

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

F. MICHAEL HERZBERG IV – CHAIRMAN
COLD HARBOR DISTRICT

SEAN M. DAVIS – VICE CHAIRMAN
HENRY DISTRICT

SUSAN P. DIBBLE
SOUTH ANNA DISTRICT

DANIELLE GRIESHABER FLOYD
CHICKAHOMINY DISTRICT

RYAN M. HUDSON
MECHANICSVILLE DISTRICT

FAYE O. PRICHARD
ASHLAND DISTRICT

JEFF S. STONEMAN
BEAVERDAM DISTRICT

JOHN A. BUDESKY
COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR



HANOVER COUNTY

ESTABLISHED IN 1720
WWW.HANOVERCOUNTY.GOV

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

JO ANN M. HUNTER, AICP
SENIOR DIRECTOR OF PLANNING &
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MARY B. PENNOCK
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

ANDREW J. POMPEI
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

GRETCHEN W. BIERNOT
CURRENT PLANNING MANAGER

DONNA S. BOWEN
PRINCIPAL PLANNER

C. JASON HAZELWOOD
CODE COMPLIANCE SUPERVISOR

ERIN M. BABER
BUSINESS MANAGER

P. O. BOX 470
HANOVER, VIRGINIA 23069
PHONE 804-365-6171

October 17, 2025

VIA email: mroberts@hirschlerlaw.com
Hirschler c/o Matthew G. Roberts
P.O. Box 500
Richmond, VA 23218

RE: REZ2025-00020, SE2025-00021, and CUP2025-00014
(Loch Levan Land Limited Partnership) – Comment Letter #1

Mr. Roberts:

The Planning Department has conducted a review of your application materials and provides the comments listed below. Attached, you will also find comments from other reviewing agencies. Your request has tentatively been placed on the Planning Commission's agenda for **January 15, 2026**. Please respond to the comments below by **December 12, 2025**, which is the submittal deadline for the January meeting.

The following are comments from the Planning Department regarding your request:

1. *Comprehensive Plan Amendment*: Note that the Board of Supervisors must authorize advertisement of the requested Comprehensive Plan Amendment at a future meeting. Note that the boundaries of the area to be designated *Employment Center* are general in nature (not parcel specific) and may be prepared to follow natural or manmade boundaries where possible, such as roadways, transmission lines, waterways, etc.
2. *Residual Areas Zoned A-1*: Provide the acreage of the residual land that will remain zoned A-1. Verify that these parcels maintain legal access and meet all dimensional standards for the A-1 zoning district (minimum requirements regarding lot size, lot width, lot frontage, etc.).
3. *Conceptual Plan Legend*: Provide a legend with the conceptual plan. It is unclear what the dark green areas specify. It is unclear what the lighter tan areas note surrounding the conceptual building areas. Note what type of uses/activities are permitted in these areas.

