



City of Virginia Beach

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens

Advisory Committee

Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Annual Report to City Council

Appointive Agency Chair: Jessica Windish

Date: August 6, 2026

Executive Summary

During the **Fiscal Year** covering the period of July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026 the Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee (TA/ITA CAC) volunteers and liaisons

- Met thirteen (13) times

Our most significant accomplishments are detailed below, along with recommendations for your consideration.

Mission Statement

The Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee serves an advisory role for the residents and businesses of the Transition Area and Interfacility Traffic Areas located between the urbanized regions of the city to the north and the rural areas of the south. The Green Line and the Transition Area establish significant growth management strategies and planning policies that ensure new development is sensitive to and compatible with the topography, the agricultural and rural parts of the city, and the flight path between Naval Air Station Oceana and Naval Auxiliary Landing Field Fentress, while limiting infrastructure and city services expansion.

Responsibilities Include:

- To become familiar with and provide advice to the City Council concerning the provisions and recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Transition Area and

ITA, including, the Princess Anne Commons and Transition Area, the Transition Area Design Guidelines, the Interfacility Traffic Area and Vicinity Master Plan, and all future amendments to the Comp Plan and studies related to the Transition Area and ITA.

- To engage in public information efforts to improve communications between the residents and businesses of the Transition Area and ITA and the City, and to provide a forum to discuss matters related to the Transition Area and ITA.
- To monitor and report on public projects and plans within the Transition Area and ITA to the Council and provide recommendations for remedial actions, as necessary.

Accomplishment of Goals and Objectives

Over the past **Fiscal Year** the appointive agency, through its appointed volunteers and its liaisons, worked on the following key matters in furtherance of its mission:

1. Held regular meetings to provide advisory comments to the Planning Commission and the City Council for the projects proposed within the Transition Area and the Interfacility Traffic Area.
 - a. Twelve regular meetings.
 - b. One special meeting was held to discuss the ITA Master Plan Update and the Virginia Beach National Golf Course Request for Proposal (RFP).
 - c. The Committee received presentations for four development projects. The Committee recommended approval for two and recommended formal denials for two.
2. The Committee recommend approval for four proposed projects between July 1, 2025, and June 30, 2026: Phil Bonifant (August 7, 2025) and Cohen Residential, LLC (October 2, 2025).
3. The Committee issued two letters recommending denial between July 1, 2024, and June 30, 2025: one for ASC Real Estate, LLC and one for Harrison and Lear, Inc.
4. A recommendation for denial was issued for the ASC Real Estate, LLC project due to the Committee's position that the project plan failed to adhere to publicly vetted documents; specifically, Innovation Park Design and Development Guidelines, Active Transportation Plan, Master Transportation Plan, Comprehensive Plan, and Flood Protection Program. The applicant's request for significant deviations from City of Virginia Beach Zoning Code, which the Committee felt lacked adequate basis, includes variances for landscaping and fencing. See formal correspondence dated September 4, 2025.
5. A recommendation for denial was issued for the Harrison and Lear, Inc. project due to the Committee's position that the project plan failed to adhere to publicly vetted documents; specifically, noncompliance with density, open space, and land use policies, erodes established zoning protections, community impacts and public opposition, and historical precedent and legal considerations. See formal correspondence dated February 25, 2026.

6. The committee sent a letter of support for the proposed Blue Line Charter Amendment, which would require a supermajority vote in order to rezone property to a higher density or a more intense zoning district south of the blue line and require specific findings to be able to extend City utilities below the blue line. See formal correspondence dated November 14, 2025.
7. Received a presentation from Nancy Helman, Convention and Visitors Bureau on sports tourism (December 11, 2025).
8. The committee sent a letter supporting the City of Virginia Beach retaining ownership of the Virginia Beach National Golf Course and maintaining its current form. See formal correspondence dated January 7, 2026.
9. Received a presentation from Emily Archer and Natalie Guilmeus, Economic Development on Economic Development land use projects (March 5, 2026).
10. The committee sent a letter with recommendations for the draft 2040 Comprehensive Plan including revised language, accurate and usable maps and graphics, utilize the terms "Transition Area", "Green Line", and "Blue Line", and ensure that the current guidelines that are in place for the TA/ITA, as referenced in the associated documents, are maintained. See formal correspondence dated April 19, 2026.
11. The committee sent a letter on the ITA Master Plan Update discussing that the current ITA Vicinity Master Plan proposes development that is specifically suited to support low density land use in this area, proposed roadways in this plan present a significant safety hazard, current primary roads into and out of this area cannot support an increase in the daily traffic that will result from the expansion of light industrial development, funding needed for the infrastructure improvements associated with the proposed plan present significant concerns, numerous entities within the Virginia Beach community have supported, and will continue to support, sports tourism expansion in this part of our city, and light industrial and flex space proposed is very vague in nature and creates potential for a great variety of industrial developments within the area. See formal correspondence dated July 6, 2026.
12. The committee sent a letter stating that the committee does not support the Virginia Beach National Golf Course proposal as its proposals conflict with the ImagineVB 2040 Comprehensive Plan, the density of the proposal, and the proposals conflict within the ongoing ITA Master Plan Update proposal. See formal correspondence dated July 6, 2026.

