the "Governing Documents") creating and governing the

Community Association shall be submitted to the County Attorney for review and approval for consistency with these Proffers.

2. **Density.** There shall be no more than 2,392 residential units and no more than 870,000 square feet of non-residential uses, excluding recreational uses, permitted on the Property. Of the 2,392 residential units no more than 1,200 residential units shall be B - attached structures containing two to four dwelling units, C - attached structures containing more than four dwelling units or D - apartments as those terms are defined in Section 24-487 of the County Zoning Ordinance. Owner shall provide on each site plan or subdivision plan for any development within the Property a then-current accounting of the number of residential units, unit type, and square footage of non-residential development that have previously been approved by the County and are proposed by the plan being submitted for review in a form reasonably acceptable to the Planning Director to permit the accurate tracking of the progression of the development of the Property in accordance with these Proffers.

3. **Transportation Improvements.** This Proffer sets forth external and internal road and intersection improvements recommended in the Traffic Study and the phasing of the construction of such improvements.

3.1 **Phase 1 Transportation Improvements.** The construction, installation, and/or implementation of the following improvements shall be completed or guaranteed in accordance with Section 15.2-2299 of the Virginia Code (or such successor provision) and the applicable provisions of the County Code of Ordinances (such performance assurances to be herein referred to as a “Guarantee” or “Guarantees”) at the times required below:

(a) Modification of the pavement and/or pavement markings on the westbound Fieldstone Parkway approach to State Route 30 to add and/or delineate a second

exclusive left-turn lane in connection with the installation of the traffic signal proffered in subsection (b) of this Section 3.1; and

(b) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 130 total dwelling units or 27,000 square feet (“sf”) of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 62 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such traffic signal is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner’s development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 390 total dwelling units or 81,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 186 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT another traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision

plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such traffic signal is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based upon an agreed upon alternative timing plan, the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of the traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and Fieldstone Parkway when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(c) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 400 total dwelling units on the Property within Tract 2 and Tract 3 (Parcels D through I), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a left turn lane warrant analysis for the intersection at the southern entrance to Parcel B and the single entrance to Parcel C heading northbound on Six Mount Zion Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a left turn lane is warranted at one or both entrances, then the Owner shall Guarantee such left turn lane(s) prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such left turn lane(s) prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such left turn lane(s) is/are not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed

above the foregoing threshold; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 600 total dwelling units on the Property within Tract 2 and Tract 3 (Parcels D through I), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT another left turn lane warrant analysis for the intersection at the southern entrance to Parcel B and the single entrance to Parcel C heading northbound on Six Mount Zion Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that such left turn lane(s) is/are warranted at one or both entrances, then the Owner shall Guarantee such left turn lane(s) prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such left turn lane(s) prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such left turn lane(s) is/are still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing threshold; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, the Owner shall (1) Guarantee such left turn lane(s) prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent left turn lane warrant analysis for the intersection at the southern entrance to Parcel B and the single entrance to Parcel C heading northbound on Six Mount Zion Road prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property within Tract 2 and Tract 3 (Parcels D through I), and (3) complete the installation of such left turn lane(s) when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(d) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 522 total dwelling units or 75,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 248 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County

and VDOT a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and the I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such traffic signal is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,000 total dwelling units or 170,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 476 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such traffic signal is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps prior to such final site plan or

subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(e) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 522 total dwelling units or 120,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 248 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such traffic signal is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,200 total dwelling units or 275,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 571 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic

signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such traffic signal is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such traffic signal at the intersection of State Route 30 and LaGrange Parkway when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(f) Owner shall provide as a separate supplemental document with each site plan or subdivision plan for any development within the Property which would result in a mix of non-residential and residential units on the Property (and with each site plan or subdivision plan for any development within the Property thereafter), the projected peak hour vehicle trip generation associated with the development (i) proposed by the corresponding site plan or subdivision plan submission, and (ii) which has previously received final site plan or final subdivision plat approval from the County (and any site plans or subdivision plans for development within the Property then under review) in a form reasonably acceptable to the Planning Director

to permit the accurate tracking of the progression of the development of the Property in accordance with these Proffers.

3.2 Phase 2 Transportation Improvements. The following additional improvements shall be completed or Guaranteed at the times required below:

(a) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 657 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 313 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such traffic signal is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 2,122 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 1,010 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a

traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such traffic signal is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Fieldstone Parkway when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(b) Install an eastbound right turn lane on Fieldstone Parkway at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road with installation of the traffic signal proffered with subsection (a) of this Section 3.2.

(c) Install a northbound left turn lane on Six Mount Zion Road at the intersection of Fieldstone Parkway with installation of the traffic signal proffered with subsection (a) of this Section 3.2.

(d) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,452 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 691 or more new peak hour vehicle trips

based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such traffic signal is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 2,122 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 1,010 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that a traffic signal is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such signal prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such traffic signal is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an

agreed upon alternative timing plan, then the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent traffic signal warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such traffic signal at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(e) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,452 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 691 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a warrant analysis for an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Mount Laurel Road at the intersection of Six Mount Zion road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that an exclusive right-turn lane is warranted at this intersection, the Owner shall Guarantee such turn-lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such turn-lane prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such turn lane is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 2,122 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 1,010 or more new peak hour

vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent warrant analysis for an exclusive westbound right-turn lane on Mount Laurel Road at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that such turn lane is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such turn lane prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such turn lane is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, then the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent turn lane warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(f) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,452 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 691 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a warrant analysis for an exclusive northbound right-turn lane on Six Mount Zion Road

at the intersection of Mount Laurel Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that an exclusive right-turn lane is warranted at this intersection, the Owner shall Guarantee such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such turn lane prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such turn lane is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 2,122 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 1,010 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent warrant analysis for an exclusive northbound right-turn lane on Six Mount Zion Road at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that such turn lane is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such turn lane prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such turn lane is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, then the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat

approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent turn lane warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(g) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,452 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 691 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a warrant analysis for an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Six Mount Zion Road at the intersection of Mount Laurel Road. In the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that an exclusive left-turn lane is warranted at this intersection, the Owner shall Guarantee such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such turn lane prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(i) In the event that such turn lane is not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 2,122 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 1,010 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent warrant analysis for an exclusive southbound left-turn lane on Six Mount Zion Road at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road. In

the event the analysis concludes, and VDOT concurs, that such turn lane is warranted at this intersection, then the Owner shall Guarantee such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval and shall complete the installation of such turn lane prior to the issuance of building permits for the development depicted on such site plan or subdivision plat.

(ii) In the event that such turn lane is still not warranted by VDOT, then Owner's development of the Property (and permits and approvals therefor) may proceed above the foregoing thresholds; however, unless waived by the Planning Director based on an agreed upon alternative timing plan, then the Owner shall (1) Guarantee a such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to such final site plan or subdivision plat approval, (2) submit to the County and VDOT a subsequent turn lane warrant analysis for the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road prior to each following site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) approval for development on the Property, and (3) complete the installation of such turn lane at the intersection of Six Mount Zion Road and Mount Laurel Road when deemed warranted by VDOT.

(h) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,932 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 920 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall install or Guarantee:

(i) a second exclusive left-turn lane for the northbound State Route 30 approach to the I-64 Westbound Off/On-Ramps intersection at Exit 227 and widen the westbound I-64 On-Ramp to consist of two receiving lanes including corresponding modifications to the traffic signal proffered in Section 3.1(d).

(ii) a second exclusive left-turn lane on the I-64 Westbound Off-Ramp approach at State Route 30 including corresponding modifications to the traffic signal proffered in Section 3.1(d).

(i) Prior to approval of a site plan(s) and/or subdivision plan(s) that would result in more than 1,662 total dwelling units or 740,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on the Property (or, any combination of such uses that would result in 790 or more new peak hour vehicle trips based on the trip generation rates utilized in the Traffic Study), Owner shall install or Guarantee:

(i) a modification of the pavement and/or pavement markings on La Grange Parkway to add and/or delineate a second exclusive left-turn lane to the westbound LaGrange Parkway approach to State Route 30, including corresponding modifications to the traffic signal proffered in Section 3.1(e).

(ii) a second exclusive left-turn lane for the southbound State Route 30 approach to the LaGrange Parkway intersection, including corresponding modifications to the traffic signal proffered in Section 3.1(e).