4. *Ultimate Right-of-Way*: Show the ultimate right-of-way along Ashland Road on the conceptual plan as specified in the Comprehensive Plan.
5. *Proposed Entrances (Proffers and Conceptual Plan)*: For clarity, proposed entrances from Ashland Road should be numbered on the conceptual plan and cross-referenced in the proffers (Proffer #8 specifically). As the existing entrance to Hunting Hawk Golf Course has a left-turn lane, consider proffering that the left-turn lane remain at that entrance. Verify that sight distance at all entrances adheres to all VDOT requirements.
6. *Internal Roads*: Please clarify whether internal roads will be public or private. Please provide a typical section. The construction plans submitted for a similar project (CON2025-00010: Hanover Technology Park Loop Road A) show wide utility easements on either side of the right-of-way creating a wider cross-section that involves additional tree clearing, particularly in buffer areas. Are additional utility easements planned for this project adjacent to and outside of the right-of-way/road easements? Also note that Sec. 26-162.5 requires a landscape buffer 25 feet in width along internal roads within the M-1 zoning district.
7. *Construction Traffic Damage (Proffer #8.d)*: Specify what segment of Ashland Road will be evaluated and corrected due to construction damage (Example: Ashland Road between Pouncey Tract Road and the existing high-voltage transmission line).
8. *Perimeter Buffers (Proffers and Conceptual Plan)*
 - a. *Inconsistency between Conceptual Plan and Proffers*: The width of perimeter buffers is inconsistent between the conceptual plan and proffered conditions. The conceptual plan shows buffers that are generally 150 feet in width, with a buffer 200 feet in width along Ashland Road (and an area along the southern boundary that is only 100 feet in width). That does not align with the buffer widths described in Proffer #4.a.i, which only mentions buffers that are 100 to 150 feet in width.
 - b. *Minimum Recommended Width*: Consider providing a minimum perimeter buffer width of 150 feet around the entire property as provided as part of REZ2023-00035 (Proffer #3), a comparable approved development for data centers, to help mitigate potential noise and visual impacts to nearby residential properties.
 - c. *Perimeter Buffers in Open Space*: Language regarding the timing and installation of supplementary plantings within buffer areas located in common open space should be included within the proffers. It seems like some perimeter buffers are in open space areas that are not near building sites requiring site plan approval (such as areas separated from building sites by the primary access road), so there should be clarity on what party is responsible for the supplementary plantings and when those should occur.
 - d. *Relationship to Ultimate Right-of-Way*: The conceptual plan or proffers should clearly state that the perimeter buffer along Ashland Road is measured from the ultimate right-of-way specified in the Comprehensive Plan.

- e. *Substation at Northeast Corner*: Consider additional buffering, setbacks, and other design techniques to minimize visibility of the proposed substation at the northeastern corner of the property from Ashland Road, as the adjacent transmission line and curvature in the road may allow visibility of that feature. Ashland Road is a locally-designated scenic road on the Comprehensive Plan, so minimizing visibility of the project from the roadway is highly encouraged.
9. *Open Space and Property Owners Association*: Consider proffering that there will be a property owners' association that will be responsible for the maintenance of open space areas and ensure consistent design within the development should there be multiple property owners (Comprehensive Plan: p. 48). Any proffer regarding establishment of the Property Owners Association should specify when the association will be formed (e.g. prior to construction plan approval, prior to subdivision approval, prior to approval of the first site plan, etc.). As part of REZ2023-00006 (Proffer #14), formation of a property owners' association is required prior to or concurrent with final approval of the initial subdivision of the property. Within the *Employment Center* land use designation, the Comprehensive Plan (p. 47) recommends at least 10% of the project area be dedicated as open space.
10. *Screening of Mechanical Equipment (Proffer #5.2)*: This proffer specifies that mechanical equipment will only be screened from "adjacent public streets and residential dwellings located in Hanover County." This proffer should be revised to require screening of mechanical equipment from view of any residential property, regardless of the locality, to mitigate potential visual and noise impacts.
11. *Fencing (Proffers, Conceptual Plan, and Special Exception Request)*
- a. There are inconsistencies regarding the proposed fencing height. Sheet C4.0 (Note #2) of the conceptual plan/sketch plan states that fencing will be 7 – 10 feet tall, while Proffer #6 states that fencing will be 6 – 10 feet tall.
 - b. The application submitted with SE2025-00021 does not specifically state that fences up to 10 feet tall are being requested, but that information is included in the sketch plan. Please ensure consistency between the conceptual plan, sketch plan, and proffered conditions and amend the application for SE2025-00021 to specifically state the maximum fence height requested.
 - c. The conceptual plan seems to show the fence crossing creeks and Resource Protection Areas (RPAs) (Example: Tributary at south-central portion of site west of a conceptual substation and well). Consider removing the fence from these areas, so that waterways and riparian corridors remain natural and serve as wildlife corridors (Comprehensive Plan Strategy EN.3d (p. 155 – 156).
12. *Building Height (SE2025-00021)*: Please specifically state the maximum building height requested on the application for SE2025-00021. It is shown on the sketch plan but not specifically stated on the application. Consider preparing line-of-sight renderings to provide a

better understanding of potential visual impacts of buildings that exceed maximum height requirements, based upon topography and vegetation.