Membership

Member	Term
Henley, Barbara (Councilmember, District 2)	
Cummings, Stacy (Councilmember, District 8)	
Windish, Jessica (Chair)	02/28/2027
Horal, Melissa (Vice Chair)	02/28/2028
Allen, Brandon L.	2/28/2029
Karslake, Michael	02/28/2028
Kirwin, Brian A.	2/28/2029
Lee, Donn L.	02/28/2027
Luckman, Thomas	06/30/2027
Merritt, Paul L.	02/28/2027
Noel III, James W.	2/28/2029
Brunke, William (VBDA Representative)	08/31/2027
Cromwell, John (Planning Commission Representative)	02/28/2029
Hicks, Diana	2/28/2026
Landfield, Kenneth	2/28/2026
White, Robert	2/28/2026
Ismail, Kaydyn R. (Student Member)	6/30/2026
Smith, Kylie T. (Student Member)	6/30/2026
Bailey, Alexis (Staff Liaison)	

Goals and Objectives for the Coming Year

- Continue to serve in an advisory role for the residents/businesses and the City Council within the Transition and Interfacility Traffic Areas located between the urbanized regions of the city to the north and the rural area to the south.
- Continue to pursue opportunities to educate various Departments and Divisions within the City, and to learn about their contributions to the TA/ITA.
- Provide input and assistance with the update to the City's Comprehensive Plan with relation to the Transition Area and Interfacility Traffic Area
- Continue to advise on the planning documents that are specific to the TA / ITA such as the Transition Area Design Guidelines, the Interfacility Traffic Area and Vicinity Master Plan, Princess Anne Corridor Study, Municipal Center, Princess Anne Commons and Innovation Park Design Guidelines, the Dewberry Study and the Hampton Roads JLUS and all future amendments to the Comp Plan and studies related to the Transition Area or ITA.
- Continue to engage in public information efforts to improve communications between the residents and businesses of the Transition Area / ITA and the City, and to provide a forum to discuss matters related to the Transition Area / ITA.
- Continue to monitor and report on public projects and plans within the Transition Area or ITA to the Council and provide recommendations for remedial actions, as necessary

Recommendations to City Council

- Implement the long-standing plans detailed in the ITA and Vicinity Master Plan by approving and activating the in-design / pending ITA implementation plan that depicts sports tourism uses, multi-use trails, natural trails, open space and preservation areas, agricultural and environmental educational centers and wildlife corridors – all of which embrace our environmentally sensitive land and support resiliency, sustainability and flood protection goals.
- Ensure that all Staff and City Council members understand matters specific to the Green Line, the Southern Watershed, the Transition Area, the Interfacility Traffic Area, and the Rural and Agricultural Areas, recognizing that this part of the city is substantially different than the area north of the Green Line, **acknowledging** that this growth management strategy continues to serve the entire City economically, environmentally, sustainably, and budgetarily.
- Ensure that the Comprehensive Plan clearly supports the objectives of City planning policies that have been in place for decades, specifically in the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area.
- Acknowledge monetary value of preserving land, achieving sustainability, building resiliency, and that tree canopy and green spaces mitigate flooding.
- Implement zoning ordinances to support and enforce key TA / ITA policies.
- Use taxpayer purchased city owned land to implement existing Active Transportation, Open Space, Southern Watershed, Sustainability, and Green Sea Blueway and Greenway

Management Plans – plans that benefit all citizens and visitors and meet City wide objectives.

- Request the assistance of the City's Legislative Director with pursuing specific opportunities for regional, state, and federal initiatives supporting the ITA and Vicinity Master Plan.

Closing

Should you have any questions or desire a formal City Council briefing from our agency, please contact Jessica Windish, Chair, at (757) 343-8120 and or Alexis Bailey, Staff Liaison, alebailey@vbgov.com or (757) 385-8745.



Assignment Service Details
July 2025 to June 2026
Planning and Community Development

Site	Place	Assignment	Volunteer	Service From Date	Service To Date	Hours	Merit Hours
Planning and Community Development	Planning Services	Transition Area/Inter-facility Traffic Area Citizen's Advisory Committee	Allen, Brandon	03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
						5:10	5:10
			Brunke, William	07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:13	1:13
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:52	1:52
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
						16:48	16:48
			Cromwell, John	08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:52	1:52
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-22-2026	06-22-2026	1:35	1:35
						15:23	15:23
			Hicks, Diana	07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:13	1:13
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:52	1:52
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
						13:26	13:26
			Horal, Melissa	07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:13	1:13
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:36	1:36
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15

Site	Place	Assignment	Volunteer	Service From Date	Service To Date	Hours	Merit Hours
			Ismail, Kaydyn	06-22-2026	06-22-2026	1:35	1:35
						19:03	19:03
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
			Karslake, Michael	06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
						11:55	11:55
				07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:05	1:05
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:44	1:44
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:17	2:17
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:21	1:21
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	1:51	1:51
			Kirwin, Brian	03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
				06-22-2026	06-22-2026	1:35	1:35
						8:00	8:00
			Landfield, Kenneth	08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:52	1:52
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
			Lee, Donn			8:38	8:38
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:44	1:44
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
			Luckman, Thomas	05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
						16:03	16:03
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-22-2026	06-22-2026	1:35	1:35
						16:10	16:10

Site	Place	Assignment	Volunteer	Service From Date	Service To Date	Hours	Merit Hours
Total	Total	Total	Merritt, Paul	07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:13	1:13
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:52	1:52
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
				06-22-2026	06-22-2026	1:35	1:35
						18:34	18:34
			Noel III, James	04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:10	1:10
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	1:42	1:42
						2:52	2:52
			Smith, Kylie	11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
						11:55	11:55
			White, Robert	07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:13	1:13
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:28	1:28
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:00	2:00
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:04	2:04
						9:12	9:12
			Windish, Jessica	07-10-2025	07-10-2025	1:13	1:13
				08-07-2025	08-07-2025	1:52	1:52
				09-04-2025	09-04-2025	0:56	0:56
				10-02-2025	10-02-2025	2:39	2:39
				11-06-2025	11-06-2025	1:31	1:31
				12-11-2025	12-11-2025	1:48	1:48
				01-08-2026	01-08-2026	1:21	1:21
				02-05-2026	02-05-2026	2:06	2:06
				03-05-2026	03-05-2026	1:47	1:47
				04-02-2026	04-02-2026	1:16	1:16
				05-07-2026	05-07-2026	2:07	2:07
				06-15-2026	06-15-2026	1:15	1:15
				06-22-2026	06-22-2026	1:35	1:35
						21:26	21:26

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

September 2, 2025

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Subject: Phil Bonifant Modification of Conditions to a Conditional Use Permit

Dear Mayor Dyer, Vice Mayor Wilson and Virginia Beach City Council Members,

At the August 7, 2025, meeting of the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee (TA / ITA CAC), members reviewed and discussed the revised concept plan for the proposed Modification of Conditions to the existing Conditional Use Permit for an Assembly Use on the applicant's property located at 2244 and 2252 Indian River Road.