(j) If Owner fails to comply with a requirement set forth in Section 3.1 or 3.2 hereof, the County shall not be obligated to grant the corresponding final subdivision or site plan approval or building permits, as applicable, unless and until such requirement is met.

(k) Owner shall provide, as a separate supplemental document with each site plan or subdivision plan for any development within the Property, the projected peak hour vehicle trip generation associated with the development (1) proposed by the corresponding site plan or subdivision plan submission, and (2) which has previously received final site plan or final subdivision plat approval from the County (and any site plans or subdivision plans for development within the Property then under review) in a form reasonably acceptable to the Planning Director

to permit the accurate tracking of the progression of the development of the Property in accordance with these Proffers.

3.3 Updated Traffic Study. Owner may have the Traffic Study updated, amended, or supplemented from time to time by an independent traffic consultant and may submit any such updated, amended, or supplemented Traffic Study to the Board of Supervisors and VDOT for approval. The schedule of road and intersection improvements and the phasing thereof set forth above may be amended based on such updated, amended, or supplemented Traffic Study submitted to the Board of Supervisors and VDOT. Owner shall convey, without charge, to VDOT or the County, as appropriate, all right of way owned by it that is necessary for such improvements and, when completed, shall dedicate all such improvements to VDOT or the County, as appropriate.

3.4 Traffic Signal Warrant Analyses. If VDOT determines that any intersection at which a traffic signal is proffered is approaching meeting warrants for installation of the traffic signal, then at the request of VDOT, Owner shall have a warrant analysis of that intersection conducted and submitted to the County and VDOT.

3.5 VDOT Standards. All improvements proffered in this Section 3 shall be designed and constructed in accordance with applicable VDOT standards and guidelines. All traffic signals proffered hereby shall be designed and installed to accommodate future proffered traffic improvements. Traffic signal timing equipment will be modified and signal timing plans updated as required by VDOT concurrently with capacity improvements at the intersection in question. All traffic signals proffered hereby shall include signal coordination equipment if required by VDOT.

3.6 FHWA Approvals. The proffered modifications to Interstate 64 interchanges will require the approval of the Federal Highway Administration (“FHWA”). If FHWA approval of a modification is not granted after submission through and with the approval of VDOT of all

appropriate and required interchange modification applications and supporting documentation, Owner shall propose to the Board of Supervisors and VDOT substitute improvements and provide VDOT and the Board of Supervisors with a traffic study showing the impact of the proposed substitute improvements, commensurate in traffic benefit and costs with the proffered interchange modifications for review and approval by the Board of Supervisors and VDOT. If such substitute improvements are approved by the Board of Supervisors and VDOT, the completion or posting of Guarantees for their completion with the County shall satisfy the obligation of Owner with respect to the proffered interchange modification for which FHWA approval was not granted.

3.7 Internal Road and Intersection Improvements.

(a) Owner shall improve the portion of Mount Laurel Road if required to meet current VDOT Standards for a 2 lane local road (as identified on the James City County Comprehensive Plan) from Six Mount Zion Road to any entrances constructed on Mount Laurel Road providing access to/from Tract 11A or Tract 11B. Signage shall be provided along Mount Laurel Road to make such roadway a “signed shared roadway” consistent with VDOT regulations.

(b) Owner shall improve the portion of Six Mount Zion Road if required to meet current VDOT Standards for a 2 lane local road (as identified on the James City County Comprehensive Plan) from Ware Creek Road northerly to any entrances constructed on Six Mount Zion Road providing access to/from Tract 2 or Tract 3.

(c) Owner shall improve the portion of Ware Creek Road if required to meet current VDOT Standards for a 2 lane local road (as identified on the James City County Comprehensive Plan) from Six Mount Zion Road to any entrances constructed on Ware Creek Road providing access to/from Tract 2, Tract 11B, or Tract S.

(d) With the prior approval of VDOT, at such time as any of the proffered improvements to the Six Mount Zion Road/Fieldstone Parkway intersection are triggered, Owner may install a roundabout meeting VDOT requirements in lieu of the improvements to the Six Mount Zion Road/Fieldstone Parkway intersection proffered above to include, without limitation, any turn lanes.

(e) With the prior approval of VDOT, at such time as any of the proffered improvements to the Six Mount Zion Road/Mount Laurel Road intersection are triggered, Owner may install a roundabout meeting VDOT requirements in lieu of the improvements to the Fieldstone Parkway/Mount Laurel Road intersection proffered above to include, without limitation, any turn lanes.

3.8 External Road Connections. Within one year from the date of approval of the requested rezoning by the Board of Supervisors, Owner shall petition VDOT to permit the disconnection of Ware Creek Road immediately west of its intersection with Mount Laurel Road from the portion of Ware Creek Road that extends through the Property and, if VDOT approval is obtained, physically disconnect the road, to prevent traffic from the Property from using Ware Creek Road to access Croaker Road. If VDOT refuses to allow this disconnection, Owner shall not improve a segment of Ware Creek Road of at least 1,500 linear feet in length to the west of its intersection with Mount Laurel Road to the first subdivision road in the Property and through the use of signage and other measures as approved by VDOT shall attempt to de-emphasize Ware Creek Road as a means of ingress and egress to and from the Property. A plan for signage and other measures shall be submitted within 180 days of VDOT's notification to Owner of a denial of the petition, should this occur, for Planning Director review and approval, and shall be

implemented within 180 days of such approval or within such other timeframe as is agreed to in advance by both parties.

4. **Public Sites.**

4.1 **School Site.** Owner shall, in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in a Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement between the Owner and the County, of even date herewith, (i) convey to the County, without consideration, a site containing approximately 88.73 gross acres (the “School Site”) in the location shown on the Master Plan as “9 MIDDLE SCHOOL”; or (ii) make a one-time contribution of \$837,200.00 for use by the County in expanding school capacity within the County.

4.2 **Public Recreation Trail.** A public recreation trail (“Public Trail”) will be developed within a portion of the Property as more particularly described herein. Any portions of the Public Trail located outside of public right of way will be owned and maintained by the Community Association but open for use by the public subject to reasonable rules and regulations agreed upon by the Community Association and the County. Any sections of the multi-use paths located outside of public right of way and owned and maintained by the Community Association shall be built to paved trail standards as defined in the now current version of the Parks and Recreation Greenway Master Plan, dated June 25, 2002. Any portion of the Public Trail which is located within the public right of way and to be publically maintained shall be built to VDOT standards. The Public Trail will consist of a minimum of:

(a) 10,000 linear feet of multi-use trail or shoulder bike lane along Six Mount Zion Road. All improvements to Route 600 within the Property shall include a shoulder bike lane or multi-use trail except where Route 600 passes under Interstate 64 in which location a 5 foot sidewalk, which shall transition or tie into the multi-use trail or shoulder bike lane segments, as

applicable, located immediately to the north and south of the subject Interstate 64 overpass area, shall be installed (subject to receipt of all applicable governmental approvals);

(b) 8,000 linear feet of multi-use trail along Ware Creek Road; and

(c) 6,000 linear feet of multi-use trail along Mt. Laurel Road.

The Public Trail will be installed at the time the adjacent road is constructed or improved with the development of adjacent parcels. Any portions of the Public Trail subject to VDOT policies and regulations shall have signage consistent with those requirements.

4.3 Reversion. If (i) the Board of Supervisors makes a formal determination by resolution not to use the School Site conveyed to the Williamsburg-James City County Public School Division or applicable school board for the school facilities before construction of any improvements on such School Site, or (ii) construction of improvements has not been commenced within fifteen (15) years from the date of conveyance to the Williamsburg-James City County Public School Division or the applicable school board, then at the option of Owner title to the School Site shall revert to (a) the Owner or an entity designated by Owner (if, at such time, Owner owns any of the Property), or, if Owner does not then own any of the Property, (b) the master Community Association. The County, at the request of the Owner or Community Association (as applicable), shall deliver deeds to the Owner or Community Association, as provided above, evidencing such reversion of title. The County's obligation to return the School Site to the Owner or Community Association (as applicable) shall expire on the earlier of (i) the commencement of construction on the School Site; and (ii) the fortieth anniversary of the approval of the Application by the County.