13. *Building Elevations*: Please provide building elevations that align with the proffered conditions. If building elevations are conceptual in nature, please identify key elements that align with proffered conditions and recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan (examples below).



14. *CUP and SE Conditions*: Note the Hanover County may impose any reasonable conditions the Board of Supervisors deems necessary to mitigate potential impacts of any uses requested with the CUP and SE applications. While the application included suggested conditions, the Planning Department will develop recommended conditions to mitigate potential impacts identified during the review process. Those conditions will be included in the staff report and may differ from the suggested conditions included in the application.
15. *Wastewater Utility Pumping Station and Treatment Plant*: To help the Planning Department identify potential impacts, please provide additional information regarding the capacity of the conceptual well, hydro tank, and wastewater utility pumping station and treatment plan. Due to the project's location on the edge of the Suburban Service Area (with the opposite side of Ashland Road being outside of the Suburban Service Area), nearby residents have expressed concerns regarding potential impacts to groundwater. Please provide information or studies on how the proposed private well and wastewater systems may impact (or may not impact) groundwater and nearby wells. If there is an impact, please identify mitigation measures. Please provide elevations of the hydro tanks and indicate their maximum height.
16. *Community Meeting*: Please organize a community meeting for these zoning requests (organized by the applicant in coordination with the Planning Department). When planning the community meeting, please coordinate the meeting with your district representatives and staff to determine a mutually-acceptable date for the meeting. Please schedule this meeting ahead of the resubmittal deadline. Staff may have additional comments depending on the outcome of the community

meeting and public feedback received. I have attached community meeting guidelines for reference.

17. *Response Letter Requested*: Please submit a response sheet to this comment letter.
18. *Review Meeting*: Please contact me to schedule a meeting to review the contents of this letter prior to resubmittal.
19. *Resubmittal Deadline for Planning Commission Meeting (Tentative Date: January 15, 2026)*: Please email me a PDF of the revised sketch plan and proffers before submitting hard copies. Electronic copies will be due by December 12, 2025, but hard copies will be due January 5, 2026 [Sec. 26-307(c)].

Note that the Planning Commission public hearing will not be advertised until a community meeting is held and VDOT approves the Traffic Impact Analysis. VDOT presented significant issues with the Traffic Impact Analysis and transportation network in its comment letter, so please ensure these issues are addressed prior to resubmittal. Note that Hanover County has also sent the Traffic Impact Analysis to a third-party consultant for review and will be forwarding their comments in early November.

20. *Potential for Additional Comments*: Staff may have additional comments following responses to this letter and the community meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (804) 365-6369.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gretchen W. Biernot', written in a cursive style.

Gretchen W. Biernot, AICP
Current Planning Manager

Community Meeting Guidelines

It is often recommended that applicants who file a zoning application for rezonings, Conditional Use Permits, or Special Exceptions arrange a community meeting with surrounding property owners. These meetings are particularly necessary for complex rezoning applications or cases with significant community interest.

What is the purpose of a community meeting?

A community meeting allows the applicant the opportunity to present their case to the community and obtain feedback from citizens who may have questions, concerns, or comments about the proposal.

When should the meeting be scheduled?

The applicant is responsible for scheduling the meeting, which shall include a date, time, and location. The Planning Staff recommends that applicants schedule the meeting after all agencies have conducted their initial review of the application and at least one month prior to the date the application is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission or Board. This timeframe should allow the applicant time to make any necessary changes to the application following the meeting and still meet applicable plan revision deadlines. The Planning Commission rules require that the meeting be scheduled prior to the advertisement date, which is 21 days prior to the meeting.

Who should be contacted to arrange for the meeting time?

The applicant should coordinate with their Planning Commissioner, Board of Supervisors representative, and Planning Staff to arrange the meeting time and location. Please note that applicants that schedule meetings without coordinating with the staff may be required to reschedule the meeting, which may cause the application review process to be delayed.