This revised modification includes a proposal to demolish and remove the existing structure and replace it with an enclosed greenhouse. The enclosed structure will enable the applicant to hold additional weddings and events year-round in a climate-controlled environment while operating under the currently existing Conditional Use Permit. Many of the concerns raised by the previous concept plan are no longer relevant, however, the CAC advises onsite compliance with current stormwater requirements and ongoing monitoring of roadway conditions along Indian River Road.

The TA / ITA CAC voted in support of the Modification of Conditions.

On behalf of the members of the TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee,

Diana Hicks
Chair - TA / ITA CAC
757.641.3900

Cc: Barbara Henley, District 2 Councilmember
John Cromwell, District 2 Planning Commissioner
Marchelle Coleman, Staff Planner
Alexis Bailey, TA / ITA CAC Staff Liaison

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

September 4, 2025

Virginia Beach City Council
Virginia Beach Planning Commission
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Advisory of non-compliance:

ASC Real Estate LLC – Application for Conditional Use Permit (Bulk Storage Yard)

Dear Mayor and Members of the Virginia Beach City Council and the Virginia Beach Planning Commission,

On August 7, 2025, Margaret Shaia of ASC Real Estate LLC, and Dave France from Kimley Horn, presented a concept plan and rendering as the basis for a Conditional Use Permit application for a Bulk Storage Yard at 2008 Hudome Way. The concept plan and renderings illustrate the proposed manufacturing building, two separate bulk storage yards, paved parking lots, separate garage / office building, the freight driveway and paved surface area, site landscaping, stormwater pond, fencing, multiple public utility easements, Dominion easement and the Southeastern Parkway and Greenbelt (SEPG) roadway reservation.

The City of Virginia Beach zoning ordinance requires a Conditional Use Permit to operate a bulk storage facility on an I-1 Light Industrial zoned parcel. Article 10 and Appendix A, Article 2. C. Sec 228* detail these requirements. Additionally, to effectively consider compliance, the TA / ITA CAC relies on Comprehensive Planning policies and documents, including the Innovation Park Design and Development Guidelines.

In reference to the bulk storage facilities, the CAC Members asked the applicant specific questions regarding what would be stored, requesting confirmation that scrap, salvage, and secondhand materials would not be stored, processed or sold, inquired about the height of storage racks, materials, and finished products being stored, asked for an explanation for the deviation from the screening requirement, why the minimum fence height was being proposed given the size of the stored items, and why the requisite fencing to completely enclose both storage yards was not being followed. They responded with explanations that supported their desired use and needs, along with assumptions of viewshed changes over time, but did not indicate an understanding or willingness to comply with the zoning ordinance requirements. *

Concerns were raised over the bulk storage yard, fencing, parking lot and drive aisle that are included in this concept plan as they encroach on the City of Virginia Beach SEPG roadway reservation, and that vertical restrictions in the Dominion easement hamper parking lot landscape requirements. Furthermore, these encroachments and fenced off public easements subsequently disregard and remove planned trail networks anticipated

in other citywide plans. When asked how this was even feasible, they responded with explanations that changes would be made on the property to accommodate citywide plans should they come to fruition in the future, and that VB Public Works had already seen these plans, further stating “this has already been worked out.” The CAC questioned the reasonability of this plan, and the authority or acceptability of an administrative ‘complete street roadway/trail reservation’ closure for the use of a private entity.

Questions were raised regarding the level of impervious surface contained in the bulk storage yards and within the site, and the implications to stormwater runoff. The Innovation Park Design and Development Guidelines offer stormwater treatment for up to 60% of the impervious site coverage (Page 3). The CAC questioned the ability for the rendered 0.29-acre onsite stormwater pond to effectively capture the excess stormwater runoff from this largely impervious 21-acre parcel if only 60% of the impervious surface cover is considered under treatment in the offsite stormwater pond. Applicant responses did not resolve concerns, and after considerable discussion, the consensus of the CAC members is that strict compliance with stormwater policy and regulations, along with meeting open space requirements in the TA / ITA, are necessary components to mitigate stormwater and flooding implications. It is widely known and understood that the land in the ITA is poorly draining and flood-prone, and that exceptions here place additional burden on neighboring parcels, our Flood Protection Program, and ongoing taxpayer cost to maintain and remedy stormwater and flooding problems. The regularly flooded VB National Golf Course, with very little impervious surface, is a prime example of an already burdened neighboring parcel in the ITA. The ASC concept plan offers very limited open space, located primarily in the roadway reservation.

In a review of our city policies, the CAC finds that the application for a Conditional Use Permit on this concept plan further exacerbates the lack of compliance with many planning documents:

- 1) Innovation Park Design and Development Guidelines – development here continues to ignore the guidelines established specifically for this corporate park even after they were changed in 2023 (from BioMed to Innovation Park), resulting in a manufacturing / warehouse district facing Princess Anne Road, despite planning objectives and proffers.
 - P3 – Princess Anne Commons Comprehensive Plan Recommendations – application does not comply with open space, protection of sensitive land, building type and style, or public amenity expectation. There is no mention of an allowance for bulk storage yards in existing plans.
 - P3 – Section 1.3 – concerns over stormwater management and deficiency are highlighted above.
 - P6 – Section 1.6 – Applicable Codes – the concept plan does not conform to the zoning ordinance. *
 - P8 – 2.1 Pathways – there is no onsite or trail connectivity illustrated.
 - P9 – 2.3 Fencing – appropriate fencing and screening should be employed to protect the Princess Anne Road viewshed.