5. **Community and Recreational Facilities.**

5.1 **Facilities and Phasing.** Owner shall construct the community and recreational facilities described below (conditioned upon Owner's obtaining all required governmental permits and approvals and in accordance with the now current James City County Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update 2017 – Appendix F Development Guidelines) generally in the locations shown on the Master Plan:

(a) Tract 3 Amenity (H) – A community building, swimming pool and playground (which currently exist). Before the issuance of the 800th building permit on the Property and within the Stonehouse Glen subdivision, 1 multi-purpose court will be constructed on the Amenity H property.

(b) Ware Creek Road Amenity (A) – Concurrent with the first preliminary site plan or subdivision plan approval for development on all or a portion of Tract 2, Tract S, Tract 3 Parcel D, or Tract 3 Parcel E, conceptual site plans for a single community facility or multiple community facilities totaling approximately 8 acres across Tract 2, Tract S, Tract 3 Parcel D, or Tract 3 Parcel E shall be submitted to the County. Such facility or combination of facilities shall include 3,000 sf of buildings, one swimming pool, one multi-purpose grass field of adequate size to accommodate a regulation soccer field, and one multi-purpose court. The facility or facilities will be required to be open to the homeowners prior to the issuance of more than 1,200 building permits on the Property.

(c) Tract 11A Amenity (B) – Concurrent with the first preliminary site plan or subdivision plan approval for Tract 11A, a conceptual plan for an approximately 8 acre community facility in Tract 11A, with a pavilion, outdoor fitness equipment, and a multi-purpose grass field of adequate size to accommodate a regulation soccer field, will be submitted to the

County. The facility will be required to be open to the homeowners prior to the issuance of more than 150 building permits on Tract 11A.

(d) Tract 10B Amenity (C) – Concurrent with the first preliminary site plan or subdivision plan approval for Tract 10B, a conceptual plan for an approximately 17 acre multi-use outdoor recreation facility and two multipurpose/soccer fields in Tract 10B as shown, generally, on that certain exhibit entitled “Tract 10B Preservation Square”, dated July 26, 2019, prepared by Cole Jenest & Stone, a copy of which is on file with the County Planning Director, will be submitted to the County. The facility will be required to be open to the homeowners prior to the issuance of more than 40 building permits on Tract 10B.

(e) Playgrounds – A minimum of 3 playgrounds shall be provided within the Property. Such playgrounds will be sited, identified, and the apparatus’ specified within the preliminary site plan or subdivision plan where such facilities are to be located.

(f) Land Bay 5 Amenity (K) – Concurrent with the first preliminary site plan or subdivision plan approval for Land Bay 5, a conceptual plan for an approximately 2 acre groomed passive open space, will be submitted to the County. The facility will be required to be open to the homeowners prior to the issuance of more than 80 building permits on Land Bay 5.

5.2 Modification of Facilities. The exact facilities to be provided at each amenity site may be modified from time to time by Owner (or the Community Association if ownership of such site has been conveyed to same) provided any such modification provides an equivalent or greater recreational benefit. Any such modification shall be subject to the prior approval of the Planning Director for consistency with this Proffer.

5.3 Trail System. In addition to the Public Trail, Owner shall install a minimum of 16,000 linear feet of soft-surface trail(s) within Tracts 11A, 11B, and S which provide connection

to Six Mount Zion Road, Ware Creek Road, and Mt. Laurel Road. Design plans for the path within a Tract shall be submitted to the County with the first development plan for the Tract and construction of such path shall begin or Guarantees for such construction shall be posted before the County is obligated to grant final subdivision or site plan approval for more than 50% of residential lots or units permitted in the Tract and in any event the path shall be installed within three years from the date of final approval of the first subdivision plat or site plan for development within the Tract in question. Such soft-surface trails shall be built to mulch trail standards as currently defined in the Parks and Recreation Greenway Master Plan, dated June 25, 2002.

6. **Archaeological Sites.**

6.1 **Archaeological Sites.**

(a) Prior to the issuance of building permits that would result in more than 50 total dwelling units or 30,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on Tract 10B, an interpretive kiosk will be constructed or Guaranteed, as generally depicted upon that certain exhibit entitled “Tract 10B Preservation Square”, dated July 26, 2019, prepared by Cole Jenest Stone, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the County Planning Director. This interpretive kiosk will provide images and a cultural narrative of the historical events, significance, and sites that are located on the Stonehouse property.

(b) Archaeological sites listed in the Archaeological Documents (defined in Recital H) (each referred to as a “Site”) that are potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places that can be avoided by the development will be clearly marked on site plans or subdivision construction plans (“development plans”). In addition, if land clearing or construction activities take place near a Site area, then the Site boundaries will be cordoned-off in the field with orange snow fencing prior to land disturbing near the area. If a Site cannot be avoided by the

development, then a Phase II evaluation will be completed on the Site prior to any land disturbance activity in the Site area. The Phase II evaluation will be submitted to the County Planning Director for review.

(c) At the conclusion of the Phase II evaluation, if a Site is determined not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, then development may occur in the Site area. If the determination is made that a Site is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, then several mitigation options are available:

(i) Avoidance. The Site may be avoided by the development by setting aside the Site in a park, RPA buffer, or vegetative area. National Register-eligible archaeological Sites that can be avoided by the development will be clearly marked on project development plans. In addition, if land clearing or construction activities take place near the Site area, then the Site boundaries will be cordoned-off in the field with orange snow fencing prior to land disturbing in the area.

(ii) Partial Avoidance/Data Recovery. The Site may be partially avoided and partially impacted. In this case, data recovery will be limited to the Site area to be impacted. The portion of the Site area to be avoided will be clearly marked on project development plans. In addition, if land clearing or construction activities take place near the Site area, then the remaining Site boundaries will be cordoned-off in the field with orange snow fencing prior to land disturbing in the area. A Treatment Plan for the portion of the Site area to be impacted will be completed and submitted to the County Planning Director for review.

(iii) Data Recovery. If the Site cannot be avoided, then a Treatment Plan will be completed and submitted to the County Planning Director for review.

(d) If the Phase II or Phase III study of a Site determines the Site is eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and such Site is to be preserved in place, the treatment plan shall include nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. All approved treatment plans shall be incorporated into the plan of development for the affected portion of the Property and the clearing, grading or construction activities thereon.

6.2 Unexpected Archaeological Discoveries. Should previously unidentified historic properties be identified during development of the Property, the applicant will halt all construction work involving subsurface disturbance in the area of the resource and in the surrounding area where further subsurface remains can reasonably be expected to occur and notify the Planning Director and the Virginia State Historic Preservation Officer (“SHPO”) of the discovery. The Planning Director and the SHPO will be allowed to immediately inspect the work site and determine the area and nature of the affected archaeological resource. Construction work may then continue in the area outside the archaeological resource as defined by Planning Director and the SHPO, or their designated representative. Within 14 working days of the original notification of discovery, the Planning Director, in consultation with the SHPO, will determine the National Register eligibility of the resource based on information provided by Owner’s archaeologist recovered from the field, site type, artifacts, and historic research. If the resource is determined eligible for the National Register, the applicant will prepare a plan for its avoidance, protection, recovery of information, or destruction without data recovery. The plan shall be approved by the Planning Director, in consultation with the SHPO, prior to implementation. Work in the affected area shall not proceed until either (i) the development and implementation of appropriate data recovery or other recommended mitigation procedures, or (ii) the determination is made that the located remains are not eligible for inclusion on the National Register.

6.3 Qualifications and Standards. The archaeological excavations will be conducted under the direct supervision of an archaeologist who meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards*. All work and resulting reports will meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation* and applicable Virginia Department of Historic Resource guidance.

7. **Cash Contributions for Community Impacts.**

(a) Owner shall make a one-time contribution to the County of \$2,571.27 for each residential dwelling unit constructed on the Property. Such contributions shall be used by the County for school uses.

(b) Owner shall make a one-time contribution to the County of \$1,254.94 for each residential dwelling unit constructed on the Property. Such contributions shall be used by the County for the provision of affordable housing within the County.

(c) Owner shall make to the JCSA a one-time contribution \$0.14 per gallon per day of average daily sanitary sewage flow for each non-residential building based on the use of the building(s) the sewer flows from which discharge into JCSA Lift Station 9-5 as determined by JCSA.

(d) Owner shall make to the JCSA a one-time contribution of \$0.31 per gallon per day of average daily sanitary sewage flow for each non-residential building based on the use of the building(s) the sewer flows from which discharge into JCSA Lift Station 9-7 as determined by JCSA.