Where and at what time of day should the meeting be held?

The applicant is responsible for finding a location to hold the meeting. Potential locations often include churches, fire stations, and libraries.

The meeting should be held in the evening, Monday through Thursday, beginning around 6:00 pm. Meetings typically last from one to two hours, depending on the complexity of the case. Applicants should provide a sign-in sheet (prepared by staff) and an agenda for the meeting, setting aside time for a presentation and a review of the plan by the applicant, staff comments, and a question and answer period. A sample agenda is attached.

Who should be notified about the meeting?

The applicant should start by sending written notices to adjacent property owners as well as property owners adjacent to those owners. The applicant should work with staff to determine if it is appropriate to notify all of the residents within the subdivision (if the property is within a subdivision). It may also be necessary to notify representatives of nearby communities, such as the president of a homeowners association. It is helpful to include a copy of the proposed sketch plan or conceptual plan with the notice. This will allow citizens who may not be able to attend the meeting the opportunity to educate themselves about the nature of the project. Property owner information may be obtained from the County's website. (Contact staff for assistance in using this website.) The applicant should give adjacent property owners two weeks' notice of the meeting to allow them time to make arrangements to attend the meeting.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RICHMOND DISTRICT
2430 Pine Forest Drive
COLONIAL HEIGHTS, VA 23834
www.VDOT.Virginia.gov

Stephen C. Brich, P.E.
COMMISSIONER

October 16, 2025

County of Hanover
Department of Planning and Zoning
P.O. Box 470
Hanover, VA 23069
Attn.: Gretchen Biernot

Re: REZ2025-00020 – Lock Levan Land Limited Partnership, Et Al. - TIA

Ms. Biernot,

The Department of Transportation, Ashland Residency Transportation and Land Use Section has reviewed the above referenced Traffic Impact Analysis submitted by Hirschler dated, August 22, 2025 and offer the following comments:

1. Please provide the trip generation information (both of full buildout traffic and construction) in the Appendix.
2. Please include an access management section discussing if the proposed site entrances will meet VDOT's spacing requirements.
3. The EB and WB through volumes at the site entrances in Figure 7-2 are incorrect.
4. Figure 7-1 shows construction traffic distributed at 25% at Site Entrance 1, 50% at Site Entrance 2, and 25% at Site Entrance 3. It is likely that the construction traffic will be more concentrated at one or two of the entrances changing during different phases of the construction depending on where the building activities actual occur.
5. With the construction traffic distributions as shown in Figure 7-1, the AM construction volumes would warrant right turn lanes at Site Entrances 1 and 2.
6. Signal timing adjustments are recommended at the intersection of Ashland Road at Pouncey Tract Road. Please clarify if the MOEs reported are with or without these signal timing adjustments.
7. The capacity analysis shows the following:

- Under 2035 conditions, site traffic causes the SBL queue to exceed the available storage at the Ashland Road Pouncey Tract signal in the AM peak hour. Additionally, site traffic causes a significant increase in EB and WB queuing, as well as increasing overall delay by over 100 seconds over 2035 background conditions.
- Construction traffic causes an increase in overall intersection delay above existing conditions of nearly 90 seconds and 40 seconds in the 2027 AM and PM peaks, respectively, as well as significant increase in EB queuing during the 2027 AM peak. And WB queuing during the 2027 PM peak. These degradations need to be specifically called out in the report with discussions on whether or not mitigations are recommended.

Please provide a detailed response to comments indicating where and how each comment was addressed with your resubmittal. If further information is desired, please contact Jessica Miller at 434-774-6074.

Additionally, office hours for comment discussions will be held at the Ashland Residency on Thursdays from 2-3pm each week. Please contact me or the front desk to advise of attendance (Engineer of Record is required and Owner/Developer strongly recommended).