- P10 – 2.4 – Landscape and Plantings – Given the number of trees that will be removed to clear the site, the tree canopy in this area is being further compromised – ensure replacement minimums and guidelines are met.
 - P10 – 2.6 – Outdoor Amenity – none illustrated.
 - P11-14 – Building Design – not reflective of Innovation Park Guidelines
- 2) Outdoors Plan and Active Transportation Plan – citywide connectivity policy goals and the trail network are compromised south of Princess Anne Road.
 - 3) Master Transportation Plan and 2040 Draft Master Transportation Plan – the planned roadway network is compromised.
 - 4) 2016 Comprehensive Plan and ITA & Vicinity Master Plan – significant overreach on type, level, and intensity of development under the AICUZ Overlay.
 - 5) Flood Protection Program - Flooding remains a critical issue in this sensitive and poorly draining area of Virginia Beach. The excessive impervious surface cover suggested on this site plan is alarming.

In addition to noncompliance with adopted planning and policy documents and failure to meet the special zoning requirements for a Bulk Storage Yard Conditional Use Permit, the large scale and size of this operation, along with the 21-acre parcel size raises the question of proper zoning (i.e., light vs heavy) and compatibility with nearby uses along Princess Anne Road. The concept plan blatantly disregards plans and policies, including those put in place for use by the Virginia Beach Development Authority, demonstrating that industrialization below the Green Line lacks consideration for compliance, and outrightly ignores the legitimate concerns and expectations of the citizens of Virginia Beach.

For these reasons, we recommend denial of this application for a Conditional Use Permit. Further, we request attention to the matters articulated here regarding the applicant's concept plan that was provided to the Committee. The CAC values our City's Comprehensive Planning documents and considers compliance as the normal and expected course of business.

Sincerely, and on behalf of the Transition Area / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee,

Diana Hicks
Chair – TA / ITA CAC

***Sec. 228. - Bulk storage, auto storage and contractor storage yards.**

In addition to general requirements, the following special requirements and limitations shall apply to bulk storage, auto storage and contractor storage yards in districts in which they are generally permitted:

(a) *Fencing.* The storage yard shall be completely enclosed, except for necessary openings for ingress and egress, by a fence not less than six (6) feet in height, except where prohibited by [section 201\(e\)\(1\)](#), and Category VI landscaping.

(b) *Lighting.* All outdoor lights shall be shielded to direct light and glare onto the premises, said lighting and glare shall be deflected, shaded, and focused away from all adjoining property. Any outdoor lighting fixtures shall not be erected any higher than fourteen (14) feet.

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

February 25, 2026

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

SUBJECT: Recommendation of Denial — Harrison and Lear, Inc. Conditional Rezoning and Modification of Proffers Applications (Signature at West Neck).

Dear Mayor Dyer, Vice Mayor Wilson, and Virginia Beach City Council Members,

On February 5, 2026, Harrison and Lear, Inc. presented a Conditional Rezoning Application (86.04 acres) and a Modification of Proffers Application (203.62 acres) to the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee (TA / ITA CAC). These proposals would materially alter the former Signature at West Neck Golf Course and the PD-H1 Villages at West Neck residential community.

The TA / ITA CAC voted to **recommend denial** of both applications due to non-compliance with key provisions of the Transition Area Design Guidelines and the Comprehensive Plan, particularly related to **density and open space** policies. This recommendation is consistent with the Planning Staff Recommendation (see Staff Report Feb 2026). Additional factors include:

1. The proposal directly conflicts with the General Legislative Intent of Section 1100, which explicitly states that it is not the intent to create new PD-H1 or PD-H2 districts, or to enlarge the limits of existing ones. The Conditional Rezoning Application effectively enlarges the scope and functional limits of an existing PD-H1 district in a manner inconsistent with Section 1100, and results in a de facto district-within-a-district configuration.
2. The conditional rezoning would convert Preservation-zoned (P-1) land and dedicated open space, disregarding zoning specifically established to protect these lands. Approval would set an unnecessary precedent with far-reaching implications for citywide open space, land preservation, and neighborhood preservation efforts.
3. The 1999 rezoning already incorporated this land into density calculations and granted density in excess of the Comprehensive Plan. That approval was expressly contingent upon the permanent preservation of the Arnold Palmer Signature Golf Course as an open-space amenity. The current proposal effectively counts this land, with an already-excessive density, a second time.
4. The proposal would significantly and negatively impact an established age-restricted community. The preservation and well-being of established neighborhoods are clearly stated priorities in the Comprehensive Plan, and this proposal directly contradicts them.
5. The applications seek to allow the sale of approximately 62 acres of P-1 land to the developer, while the current owner would retain approximately 140 acres of P-1 zoned land with no enforceable ability or requirement to provide the advertised 9-hole golf course.
6. Housing need in Virginia Beach has been advanced as a basis for support. The 143 homes proposed do not address this need, are priced well above attainability and affordability thresholds, and would not meaningfully add to the city's attainable housing supply. In this instance, housing

need is being given determinative weight over key Comprehensive Plan priorities and zoning protections, including neighborhood preservation, open space protection, and orderly growth.

City Council has numerous legitimate and well-founded reasons to deny these applications and no compelling reason to set aside the zoning ordinance, the recommendations of professional planning staff, our adopted planning policies, or the concerns of taxpaying residents.

Relying on housing demand alone to override other considerations is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's balanced approach to land use, neighborhood preservation, open space protection, and orderly growth.