(e) Owner shall make a one-time contribution of \$800,000.00 for use by the County in expanding school capacity within the County. The foregoing contribution shall be made by Owner to the County upon the earlier of (i) the approval by the County of site plans or

subdivision plats for at least 1,000 dwelling units on the Property, or (ii) within 90 days after receipt of a written request from the school district for the funds. The County shall not be obligated to grant final subdivision plat or site plan approval for residential dwelling units on the Property after such payment is triggered until the contribution is made.

(f) The contributions described in subsections (a) through (d) above shall be payable at the time of issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the residential unit or non-residential building.

(g) The per unit contribution amounts shall consist of the amounts set forth in subsections (a) and (b) above plus any adjustments included in the Marshall and Swift Building Costs Index (the “Index”) from 2019 to the year a payment is made if payments are made after on or after January 1, 2020. The per unit contribution amount shall be adjusted once a year with the January supplement of the Index of the payment year. In no event shall the per unit contribution be adjusted to a sum less than the amounts set forth in the preceding subsections of this Section. In the event that the Index is not available, a reliable government or other independent publication evaluating information heretofore used in determining the Index (approved in advance by the County Manager of Financial Management Services) shall be relied upon in establishing an inflationary factor for purposes of increasing the per unit contribution to approximate the rate of annual inflation in the County.

(h) The County, JCSEA, and Owner acknowledge and agree that the obligations of Owner to make cash contributions for water system improvements is governed by the Water Facilities Agreement dated April 29, 2005 among JCSEA and the predecessors in title to Owner to the Property.

8. **Water Conservation.**

(a) The Owner shall be responsible for developing water conservation standards to be submitted to and approved by JCSA. The Community Association shall be responsible for enforcing these standards. The standards shall address such water conservation measures as (i) use of a reclaimed water system (“Reclaimed Water System”) for irrigation if such system is constructed, (ii) limitations on the installation and use of irrigation systems (other than the Reclaimed Water System) and irrigation wells, (iii) if the Reclaimed Water System is not constructed, the use of approved landscaping materials such as warm season turf in appropriate growing areas and drought tolerant native plants, and (iv) the use of water conserving fixtures and appliances to promote water conservation and minimize the use of public water resources. The standards shall be approved by JCSA prior to final subdivision or the plan approval for development on the Property.

(b) If the Owner desires to have outdoor watering of common areas on the Property it shall provide water for irrigation utilizing the Reclaimed Water System if it is constructed or otherwise from recycled water or surface water collection from surface water ponds and shall not use JCSA water or well water for irrigation purposes, except as provided below. This requirement prohibiting the use of well water may be waived or modified by the General Manager of JCSA if the Owner demonstrates to JCSA General Manager that there is insufficient water for irrigation from recycled water or in the surface water impoundments, and the Owner may apply for a waiver for shallow (less than 100 feet) wells to supplement the recycled water supply or surface water impoundments. Owner acknowledges a waiver will be required for each well requested.

9. **Environmental Protection.**

9.1 **Stormwater Management Plans.** At least 60 days prior to submission of development plans for a Tract as designated on the Master Plan within the Property, Owner shall submit to the County a conceptual master stormwater management plan for that Tract (“Stormwater Plan”). Each Stormwater Plan shall include the following: (i) narrative providing information about specific site plans including proposed land use, significant environmental constraints, and proposed method for meeting stormwater management requirements; (ii) preliminary site plan with conceptual layout of road network and utilities; (iii) completed Significant Design Consideration Checklist; (iv) identification of proposed location and type of each stormwater management device; (v) mapping of existing conditions drainage areas and environmental constraints; (vi) identification of stream crossings including proposed type of crossing and summary of environmental impacts and mitigation requirements; and (vii) outfall channels. The submittal will not include calculations or detail sheets representing the design of stormwater management devices.

9.2 **Stormwater Management Inventory System.** Owner shall create a comprehensive inventory of all stormwater management devices within the Property. This inventory shall include data sheets for every device that will include basic information including location, type, and size of device. Additionally, a digital picture and other design information such as required storage volume and general operations and maintenance requirements shall be included. The goal of the system is to provide an interactive means by which the Community Association can maintain the stormwater management system and work proactively with the County. The database will be designed in accordance with any existing James City County stormwater management inventory

standards. The initial version of the system shall be submitted with the first conceptual Stormwater Plan for the Property and the inventory system shall be updated as each Tract develops.

9.3 Building RPA Setback. A 25 foot setback from the defined RPA buffer is hereby established so that no building will be erected within 25 feet of the RPA. This additional setback shall be shown on all site plans, subdivision plans, and plans of development.

9.4 Natural Resources. A natural resource inventory of suitable habitats for S1, S2, S3, G1, G2, or G3 resources as defined in the County's Natural Resources Policy on the portion of the Property then proposed for development shall be submitted to the Planning Director for his/her review and approval prior to land disturbance of such portion of the Property. If the inventory confirms that a natural heritage resource exists, a conservation management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director for the affected area. All inventories and conservation management plans shall meet the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation's Division of Natural Resources ("DCR/DNH") standards for preparing such plans, and shall be conducted under the supervision of a qualified biologist as determined by the DCR/DNH or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. All approved conservation management plans shall be incorporated into the plan of development for the portion of the Property then proposed for development, and the clearing, grading or construction activities thereon, to the maximum extent possible. Upon approval by the Planning Director, a mitigation plan may substitute for the incorporation of the conservation management plan into the plan of development for the site. This proffer shall be interpreted in accordance with the County's Natural Resources Policy adopted by the County on July 27, 1999.

9.5 Nutrient Management Plan. The Association shall be responsible for contacting an agent of the Virginia Cooperative Extension Office ("VCEO") or, if a VCEO agent is unavailable,

a soil scientist licensed in the Commonwealth of Virginia, an agent of the Soil and Water Conservation District or other qualified professional to conduct soil tests and to develop, based upon the results of the soil tests, customized nutrient management plans (the “Plans”) for all common areas within the Property and for the single family lots shown on each subdivision plat of the Property. The Plans shall be submitted to the County’s Stormwater & Resource Protection Director for review and approval prior to the issuance of the building permits for more than 25% of the units shown on the subdivision plat. Upon approval, the Owner so long as it controls the Community Association and thereafter the Community Association shall be responsible for ensuring that any nutrients applied to common areas which are controlled by the Community Association be applied in strict accordance with the Plan. The Owner shall provide a copy of the individual Plan for each lot to the initial purchaser thereof. Within five years after issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for the first dwelling unit on the Property and every three years thereafter, a turf management information seminar shall be conducted on the site. The seminar shall be designed to acquaint residents with the tools, methods, and procedures necessary to maintain healthy turf and landscape plants.

9.6 Water Quality Monitoring Program. Owner shall cooperate with the Environmental and Stormwater Divisions in establishing three water quality monitoring stations on the Property in locations approved by Owner. These stations will be located to operate in conjunction with any other stream monitoring conducted by Owner pursuant to permit or regulatory requirements.

9.7 Low Impact Development Education. Prior to the issuance of building permits that would result in more than 50 total dwelling units or 30,000 sf of non-residential use(s) on Tract 10B, an interpretive kiosk will be constructed or Guaranteed, as generally depicted upon that

certain exhibit entitled “Tract 10B Preservation Square”, dated July 26, 2019, prepared by Cole Jenest & Stone, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the County Planning Director. This interpretive kiosk will provide images and a narrative explaining the significance of low impact development techniques and the location of example features within the Property.

10. **Conceptual Review.** At least 60 days prior to submission of a development plan for all or any portion of a Tract, Owner shall submit a conceptual development plan for the development of the entire Tract to the Planning Director for review and comment by the Planning Director and the Development Review Committee. The conceptual development plan shall show the layout of lots/units or commercial buildings, density in units or square footage, road locations, amenity areas and improvements, trails and pedestrian paths, common and natural open space, required or proffered buffers, proposed clearing limits and any archaeology or natural resource preservation areas within the tract. Such review shall be for the purposes of determining general consistency with zoning ordinance requirements, the Master Plan, these proffers, and other applicable County policies.