Jessica Miller
Engineer I - Plan Reviewer
VDOT Ashland Residency Office

on behalf of:

Harley E. Joseph, Jr., PE
Richmond District Land Use Engineer



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

RICHMOND DISTRICT
2430 Pine Forest Drive
COLONIAL HEIGHTS, VA 23834
www.VDOT.Virginia.gov

Stephen C. Brich, P.E.
COMMISSIONER

September 26, 2025

County of Hanover
Department of Planning and Zoning
P.O. Box 470
Hanover, VA 23069
Attn.: Gretchen Biernot

Re: REZ2025-00020 – Lock Levan Land Limited Partnership, Et Al.

Ms. Biernot,

The Department of Transportation, Ashland Residency Transportation and Land Use Section has reviewed the above referenced rezoning request submitted by Hirschler dated, August 22, 2025 and find the request to be generally acceptable as noted:

1. It is the responsibility of the engineer who signs and seals the plans to verify that the intersection and stopping distances at the proposed entrance locations have been checked.

A TIA is currently under review for this rezoning application. Comments will be provided under separate cover when the review is complete.

A VDOT Land Use Permit will be required prior to any work within the right of way. The owner/developer must contact the Ashland Residency Transportation and Land Use Section at 804-585-3592 for information pertaining to this process.

Jessica Miller
Engineer I - Plan Reviewer
VDOT Ashland Residency Office

on behalf of:

Harley E. Joseph, Jr., PE
Richmond District Land Use Engineer

ZONING STAFF MEETING

Department of Public Utilities Comments

CASE NAME: Loch Levan Land Limited Partnership, et al

PROJECT #: REZ2025-00020

PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW:

No Comment: ☐

Comments Below: ☒

DATE: 9/22/2025

REVIEWED BY: T. Watkins

The Hanover County Department of Public Utilities (DPU) has reviewed the above referenced rezoning request and has the following comments:

1. This development is within the Suburban Service Area (SSA) but public water and sanitary sewer are not immediately available for this development and will require both extensive, off-site extensions and off-site Water and Sanitary Sewer Easements to provide public service.
2. If required, any improvements, extensions or new connections to the public water or sanitary sewer systems will need to be completed in accordance with DPU requirements. If public water and sanitary sewer are required, additional comments will be generated.
3. The developer is responsible for all approvals required for their proposed private wells, water storage tanks, water pump stations and wastewater treatment plant.
4. The developer is responsible for the cost of all improvements required to support this development.
5. This development represents approximately 400+ acres at the western limits of the SSA. This area is not currently served by public water and sanitary sewer. A development of this scale in this area could impact DPU's Utility Master Plan including the need for future public water storage tanks with pump stations and wastewater pump stations. This development's continued inclusion or removal from the SSA should be considered and evaluated to allow DPU to adjust planning for future support facilities/improvements accurately.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.



HANOVER FIRE-EMS OFFICE OF THE FIRE MARSHAL



P.O. Box 470 Hanover, VA 23069, General Questions - (804) 365-6195, Email - fmo@hanovercounty.gov

FIRE PLANS REVIEW

Date:	9-19-2025
Subject:	LOCH LEVAN LAND LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL. -Hunting Hawk Technology Park
Jurisdiction:	Hanover
Trakit File #	REZ2025-00020
From:	Lieutenant Paul Polivka Phone: 804-365-4858 Email: ptpolivka@hanovercounty.gov
To:	Gretchen Biernot
Type of Review:	Rezoning 1 st Review
Comments:	1. The Hanover Office of the Fire Marshal has completed its review of the Rezoning of this property and has the following comments as the project advances. • The submitted plan shall indicate the location of all required or existing fire hydrants after determining the number and distribution of fire hydrants: VSFPC - C105.1 (2012) • Fire hydrants must be located within 400 feet (600 feet if Sprinklered) of all parts of the building: VSFPC - 507.5.1 (2021) • Provide details on the method to access all exterior points of the building from within 150 feet of an approved emergency fire apparatus access roadway. Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building, or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of this section and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. VSFPC - 503.1.1 (2021) • Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet (6096 mm), exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches (4115 mm). VSFPC 503.2.1. • Where a fire hydrant is located on a fire apparatus access road, the minimum road width shall be 26 feet. VSFPC - D103.1 (2012)