The March 7, 2025 letter recommending denial of the prior applications is provided for reference. The Committee remains in consensus that the concerns and deficiencies identified in that letter continue to apply.

Accordingly, the Committee respectfully urges City Council to give substantial weight to these findings, which reflect both professional planning guidance and the considered judgment of the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee.

Sincerely and on behalf of the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee,

Diana Hicks

Chair - TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee

CC: Virginia Beach Planning Commissioners

Patrick Duhaney, City Manager

Amanda Jarrett, Deputy City Manager

Kathy Warren, Director of Planning

Marchelle Coleman, Planner

Amanda Barnes, City Clerk

Members, TA / ITA CAC

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

March 7, 2025 *revised*

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Citizens Advisory Committee **recommendation for denial** of the Harrison and Lear, Inc. Application for Conditional Rezoning and Modification of Proffers - Signature at West Neck Golf Course

Dear Mayor Dyer, Vice Mayor Wilson, and Virginia Beach City Council Members,

On September 5th, 2024, at the regular monthly meeting of the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee (TA/ITA CAC), Harrison and Lear, Inc. presented their proposal for a redevelopment project within an existing Transition Area neighborhood. This proposal includes an application for conditional rezoning, an application for modification of proffers, and the vacation of the Conditional Use Permit for the existing golf course. After thorough discussion and review of the Comprehensive Plan, the Transition Area Design Guidelines, and community impacts, the TA/ITA CAC strongly recommends that the City Council deny these applications. We urge the Council to consider the following critical factors:

1. Noncompliance with Density, Open Space, and Land Use Policies

- The applicant seeks to rezone 175.38 acres of P-1 Preservation and 23.2 acres of PD-H1 PUD to Conditional PD-H2 (R-20 residential), placing 157 units on twenty highly developed acres—a density that is far beyond the allowable limits for the Transition Area.
- **Transition Area policies (p.8,9 of the Guidelines) restrict density to one unit per developable acre**, ensuring that land use remains consistent with the area’s intended low-impact, low-density character.
- The original site plan was approved in **1999 with excess density, contingent upon the maintenance of the Arnold Palmer Signature Golf Course as a permanent open space amenity**. The applicant’s proposal **eliminates this fundamental land use condition**.
- Approval of this rezoning would **fragment and eliminate designated open space (p.10 of the Guidelines)**, setting a **dangerous precedent** for future Preservation-zoned land.
- The City’s **policy to protect designated open space (p.28 of the Guidelines)** using appropriate zoning classifications, such as P-1 Preservation, would be **entirely negated** if this application is approved.

2. Erodes Established Zoning Protections

- **ARTICLE 3 - PRESERVATION DISTRICT: Sec. 301** explicitly **prohibits residential uses in P-1 Preservation-zoned land**. Approval of this rezoning would **completely disregard these protections, contradicting the intentional rezoning to P1 for this exact purpose**.
- The property was **rezoned from Agriculture-2 to PD-H1 in 1999** under the condition that the open space **remains a golf course**—a stipulation that was critical to the project’s original approval.
- If this rezoning is granted, it will **set a harmful legal precedent**, making it easier for other developers to circumvent P-1 zoning protections across Virginia Beach.

3. Severe Community Impacts and Strong Public Opposition

- **Loss of Neighborhood Stability:** The project threatens the character of an established neighborhood, diminishing the quality of life for current residents.
- **Financial Harm to Homeowners:** Hundreds of property owners paid a significant lot premium for homes adjacent to the golf course. The removal of this designated open space will devalue these properties and breach the expectations set when these homes were purchased.
- **Permanent Removal of a High-End Public Amenity:** The Arnold Palmer Signature Golf Course was a key condition of prior rezoning approvals. Its loss would negatively impact both residents and visitors.
- **Extended Construction Disruptions:** The proposed development will introduce years of construction-related impacts including noise, road closures, increased traffic, and land disturbance.
- **Citywide Concern:** Homeowners from West Neck, Indian River Plantation, and other Transition Area neighborhoods have voiced overwhelming opposition, recognizing this project as inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the City's long-standing land-use policies.

4. Historical Precedent & Legal Considerations

- The City of Virginia Beach **approved the original site plan on May 11, 1999**, under the premise that the **golf course would serve as a permanent recreational and open space buffer**.
- This is further reinforced by the City's initial filing to the Virginia Beach Circuit Court (CL21-3095, June 29, 2021), which stated:

"All Land Use Plans associated with the Property have required the Property to be maintained as a golf course. Indeed, favorable consideration for the Property's and surrounding properties' re-zoning in 1999 was based in part upon the developer's agreement that the Property would be developed and maintained as an Arnold Palmer Signature golf course. Although the Property and the surrounding properties, when initially developed, would have violated City guidelines regarding housing density, these guidelines were waived and/or not enforced because the density was supportable due to the unique attributes of the development, {including a} high-end quality recreational amenity (Signature golf course)."

- This legal filing underscores the City's position that **the current proposal undermines the very basis on which the original rezoning was granted**.

5. Accountability

The absentee and negligent landowner has engaged in deliberate delays and participated in a drawn-out application process, causing constant disruption to residents for years. This pattern of behavior is unacceptable. As citizens, we expect the City of Virginia Beach, its policies, and processes, to protect our quality of life and our established neighborhoods and to maintain public trust.

These items were discussed with the applicant at the time of presentation, as was the position of the CAC. Approving this application would not only violate established zoning protections but would also betray the trust of residents who relied on these safeguards when choosing to live in this community. We urge the Virginia Beach City Council to honor its Comprehensive Plan policies and uphold the integrity of its zoning ordinances. We respectfully request the City Council reject this application in full.