11. **Work Force Housing.** A minimum of 85 of the residential units shall be offered for sale at a price at or below \$313,735.50 (“Workforce Units”) subject to adjustment as set forth herein. The maximum price for Workforce Units shall be adjusted annually, on January 1st of each year, by increasing such price by the cumulative rate of inflation as measured by the Index annual average change for the period from 2019 to the year a Workforce Unit is sold if such sale occurs on or after January 1, 2020. In the event that the Index is not available, a reliable government or other independent publication evaluating information heretofore used in determining the Index (approved in advance by the County Manager of Financial Management

Services) shall be relied upon in establishing an inflationary factor for purposes of increasing the maximum price for Workforce Units to approximate the rate of annual inflation in the County.

The Planning Director shall be provided with a copy of the settlement statement for each sale of a Workforce Unit and a spreadsheet prepared by Owner showing the prices of all of the Workforce Units that have been sold for use by the County in tracking compliance with the price restrictions applicable to the Workforce Units.

12. **Water and Sewer Master Plans.** Owner shall submit to the JCSA for its review and approval an overall master water and sanitary sewer plan for the Property prior to the submission of any development or subdivision plans for the Property. The overall Master Plan will be submitted as a skeletized layout reflecting the major pressure lines of the system with calculations justifying the line sizes. The purpose of the overall water master plan is to be sure the “system backbone” is appropriately sized for total build-out and not handled on a section-by-section submittal basis. The overall Master Water Plan shall also identify at what point in the development a future water source/facility may be required. JCSA will not require lift station locations and gravity sewer layout to be shown as part of the overall Master Sewer Plan. These items will be included on sub-Development Area master plan submittals when more detail can be provided (i.e. lift station locations, gravity sewer layout, looping of waterlines, etc.). It is understood the Reclaimed Water System if implemented will impact the overall Master Sewer Plan. Assuming that the project will be moving forward with sections of the development prior to this determination, notes/disclaimers will be added to the overall Master Sewer Plan stating the

water re-use facility is not included. If the Reclaimed Water System does happen, then revised overall Master Sewer Plans will have to be submitted.

13. **Strip Shopping Centers Prohibited**. No non-residential development in Tract 10 shall consist of an unbroken row or line of building fronts which are one unit deep and parallel or principally oriented to either Fieldstone Parkway or Six Mount Zion Road, with the parking field for such buildings located between the building and Fieldstone Parkway. It is the intent of this proffer to prohibit retail development commonly known as “strip retail/commercial development.” Development plans for non-residential development in Tract 10 shall be subject to approval by the Planning Director as to their compliance with this proffer.

14. **Design Review**. Owner shall prepare and submit design review guidelines for each Tract of the Property to the Planning Director setting forth design and architectural standards consistent with the section of the Community Impact Statement, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the County Planning Director, entitled “Architectural Criteria” for the development of the Tract prior to the County being obligated to grant final approval to any development plans for the Tract (the “Guidelines”). Owner shall establish one or more Design Review Board(s) to review all building plans and building elevations for conformity with the Guidelines and to approve or deny such plans.

15. **Tract 10B**. Prior to approval of a site plan and/or subdivision plan for residential development of Tract 10B, Owner shall obtain approval of a subdivision plat that establishes a parcel or parcels for the non-residential use intended on Tract 10B. Such residential site plan and or subdivision plan shall include easements for access and utilities adequate to serve the non-

residential development intended for Tract 10B. The gross acreage of non-residential use(s) in Tract 10B shall be not less than 8.0 acres.

16. **Headings.** All section and subsection headings of Conditions herein are for convenience only and are not a part of these Proffers.

17. **Severability.** If any condition or part thereof set forth herein shall be held invalid or unenforceable for any reason by a court of competent jurisdiction, the invalidity or unenforceability of such condition or part thereof shall not invalidate any other remaining condition contained in these Proffers.

18. **Successors and Assigns.** These Proffers shall run with the title to the Property and shall be binding on the parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns; provided, however once a party ceases to own any portion of the Property, such party shall have no continuing liability hereunder.

19. **Void if Amended Application not Approved.** In the event that the Amended Application is not approved by the County or is overturned by subsequent judicial determination, these Proffers and the Master Plan shall be null and void.

[Signatures located on following pages]

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.

WITNESS the following signatures and seals:

SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 1 LLC

By: David C. Lane
Title: AUTHORIZED Representative


STATE OF TEXAS
CITY/COUNTY OF DALLAS, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 20th day of September, 2019, by DAVID A. LANE, AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE, of SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 1 LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, on behalf of the company.

Linda A. Neal
NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

7-29-2021



Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.

SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 2 LLC

By: David C. Lane
Title: AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE


STATE OF TEXAS
CITY/COUNTY OF DALLAS, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 20th day of September, 2019, by DAVID A. LANE, AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE, of SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 2 LLC, a Delaware limited liability company, on behalf of the company.

Linda A. Neal
NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

7-29-2021



Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.

STONEHOUSE OWNERS FOUNDATION

By: Robert W. Woodruff
Title: PRESIDENT

STATE OF Virginia
CITY/COUNTY OF London, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 23RD day of September, 2019, by Robert W. Woodruff, President, of STONEHOUSE OWNERS FOUNDATION, a Virginia

Timothy O. Trant II
NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

2/28/2021



Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.

NVR, INC.




By: _____

Title: Vice President

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 23 day of September, 2019, by Jeff Ambrose, Vice President, of NVR, INC., a Virginia corporation, on behalf of the company.




NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

5/31/2023

Kelly Lynn Wroten
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7149229
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires May 31, 2023

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.


The authorized officer of NVR, Inc.
Attorney in fact for Anil Jain.
Anil Jain

By: Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Anil Jain

Name: Jeffrey C. Ambrose
Title: Authorized Officer



The authorized officer of NVR, Inc.
Attorney in fact for Krishnan Menon
Krishnan Menon

By: Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Krishnan Menon

Name: Jeffrey C. Ambrose
Title: Authorized Officer

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged this 23 day of September,
2019, by Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR, Inc. as attorney-in-fact for Anil
Jain and Kirshnan Menon.



NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

5/31/23

Kelly Lynn Wroten
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7149229
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires May 31, 2023

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.

Mary Christina Allegretto

Mary Christina Allegretto, Trustee of the Restated
Revocable Trust Agreement of Mary Christina Allegretto,
dated April 21, 2006, amended December 4, 2008

James Daniel Allegretto

James Daniel Allegretto, Trustee of the Restated Revocable
Trust Agreement of Mary Christina Allegretto, dated April
21, 2006, amended December 4, 2008

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged this 11th day of October,
2019, by Mary Christina Allegretto, Trustee and James Daniel Allegretto, Trustee of the Restated
Revocable Trust Agreement of Mary Christina Allegretto, dated April 21, 2006, as amended.

Mary R. Hopkins


NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

10/31/2023

Mary Rogers Hopkins
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7839293
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires October 31, 2023

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.



The authorized officer of NVR, Inc.
Attorney in fact for David Christopher Ferguson.
David Christopher Ferguson

By: Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for David Christopher Ferguson

Name: Jeffrey C. Ambrose
Title: Authorized Officer

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged this 23 day of September,
2019, by Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR, Inc. as attorney-in-fact for David
Christopher Ferguson.




NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

5/31/23

Kelly Lynn Wroten
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7149229
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires May 31, 2023

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.



The authorized officer of NVR, Inc.
Attorney in fact for Tyanne F. McDonald
Tyanne F. McDonald

By: Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Tyanne F. McDonald

Name: Jeffrey C. Ambrose
Title: Authorized Officer

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged this 23 day of September,
2019, by Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR, Inc. as attorney-in-fact for Tyanne
F. McDonald.




NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

5/31/23

Kelly Lynn Wroten
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7149229
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires May 31, 2023

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.


the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Vianney Victoire
Vianney Victoire

By: Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Vianney Victoire

Name: Jeffrey C. Ambrose
Title: Authorized Officer

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged this 29 day of October,
2019, by Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR, Inc. as attorney-in-fact for Vianney
Victoire.


Kelly Lynn Wroten
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7149229
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires May 31, 2023


NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

5/31/23

Signature page to the Amended and Restated Stonehouse Proffers.


the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Gloria Ann Simonnet
Gloria Ann Simonnet

By: Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR,
Inc., attorney-in-fact for Gloria Ann Simonnet

Name: Jeffrey C. Ambrose
Title: Authorized Officer

STATE OF VA
CITY/COUNTY OF James City, to-wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged this 29 day of October,
2019, by Jeffrey C. Ambrose, the authorized officer of NVR, Inc. as attorney-in-fact for Gloria
Ann Simonnet.