HANOVER FIRE-EMS OFFICE OF THE FIRE MARSHAL



P.O. Box 470 Hanover, VA 23069, General Questions - (804) 365-6195, Email - fmo@hanovercounty.gov

FIRE PLANS REVIEW

- The approximate location of all required fire lane markings shall be indicated on the plans. Fire lanes between twenty and twenty-six feet in width shall be marked on both sides of the roadway. The required forms and installation instructions for the fire lane details can be obtained from Hanover Fire and EMS Office of the Fire Marshal website. <https://www.hanovercounty.gov/1082/Plans-Review>
- An approved lock shall be installed on buildings, gates, or similar barriers where required by the fire code official. VSFPC – 505.1.1 (2021)
- Buildings or facilities with a gross area of more than 62,000 square feet (124,000 w/sprinklers) shall be provided with two separate and approved fire apparatus access roads. VSFPC - D104.2 (2012)
- Where two fire apparatus access roads are required, they shall be placed a distance apart equal to not less than one-half of the length of the maximum overall diagonal dimension of the lot or area to be served, measured in a straight line between accesses. VSFPC - D104.3 (2012)
- Buildings or facilities exceeding 30 feet or three stories in height shall have at least two means of fire apparatus access for each structure. VSFPC - D104.1 (2012)
- Buildings or portions of buildings or facilities exceeding thirty feet in height above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access shall be provided with an aerial fire apparatus access road. The aerial fire apparatus access road shall have a minimum of twenty-six feet of unobstructed clear width in the immediate vicinity of the building. Overhead obstructions in the form of utility or power lines shall not be located within the aerial fire apparatus access roadway. At least one aerial fire apparatus access roadway shall be located a minimum of fifteen feet and a maximum of thirty feet from the building and positioned parallel to one entire side of the building: VSFPC - D105.1 / D1105.2 (2012)
- Parking stalls or other obstructions shall not be placed in front of the access to fire hydrants, fire pump test headers, fire department sprinkler system connections, fire department standpipe connections, or fire protection system control valves. VSFPC - 507.5.4 / 507.5.5 (2021)
- As this project progresses, the applicant should be aware of the requirements of the Hanover Fire Marshal's Office. Requirements can be found on the Hanover Fire and EMS web page: <https://www.hanovercounty.gov/1082/Plans-Review>.
- The Hanover County- Plans Review Guidelines and the Commercial Development- Checklist are in the Reference Plans Review Tab.

Department of Public Works Comments

CASE NAME: LOCH LEVAN LAND LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL.
TRACKIT PROJECT #: REZ2025-00020
PLEASE MARK THE APPROPRIATE BOX BELOW:

No Comment ☐

Comments Below ☒

DATE: 09/15/2025 REVIEWED BY: MJD

No comments on zoning actions

Comments on future development.

1. Wetlands delineation, evaluation of CBPA and extent of RPA required. Water quality impact assessment certification required along with associated supporting information.
2. Additional development subject to runoff reduction and channel protection.
3. With the large increase in impervious area, it is likely that the onsite detention of stormwater will be required.
4. If development is 5 acres or more or 10lb or more of phos load, 75% of nutrient reduction must be met on site.
5. Analysis of downstream manmade and natural systems to a point where the site is less than 1% of drainage area will likely be required.
6. There does not appear to be a clear outfall from the site to a manmade or natural stormwater conveyance. Easement on adjacent sites may be required.
7. NWI wetlands are prevalent on the site. Site specific evaluation/determination of the extent of wetlands will be required.
8. Tiller dam located onsite is regulated by DCR. Inundation mapping will be needed to show areas to avoid development.
9. Onsite ponds must meet the requirements of the Hanover County Drainage Design Handbook. Tiller dam must be current with state permitting.
10. Offsite ponds must not be impacted by development. See Hanover County Drainage Design Handbook.