Sincerely and on behalf of the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee,

Diana Hicks
Chair, TA/ITA CAC

CC: Virginia Beach Planning Commission

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

November 14, 2025

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Subject: Support for proposed “Protecting the Blue Line” Charter Amendment

Dear Mayor Dyer, Vice Mayor Wilson, and Members of City Council:

At its regular meeting on November 6, 2025, the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee (TA/ITA CAC) voted to formally support the proposed City Charter Amendment designed to protect the Blue Line, as written in Exhibit A, Revision 2.

The Committee supports Exhibit A, Revision 2*, which adds Section 2.03 and subsections (a), (b), and (c) i–iv. The supermajority requirement in subsection (b) serves as a critical protection for one of Virginia Beach’s three primary economic pillars and aligns with the principles of the Agricultural Reserve Program—reinforcing the City’s longstanding commitment to agriculture.

The Committee also finds it essential that subsection (c) i–iv remain intact in the Charter Amendment. These provisions reaffirm the urban services boundary and reinforce the long-standing policy of prohibiting southerly expansion of City water and sewer services. Additionally, we recommend that the Charter Request section specifically address the importance of subsection (c).

During discussion, the Committee also expressed interest in Council considering a similar Charter-level protection for the Green Line. As the City’s principal growth-management tool intended to “safeguard rural and agricultural property and limit local spending,” the Green Line plays an equally critical role. Citizen input has demonstrated overwhelming support for the integrity of the Green Line. The Transition Area / ITA, situated between the Green Line and the Blue Line, has served as a buffer between urban development and rural and agricultural property for decades. Limiting development and additional infrastructure demands south of the Green Line remains crucial to maintaining existing infrastructure, focusing capital improvements where backlogs already exist, promoting redevelopment - especially in aging Strategic Growth Areas, and avoiding the substantial cost of extending infrastructure and services into greenfield areas at taxpayer expense. Strengthening these protections also supports ongoing efforts to mitigate flooding, subsidence, and sea-level-rise impacts within the Southern Rivers Watershed, supporting the promise made to citizens with the onset of the Flood Protection Program.

On behalf of the members of the TA/ITA Citizens Advisory Committee,

Diana Hicks
Chair, TA/ITA CAC
757.641.3900

Cc: City Manager Patrick Duhaney
Amanda Jarratt, Deputy City Manager
David Trimmer, Director of Agriculture
Brent McKenzie, Director of Legislative Affairs
Alexis Bailey, TA/ITA CAC Staff Liaison
Members of the Planning Commission
Members of the TA/ITA CAC

**Exhibit A, Revision 2: Proposed Charter Amendment*

Amend City Charter to add Section 2.03. Procedure for Land Use Approvals South of the Blue Line

(a) As used in this section, the “blue line” shall be a line running along North Landing Road to Indian River Road, then extending eastward to New Bridge Road, then proceeding north until it intersects with Sandbridge Road, then proceeding eastward tracing the eastern and southern boundaries of the Sandbridge Special Service District until such boundary reaches the Atlantic Ocean.

(b) No application to rezone property to a higher density or a more intense zoning district south of the blue line shall be approved except by an affirmative recorded vote of three-fourths of all members elected to the City Council.

(c) No extension of public water and sanitary sewer (“public system”) shall extend south of the blue line absent a public hearing conducted pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-1427 and a finding by the City Council that:

- i. Adequate capacity exists in the public system at the point of connection;
- ii. The Virginia Department of Health has issued a written opinion that existing on-site utilities are failing or likely to fail and no practical, feasible alternatives exist;
- iii. The principal use of the property is not changed; and
- iv. The extension serves (a) an existing development, (b) the reconstruction or expansion of an existing commercial development consistent with its zoning, with total floor area no more than double the existing development, or (c) the reconstruction or expansion of an existing residence by no more than 10% of existing floor area, or a residential development where no additional dwelling units are added.

Transition Area/Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

January 7, 2025

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

Subject: Advisory Letter for Virginia Beach National Golf Course

Dear Mayor Dyer, Vice Mayor Wilson, and Members of City Council,

At its December 11, 2025 regular meeting, the TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee continued deliberations regarding the City's Request for Proposal to consider the sale of the Virginia Beach National Golf Course.

After reviewing information provided by Economic Development staff, the VBDA, the course operator, citizens, and sports tourism stakeholders—and considering extensive public feedback gathered through multiple public meetings and forums over the preceding six weeks—the Committee determined that Virginia Beach National Golf Course is a vital, successful, and irreplaceable asset to the City of Virginia Beach.

Virginia Beach National, together with the First Tee program, provides affordable, professionally designed golf access for residents of all ages—from youth and high school athletes to families and seniors—while also serving local, regional, and visiting golfers.

The course further supports the community through its significant role in charitable fundraising, providing a trusted venue that enables local organizations to advance their missions. In addition, Virginia Beach National delivers consistent economic and sports tourism benefits and is widely recognized as one of the region's premier public golf courses.

Accordingly, the TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee strongly recommends that the City of Virginia Beach retain direct ownership of the Virginia Beach National Golf Course, preserve its existing design, and continue to recognize its substantial daily and long-term value to the City of Virginia Beach.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee,

Diana Hicks

Chair - TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee
757.641.3900

Cc:

Patrick Duhaney, City Manager

Amanda Jarratt, Deputy City Manager

Amanda Barnes, City Clerk

Alexis Bailey, TA / ITA CAC Staff Liaison

Members of the Planning Commission

Members of the TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee

Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

April 19, 2026

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

RE: Recommendations for the Draft 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN by the Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee on 4/2/2026, based on 02/18/2026 version and associated discussions and recommendations of the Planning Commission.

Dear Mayor and Members of the Virginia Beach City Council,

After reviewing the February 18, 2026 draft of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan, imagineVB2040, at the TA/ITA CAC Meeting on March 5th, and discussing the results of the Planning Commission Meeting and recommendations from their March 11th meeting at the TA/ITA CAC Meeting on April 2nd, the TA/ITA CAC compiled the list below of FOUR recommendations that the TA/ITA CAC would like the City Council to consider on April 21st, prior to their actions to adopt imagineVB2040 in its current form with associated conditions presented by the Planning Commission.