Kelly Lynn Wroten
NOTARY PUBLIC - Reg. No. 7149229
Commonwealth of Virginia
My Commission Expires May 31, 2023


NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires:

5/31/23

EXHIBIT “A”
PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

OWNER: SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 1 LLC

PIN NUMBERS: 0440100030; 0530100009; 0440100029; and 0440100025

Land Bay 5:

Parcel ID 0440100030:

All that certain lot, parcel or tract of land, lying, situate and being in Stonehouse Magisterial District, James City County, Virginia and being more particularly shown and described as Parcel B-1 on that certain plat entitled “Plat Showing Boundary Line Adjustment & Lotline Extinguishment being New Parcel B-1 and Lot 1, Section 1-A for 2J Investments, L.L.C.”, prepared by G.T. Wilson, Jr., L.S., of AES Consulting Engineers, dated February 9, 2005 and recorded March 29, 2005 in the Clerk’s Office of the Circuit Court of the City of Williamsburg and County of James City as Instrument No. 050007055 to which plat reference is hereby made for a more particular description such property.

Parcel ID No. 0530100009:

All that certain lot, parcel or tract of land, situate, lying and being more particularly shown and described as Parcel B-2 on that certain plat of subdivision entitled “Subdivision Plat of Stonehouse Development Area One, Phase 1, Section 1-B, Section II-A, Section III-C, Parcel B and Parcel C being a subdivision of properties owned by Stonehouse Limited Liability Company and Stonehouse, Inc., prepared by Langley and McDonald, P.C., dated November 19, 1999, revised December 9, 1999, a copy of which is of record in the Clerk’s Office of the Circuit Court of the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City, Virginia, in Plat Book 75 at Page 93 to which reference is hereby made for a more particular description of such property.

Land Bay 3:

Tax Parcel ID No.: 0440100029:

Section 1-B containing 19.1500 acres as shown on “Subdivision Plat of Stonehouse Development Area One, Phase I, Section I-B, Section II-A, Section III-C, Being a Subdivision of Properties Owned by Stonehouse Limited Liability Company and Stonehouse, Inc.”, made by Langley and McDonald, Inc., dated November 19, 1999, last revised December 9, 1999, recorded in Plat Book 75, Pages 93-97, and that certain property shown as “Parcel R-5” on that certain “Subdivision Plat Showing Stonehouse Glen Section 1 & 2 and Right of Way of Fieldstone Parkway being a subdivision of the property of Fieldstone Investment, LLC and Stonehouse Glen, LLC” dated May 31, 2006, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk’s Office for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument Number 060016179.

Land Bay 5 & Part of Tract 10A:

Tax Parcel ID No.: 0440100025:

All those certain lots, pieces or parcels of real property lying, being, and situated in the Stonehouse Magisterial District of James City County, Virginia, shown as "PARCEL B" on a that certain plat entitled "BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT PLAT OF PROPERTY OWNED BY STONEHOUSE, INC. AND GOLF TRUST OF AMERICA, L.P.", dated May 5, 1997, made by Langley and McDonald, P.C., recorded in the Circuit Court Clerk's Office for the County of James City and City of Williamsburg (the "Clerk's Office"), in Plat Book 66, at pages 89-93; and all that certain lot, piece or parcel of real property lying, being, and situated in the Stonehouse Magisterial District of James City County, Virginia, shown as "SECTION II-A" on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION PLAT OF STONEHOUSE DEVELOPMENT AREA ONE, PHASE 1 SECTION I-B, SECTION II-A, SECTION III-C PARCEL B AND PARCEL C BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PROPERTIES OWNED BY STONEHOUSE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY AND STONEHOUSE INC.", dated November 19, 1999, revised December 9, 1999, prepared by Langley and McDonald, Inc., recorded in the Clerk's Office in Plat Book 75, at pages 93-97; LESS AND EXCEPT the following described property:

1. All that property shown as "PARCEL B-1" and "PARCEL B-2" on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION PLAT OF STONEHOUSE DEVELOPMENT AREA ONE, PHASE 1 SECTION I-B, SECTION II-A, SECTION III-C PARCEL B AND PARCEL C BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PROPERTIES OWNED BY STONEHOUSE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY AND STONEHOUSE INC.", dated November 19, 1999, revised December 9, 1999, prepared by Langley and McDonald, Inc., recorded in the Clerk's Office in Plat Book 75, at pages 93-97;
2. All that property shown as "WELL FACILITY W-25" and "EXISTING WELL FACILITY W-26" on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION & CONVEYANCE PLAT OF WELL FACILITY W-25 AND VARIABLE WIDTH UTILITY EASEMENT TO JAMES CITY SERVICE AUTHORITY FROM STONEHOUSE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC", dated February 11, 2002, prepared by Landmark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk's Office in Plat Book 85, at pages 72 and 73;
3. All that property shown as "WASTEWATER LIFT STATION NO. 9-1" on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION AND CONVEYANCE PLAT OF WASTEWATER LIFT STATION NO. 9-1 TO JAMES CITY SERVICE AUTHORITY FROM STONEHOUSE DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC.", dated January 15, 2002, prepared by Landmark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk's Office in Plat Book 85, at page 71; and
4. Public Right of Way and all that property shown as "FIELDSTONE PARKWAY", "BMP #6", "PARCEL R-3", "PARCEL R-4", and "Parcel R-5" on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION PLAT SHOWING STONEHOUSE GLEN SECTION 1 & 2 AND RIGHT OF WAY OF FIELDSTONE PARKWAY BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE PROPERTY OF FIELDSTONE INVESTMENT, LLC AND STONEHOUSE GLEN, LLC", dated May 31, 2006, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument Number 060016179.

OWNER: SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 2, LLC

PIN NUMBERS: 0540100011; 0540100012; 0540100015; 0540100016; 0630100005; 0630100006; and 0540100002

Tract S:

Parcel ID 0540100011:

“Slater” Tract, containing 158 acres, more or less, as depicted on a plat thereof dated May 4, 1914, made by Sidney Smith, Surveyor, recorded in Plat Book 2, Page 50, including the church lot and the James Taylor Lot shown on the plat. Less and Except that portion of the property conveyed to the Commonwealth of Virginia for Route 600 recorded in Deed Book 53, Page 186, Being the same property conveyed The Chesapeake Corporation of Virginia by A.D. Slater and wife by deed dated December 13, 1972, recorded in Deed Book 143, Page 425.

Tax Parcel ID No.: 0540100012:

“FILICHKO” Tract, containing 10.238 acres, being more particularly shown and described on a plat of survey by B.C. Littlepage, C.L.S., dated November 5, 1971, recorded in Plat Book 29, Page 6, being the same property conveyed to Chesapeake Corporation by John R. Filichko and wife by deed dated April 11, 1988, recorded in Deed Book 387, Page 143. Less and Except that property shown as “New Right of Way” on that certain plat entitled “Plat Showing Right of Way Being The Extension of Lagrange Parkway and Re-Alignment of A Portion of State Route 600”, dated July 8, 2002, last revised January 16, 2003, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk’s Office for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument Number 030010861.

Land Bay 3:

Tax Parcel No. 0540100015:

That certain tract or parcel of land located in James City County, Virginia shown and designated as “Tract One 272.98+/- AC.” on the plat entitled Boundary Line Adjustment of the Properties of GS Stonehouse Green Land Sub, LLC” made by LandMark Design Group and dated 08-21-08, which plat is recorded in the Clerk’s Office as Instrument No. 080027247.

A portion of which is also shown on that certain plat entitled “SUBDIVISION PLAT SHOWING PUMP HOUSE PARCEL ON STONEHOUSE TRACT 3” dated Feb. 7, 2018 made by Timmons Group and recorded in the Clerk’s Office of the Circuit Court for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 180020132.