1. **Ensure that the Comprehensive Plan is corrected to include effective support for ALL of the goals set forth in the plan.** On page 23 of the draft document it states:

“ImagineVB’s Overarching Goals originated from the initial focus group sessions and evolved over subsequent engagements. Plan goals include:

- Economic sustainability and diversity.
- Housing attainment and diversity.
- Environmental sustainability.
- Rural and agricultural land protection south of the Green Line.
- Infill urban development and multimodal access north of the Green Line.
- Community identity and connections.
- Neighborhood well-being and safety.”

In addition to the seven goals listed there are six “big ideas” listed. Despite the clear importance of the Green Line and land use plans in the area South of the Green Line, the subsequent pages (23-28) contain detailed descriptions of only six of the seven goals and only five of the six big ideas. **The goal of “Rural and agricultural land protection south of the Green Line” and the big idea “Continue the Green Line and Blue Line, and plan based on the unique contexts created by those lines” have been completely left out. They are additionally left out in pages 129-131 of Chapter 5, which specifically lists the “Green Line Context Area Goals and Objectives.”**

The omission of specific language to achieve the goal and big idea associated with the Green Line, the Blue Line, and the currently named Green Line Context Area is a significant deficiency in the current draft.

2. **Ensure that maps and graphics throughout the plan are accurate and usable.** The most egregious examples related to usability and accuracy are:
 - a. the map depicting “Place Types” on page 37 which contains an excessive amount of information for one map to be useful.
 - b. the pie charts depicting land use in each context area on pages 80, 114, 127, 142 do not create an accurate picture of land use in Virginia Beach. They indicate that large amounts of land in Virginia Beach are “Vacant”, do not describe what the large amounts of “Other” might indicate, and only include “agriculture” in the Rural Context Area despite the fact that agriculture does exist in all four context areas to at least some extent.
3. **Maintain consistency and accuracy of nomenclature used in the Comprehensive Plan when referencing the geographic region of the TA and ITA, specifically with the terms “Transition Area”, “Green Line” and “Blue Line”.** These are of great importance for several reasons:
 - a. Throughout the public input process the public regularly noted the importance of the space between the Green Line and Blue Line by regularly using that nomenclature or terminology. It was clear that there is an expectation of maintaining the space between the Green and Blue Lines as a low density transition or buffer between the more urban and suburban north and the rural south of the city. These terms are clear, and well known, by the public already. There is no need to change them.
 - b. There is already a great deal of change in terminology from the 2016 Comprehensive Plan to the 2040 Draft Comprehensive Plan, and change in terminology can cause confusion, frustration, and sometimes inaccurate decision making. It is important to note:
 - i. The 2016 plan identified the following named areas “Urban Area, Suburban Area, Princess Anne Commons & Transition Area, Rural Area, and Military Installations & Support”. Three were named with commonly used terms that indicate the density of development within the area. Two were specifically named because of the purpose they served amidst the three areas (a transition between areas and military installations). These terms proved to be quite helpful when making decisions about land use in our city. The current draft includes two terms that relate to proximity to water (Inland and Coastal), we all know that water is significant to our landscape and can see the value of the terms, but they do not indicate the uses of the land or the possible resulting density. Another new term references a boundary of a transition area (Green Line), but not the nature of the entire area. The last is the only one that still indicates a level

of density (Rural), but interestingly enough has its own inland and coastal areas. This new collection of terms has already caused confusion and frustration, for many people and for varied reasons.

- ii. The vote of the Planning Commission on March 11th, to move the 2040 Draft Comprehensive Plan forward to City Council was not unanimous but came with three conditions that have been made public on the city website. It is clear from the publicly available communication between City Council and the Planning Commission, as well as evidenced in the video footage of said Planning Commission meeting, that the three conditions the commission add were requested by the City Council of the Planning Commission without regard to public input. They are also counter to the public sentiment collected during the public input processes that were previously conducted. Two conditions relate to this topic as they are to rename the “Green Line Context Area” to “Courthouse Context Area” and rename the “Blue Line” to the “Rural Area Boundary.” Although it was noted in the media that these conditions were designed to reduce conflict surrounding the term “Green Line”, there is no evidence of such conflict. In fact, there is greater evidence from the public input that the term “Green Line” is preferred. There is, however, greater conflict regarding the change to “Courthouse Context Area” as this terminology inaccurately indicates that all of the space between the Green and Blue lines is associated with the very small area known as the Courthouse, and home to the Virginia Beach Municipal Center. The TA/ITA CAC discussed concerns related to this recommendation, as it seems that there is a desire to remove all references to the Green and Blue lines and the buffer that is created between them.

4. **Ensure that the current guidelines that are in place for the TA/ITA, as referenced in the associated documents, are maintained.** Although there has been a significant influx in industrial development in the ITA as a result of Virginia Beach Development Authority activities, on land purchased by the City of Virginia Beach, and there has been movement on an update to the ITA Vicinity Master Plan, it is the expectation of this committee that the most significant needs of this area, low density and low impact development on sensitive land in a space between two military airfields, are maintained into the future. The recent developments, along with the third item above, where it seems that there is a push to remove references to the Green and Blue Lines and the Transition Area, make the support of the current guidelines even more important. Additionally, on page 24, the plan references the need to “identify and promote areas for business growth that offer urban settings and regional multimodal access, supporting sectors such as light industrial, logistics, renewable energy, and industries with demonstrated momentum. The TA/ITA is not an urban area, it is a buffer area between suburban and rural areas. Therefore, it is recommended to remove the term “light industrial” from the Green Line Area Goals listed on page 129.