Tax Parcel Nos.: 0540800001A; 0540800022; 0540800023; 0540800024; 0540800025; 0540800026; 0540800027; 0540800028; 0540800029; 0540800030; 0540800031; 0540800032; 0540800033; 0540800036; 0540800037; 0540800038; 0540800039; 0540800040; 0540800041; 0540800078; 0540800079; 0540800080; 0540800081; 0540800082; 0540800083; 0540800084; 0540800085; 0540800086;

A portion of which is also shown on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION OF STONEHOUSE TRACT 3 PARCEL "A" & PARCEL "A", SECTION 1 LOTS 22 THROUGH 33, LOTS 36 THROUGH 41, & LOTS 78 THROUGH 86 STONEHOUSE DISTRICT JAMES CITY COUNTY VIRGINIA" dated 01/29/2019 made by LandTech Resources, Inc. and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 190002836.

A portion of which is also shown on that certain plat entitled "BOUNDARY LINE ADJUSTMENT PLAT LOTS 22 THROUGH 33, LOTS 36 THROUGH 41, LOTS 78 THROUGH 86, OPEN SPACE #1 & PARCEL A FUTURE DEVELOPMENT STONEHOUSE TRACT 3 PARCEL "A", SECTION 1 STONEHOUSE DISTRICT JAMES CITY COUNTY VIRGINIA" dated September 4, 2019 made by LandTech Resources, Inc. and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 190015433.

Tax Parcel Nos.: 0540900001A; 0540900002; 0540900003; 0540900004; 0540900005; 0540900006; 0540900007; 0540900008; 0540900009; 0540900010; 050900011; 0540900012; 0540900013; 0540900014; 0540900015; 0540900016; 0540900017; 0540900018; 0540900019; 0540900020; 0540900021; 0540900022; 0540900023; 0540900024; 0540900025; 0540900026; 0540900027;

A portion of which is also shown on that certain plat entitled "SUBDIVISION OF STONEHOUSE TRACT 3 CREATING PARCEL "B" & PARCEL "B" SECTION 1 LOTS 2 THROUGH 27 STONEHOUSE DISTRICT JAMES CITY COUNTY VIRGINIA" dated 12/12/2018 made by LandTech Resources, Inc. and recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court for the City of Williamsburg and County of James City as Instrument No. 190000917.

Tract 11A & Part of Tract 11B:

Tax Parcel No. 0540100016:

That certain tract or parcel of land located in James City County, Virginia shown and designated as "Tract Two 587.43+/- AC." on the plat entitled "Boundary Line Adjustment of the Properties of GS Stonehouse Green Land Sub, LLC" made by LandMark Design Group and dated 08-21-08, which plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 080027247.

Tract 8, Tracts 1A, 1B, 4, 5, 6 & 7, Part of Tract 11B and Part of Tract 2:

Tax Parcel No. 0630100005:

That certain tract or parcel of land located in James City County, Virginia shown and designated as "Tract Three 3031.43+/- AC." On the plat entitled "Boundary Line Adjustment of the Properties of GS Stonehouse Green Land Sub, LLC" made by LandMark Design Group and dated 08-21-08, which plat is recorded in the Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 080027247.

LESS AND EXCEPT those certain pieces or parcels of land shown as 'RIVERFRONT PRESERVE' and "STONEHOUSE PRESERVE" on that certain exhibit entitled "EXHIBIT SHOWING THE PROPOSED LOCATION OF SUBDIVISION OF THE RIVERFRONT

PRESERVE & STONEHOUSE PRESERVE JAMES CITY COUNTY VIRGINIA” dated 10/08/2019 made by LandTech Resources, Inc., a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B and made a part hereof.

Part of Tract 2:

Tax Parcel No. 0630100006:

That certain tract or parcel of land located in James City County, Virginia shown and designated as “Tract Four 38.74+/- AC.” on that plat entitled “Boundary Line Adjustment of the Properties of GS Stonehouse Green Land Sub, LLC” made by LandMark Design Group and dated 08-21-08, which plat is recorded in the Clerk’s Office as Instrument No. 080027247.

Part of Tract 10A and Tract 10B

Tax Parcel No. 0540100002:

“LAGRANGE” Tract, containing 203.29 acres, more or less, being Parcels A, B and D on a plat of survey made by John B. Vance, Jr., C.L.S., dated February 5, 1972, recorded in Plat Book 29, page 40. Being the same land conveyed to the Chesapeake Corporation of Virginia by Littleberry James Haley, Jr. et al., by deed dated March 30, 1981, recorded in Deed Book 212, Page 411.

LESS AND EXCEPT all lands lying north of the southerly boundary line of “Fieldstone Parkway” shown on that certain plat entitled “SUBDIVISION PLAT SHOWING STONEHOUSE GLEN SECTION 1 & 2 AND RIGHT OF WAY OF FIELDSTONE PARKWAY BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE PROPERTY OF FIELDSTONE INVESTMENT, LLC AND STONEHOUSE GLEN, LLC” dated May 31, 2006, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk’s Office for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument Number 060016179.

OWNER: SCP-JTL STONEHOUSE OWNER 1 LLC

PIN NUMBERS: 0530100010; 0530100020; 0530100025; 0530100023; 0530100024; 0640100001; 1210100047; 1310100008A; and 1310100019

Land Bay 14:

Parcel I:

Tax Parcel ID No. 0530100010:

Section III-C containing 16.0620 acres, all as shown on “Subdivision Plat of Stonehouse Development Area One, Phase I, Section I-B, Section II-A, Section III-C, Being a Subdivision of Properties Owned by Stonehouse Limited Liability Company and Stonehouse Inc.”, made by Langley and McDonald, Inc., dated November 19, 1999, last revised December 9, 1999 and recorded in Plat Book 75 at Pages 93-97.

Parcel II: Tax Parcel ID No.: 0530100020:

All that certain piece, parcel or tract of land, situate, lying and being in Stonehouse Magisterial District, James City County, Virginia, and being more particularly shown and described on that certain plat entitled "Composite Plat showing a Portion of Parcel A, Stonehouse Development Company, L.L.C., prepared by G.T. Wilson, Jr. L.S., dated January 14, 2004 and revised March 18, 2004, a copy of which is recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of the City of Williamsburg and County of James City as Instrument No. 040008576, which plat was recorded with that certain Deed of Bargain and Sale from Stonehouse Development Company, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company, to 2J Investments, LLC, a Virginia limited liability company, dated March 16, 2004 and recorded March 25, 2004 in the aforesaid Clerk's Office as Instrument No. 040008576, and to which plat reference is hereby made for a more particular description of such property.

Land Bay 8:

Parcel I: Tax Parcel ID No.: 0530100025:

That certain property shown as "Parcel R-5", on that certain "Subdivision Plat showing Stonehouse Glen Section 1 and 2 and Right-of-Way of Fieldstone Parkway being a Subdivision of the Property of Fieldstone Investment, LLC and Stonehouse Glen, LLC", dated May 31, 2006, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 060016179.

Parcel II: Tax Parcel ID No.: 0530100023:

All that property shown as "Parcel R-4", on that certain plat entitled "Subdivision Plat showing Stonehouse Glen Section 1 and 2 and Right-of-Way of Fieldstone Parkway being a Subdivision of the property of Fieldstone Investment, LLC and Stonehouse Glen, LLC", dated May 31, 2006, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 060016179.

Parcel III: Tax Parcel ID No.: 0530100024:

All that certain piece or parcel of land located in James City County, Virginia shown and designated as "BMP #6 1.1797 ac.", on that certain plat entitled "Subdivision Plat showing Stonehouse Glen Sections 1 and 2 and Right-of-Way of Fieldstone Parkway being a Subdivision of the Property of Fieldstone Investment, LLC and Stonehouse Glen, LLC", dated May 31, 2006, prepared by LandMark Design Group, recorded in the Clerk's Office of the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 060016179.

Tract 13 & Open Space around Commerce Park:

Tax Parcel ID Nos.: 0640100001 and 1210100047:

"Lagrange" Tract containing (i) 223.89 acres as depicted on that Plat of survey dated August 26, 1988, made by Charles J. Kerns, Jr., L.S., and recorded in Plat Book 50, Page 11, as conveyed to Chesapeake Corporation by Sheldon Lumber Company, Incorporated, dated April 29, 1987 and recorded in Deed Book 393 at Page 285, and (ii) 4.75 acres, depicted as Parcel B on Plat of survey dated March 29, 1984, made by AES, and recorded in Deed Book 246 at Page 313, as conveyed

to Stonehouse Inc. by deed from Howard V. Clayton and Marion P. Clayton, dated January 28, 1992 and recorded in Deed Book 549, Page 59.

Less and Except the following described property:

1. 15.00 acres depicted on "Plat of Section A of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse for Stonehouse, Inc." dated October 10, 1995, made by Langley and McDonald, P.C., and recorded in Plat Book 62 at Pages 94-96, as conveyed to Amoco/Enron Solar, by deed dated October 12, 1995 and recorded in Deed Book 758 at Page 721;

2. 11.1906 acres depicted as Parcel A on "Plat of Section A of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse for Stonehouse Inc.", dated October 10, 1995, made by Langley and McDonald, P.C., and recorded in Plat Book 62 at Page 94-96, as conveyed to the Industrial Development Authority of James City County, by deed dated September 30, 1996 and recorded in Deed Book 809 at Page 728;

3. 4.600 acres depicted as Stonehouse Commerce Park, Section B, Parcel A on that Plat entitled "Plat of Section B of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse for Stonehouse Inc.", made by Langley and McDonald, P.C., dated January 23, 1998 and recorded in Plat Book 68 at Pages 60-61, as conveyed to The Barre Company, L.L.C., by deed dated March 3, 1998 and recorded as Document No. 98-4099;

4. 6.245 acres as depicted on "Plat of Boundary Line Adjustment Stonehouse Commerce Park between Avid Realty, L.L.C. and Stonehouse Inc.", dated May 2, 2002, made by AES Consulting Engineers, and recorded in the Clerk's Office aforesaid in Plat Book 87 at Page 89, of which 3.100 acres, depicted as Stonehouse Commerce Park, Section B, Parcel B on that Plat entitled "Plat of Section B of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse for Stonehouse Inc.", made by Langley and McDonald, P.C., dated January 23, 1998 and recorded in Plat Book 68 at Pages 60-61, was conveyed to Avid Realty, L.L.C., by deed from Stonehouse Inc., dated June 23, 1998 and recorded as Document No. 98-11721;

5. 74.3712 acres depicted as "Stonehouse Commerce Park, Section C, Parcel A", on the Plat entitled "Plat of Section C of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse Inc.", made by Langley and McDonald, P.C., dated March 22, 1999 and recorded in Plat Book 73 at Page 38-39, as conveyed to Wachovia Capital Investments, Inc., by deed from Stonehouse Inc., dated May 17, 1999 and recorded as Instrument No. 99-11248;

6. 4.1278 acres depicted as "Stonehouse Commerce Park, New Parcel B-1, Section C", on the Plat entitled "Resubdivision Plat of Section C, Parcel B of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse for Stonehouse Inc.", made by Landmark Design Group, dated April 5, 2000 and recorded in Plat Book 77 at Pages 28-29, as conveyed to Friendship Partnership, LLC, by deed from Stonehouse Inc., dated April 6, 2000 and recorded as Instrument No. 00-7666;

7. Parcel A-2B containing 4151 S.F., Parcel A-2A containing 2750 S.F. and Parcel A-1A containing 2050 S.F., all as depicted on "Resubdivision Plat of Section A, Parcel A of Stonehouse Commerce Park at Stonehouse for the Industrial Development Authority of the County of James City, Virginia", made by Landmark Design Group, dated March 17, 2000, last revised June 23, 2000 and recorded in Plat Book 78 at Pages 4-5, and as conveyed to The Industrial Development

Authority of James City County by three deeds from Stonehouse Inc., all dated June 23, 2000, June 23, 2000 and June 23, 2000 and recorded as Instrument Nos. 00-12706, 00-12707 and 00-12708, respectively;

8. All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land with all improvements hereon and appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate, lying and being in the County of James City, Virginia, known and designated as “New Parcel”, consisting of 10.3+/- acres, more or less, as shown on that certain Plat entitled “Subdivision of the Property of Stonehouse at Williamsburg, LLC at Stonehouse Commerce Park, Stonehouse District, James City County, Virginia, made by Landmark Design Group, dated October 24, 2003 and revised October 28, 2003 and recorded in the Clerk’s Office of the Circuit Court for the County of James City, Virginia, as Instrument No. 030039997, to which reference is here made;

9. All that certain lot, piece or parcel of land with all improvements thereon and appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate, lying and being in the County of James City, Virginia, known and designated as “Parcel A 24,157 S.F. .05689 AC”, on that certain Plat entitled “Subdivision Plat of Parcel A & Parcel B Section D, Stonehouse Commerce Park being a portion of the property of Commerce Park at Stonehouse, LLC”, made by Landmark Design Group, dated September 26, 2005, attached hereto as Exhibit A-1, and the easement rights to be conveyed therewith as noted on the aforementioned Plat;

10. All that property shown as “New Right-of-Way” on that certain Plat entitled “Plat showing Right-of-Way being the extension of LaGrange parkway and Realignment of a portion of State Route 600”, dated July 8, 2002, last revised January 16, 2003, prepared by LandMark Design Group, and recorded in the Clerk’s Office for the City of Williamsburg and the County of James City as Instrument No. 030010861;

11. That certain lot or parcel of land located in the Stonehouse District of James City County, Virginia, shown and set out as “Parcel B, 100,898 S.F., 2.3163 AC”, on the Plat of Subdivision entitled “Subdivision Plat of Parcel A and Parcel B, Section D, Stonehouse Commerce Park Being a Portion of the Property of Commerce Park at Stonehouse, LLC”, prepared by Landmark Design Group, dated February 16, 2006 consisting of three sheets, which Plat of Subdivision is recorded in the Clerk’s Office of the Circuit Court of the City of Williamsburg and County of James City as Instrument No. 060009197;

Tract 9 (Middle School):

Tax Parcel ID No.: 1310100008A:

Parcel I:

All that certain tract or parcel of land situate, lying and being in Stonehouse District, James City County, Virginia, known and designated as “35.0 acres, +/-”, on a certain Plat entitled “Survey of 35 Acres +/- , for Conveyance to: Jackie L., Gary M. and Steve L. Massie from: Leon Carr Avery and Maxie G. Avery”, made by AES, a professional corporation, dated March 11, 1982, which Plat is recorded in the Clerk’s Office, Circuit Court, James City County, Virginia, in Plat Book 37 at Page 24.

Parcel II:

All that certain tract or parcel of land, situate, lying and being in Stonehouse District, James City County, Virginia, known and designated as “7.31 acres”, on Plat entitled “Boundary Survey of 7.31 acres located on the North line of Route 30”, made by AES, a professional corporation, dated December 17, 1984 and described by metes and bounds in that certain deed recorded in the Clerk’s Office aforesaid in Deed Book 262 at Page 455.

Tax Parcel ID No.: 1310100019:

All that certain tract of land lying in Stonehouse District, James City County, Virginia, containing 48.21 acres, more or less, and being in the residue of the “Tankard” Tract, known among the tax records for said county as Tax Map 13-1 (1-19). Reference is made to that Plat of survey recorded in the Clerk’s Office, Circuit Court, James City County, Virginia, in Plat Book 50 at Page 14, and Deed recorded in Deed Book 420 at Page 712, that Plat recorded in Plat Book 88 at Pages 43-44, and that Deed recorded as Instrument No. 020027159.

OWNER: STONEHOUSE OWNERS FOUNDATION


Tax Parcel ID #0540100017


All that certain lot or parcel of land conveyed to Stonehouse Owners Foundation in Instrument No. 140015279 and shown as “New Parcel, Amenity H, 461,136 S.F./10.586 Acres” on plat recorded as Instrument No. 090021691.

EXHIBIT “B”

- [illegible]

RECORD MERIDIAN
INST. #080027247

SCALE: 1"=1000'	 LRI LANDTECH RESOURCES, INC. ENGINEERING & SURVEYING CONSULTANTS	3925 Midlands Road Williamsburg, VA 23188 Ph: (757) 565-1677 Fax: (757) 565-0782 web: www.landtechresources.com					EXHIBIT SHOWING THE PROPOSED LOCATION OF SUBDIVISION OF THE RIVERFRONT PRESERVE & STONEHOUSE PRESERVE JAMES CITY COUNTY VIRGINIA
JOB: 17-278			NO.	DATE	REVISION / COMMENT / NOTE		
DRAWN BY: LRI							
SHEET: 1 OF 3							



RECORD MERIDIAN

EXHIBIT
SHOWING THE PROPOSED LOCATION OF SUBDIVISION OF THE
RIVERFRONT PRESERVE &
STONEHOUSE PRESERVE