In conclusion, as stated in all previous communication from the TA/ITA CAC and through the four items listed above, the expectation of the committee and the public, as referenced from the extensive input collected throughout the process, is that the **imagineVB2040** will:

1. **Be a useful and usable document by both the public and the departments within the City of Virginia Beach as we reshape and grow with intention and care.** The goals, language, and all graphics in the document must be accurate and clear in order to do so.
2. **Accurately name and maintain the low density buffer between urban/suburban and rural areas known as the Transition Area and the Interfacility Traffic Area, and its borders, the Green and Blue lines.** Whether identified as the “Transition Area”, “Transition Context Area”, or the “Green Line Context Area”, the name must encompass the character of the entire space. Not just a small portion of the area. This space is not only a foundation of the entire plan, but it is an expectation of the public and holds great importance to our continued positive relationship with a primary employer of our community, the US Navy.
3. **Establish safe guards for no further industrial development below the Green Line.** Industrial development is counter to the concept of a buffer, and contradictory to the environmental sustainability objectives identified in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan overarching goals. It has not received any public support outside of the individuals, businesses, and organizations that would benefit from such.

If you approve the current draft of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan without taking the time to address the items listed above, you are approving a deficient document that is misaligned with the expectations of the tax paying citizens of Virginia Beach. Your constituents deserve for you to take the time to do this very important task correctly.

Thank you for taking the time to review these recommendations and act accordingly. We now put our trust in you to make decisions that are both in line with the expectations of your constituents and with the Code of Virginia where our city is charged to establish a comprehensive planning document for “guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted, and harmonious development of the territory”.

Thank you,

Jessica W. Windish
Chair, TA/ITA CAC

Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee 10/14/2025

Review and Recommendations for the Draft 2040 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN Based on 8/20/2025 and (10/08/2025) versions

1. Maintain the Transition Area buffer objective for all Planning Areas below the Green Line as anticipated by the public, throughout the process, and as the foundation of the plan.
2. Recommend no further Industrial development below the Green Line. Until further study and public input, the CAC recommends removal of terminology or indication of any new industrial outside of the existing Innovation Park boundary. Land use here is intended to be the buffer to our rural and agricultural areas. This significant policy concept has not been presented to the public for input and undermines big ideas in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan which was organized around preserving the Green Line and focusing redevelopment and infill above the Green Line. See Page 21.
3. Industrial development below the Green Line is contradictory to the environmental sustainability objectives identified in the 2040 Comprehensive Plan overarching goals and specifically within the Chapter 5 Green Line Context Area.
4. Address consistency in use of terms throughout the document such as references to subsidiary policy plan documents, trail names, and named areas.
5. All maps should match the verbiage found within the document text and not introduce new concepts visually. See notes on Figure 5-1.
6. Add the Blue Line location definition including the hard stop policy of not extending City sewer and water, maintaining the 2004 policy initiative established by Public Works.
7. During the vital and remaining public input period, the posted draft is missing crucial components of the 2040 Draft Comp Plan – Chapter 7, Appendix A and Appendix B> These components need to be added for the public input process.
8. The TA/ITA CAC has aimed to identify major items, specifically impacting the Green Line Context Area, in the bulleted items above and in the detailed notations below.

CHAPTER 5 – Green Line Context Area

P126 (p125) – recommend different picture, not a brick building, for the Green Line CA

P127 (p126) para2: “Princess Anne Commons Planning Area” conveys a planned area. The area should be consistently referred to within the document (i.e., Princess Anne Commons Area is used on the next page p128 (p127). On P127 (p126), it should be clearly explained that the ITA & Vicinity Master Plan is the more specific underlying plan for this ‘planning’ area.

P128 (P127)

- para1: Correction noted in 10/8/2025 draft.
- Figure 5-1: the pie graph is confusing in terms of what land uses are being represented and why. What does VACANT mean? Is this privately owned land? How much is Agricultural? What are the 1,366 OTHER acres?
- para4- Complete explanations in the narrative would serve to make the pie chart more useful. Example: Explain what the 2,035 Public acres include, i.e., the Municipal Center, City owned land in the GLCA
- Para6 correction: 'This area is also home "to" the Transition Neighborhood Place Type.'

P129 (128) Figure 5-2 – Map improvements

- Title: Correct to Green Line **Context** Area (GLCA) – Planning Areas and Place Types
- Neighborhoods: Correct to **Transition** Neighborhoods
- Label major street names outside the Context Area to avoid additional map congestion.
- Extend the Blue Line to the Atlantic Ocean
- Why have the Municipal Center Neighborhoods been added to this Context Area?
- Not all GLCA existing neighborhood types are shown (i.e., Type 2-Foxfire / Sherwood).
- Center focal points are not identified; avoid misinterpretation of center core and edge areas by providing more detailed maps in Appendix B showing all Center aspects.
- Reference underlying planning documents: ITA & VMP, TADG, IPDG
- Generalized City Center size and planning guidelines are inconsistent with the Green Line and Transition Area development goals. These need to be clearly adjusted to represent development below the Green Line.

P130 (p129) Rural and agricultural land protection

Repeat all 4 bullet points from P23, adding these two bullets

- Bullet 3 - Support sustainable agricultural production.
- Bullet 4 - Provide opportunities to access nature.

P130 (p129) Economic sustainability and diversity

- Bullet 1 adjust to read 'light industrial **within the existing Innovation Park**, technology based...
- *Vague descriptions within the zoning ordinance regarding light and heavy industrial are problematic. Based on size and scope, approved development within Innovation Park is inconsistent with policy guidelines, understanding of light industrial, and impact to surrounding areas.
- Remove Bullet 2 – creating policy for specific entities is unwarranted.

P131 (p130) – Housing attainment and diversity

- Remove bullet 3: Bullet 3 contradicts the point of differentiating the Center, the premise of the Transition Area buffer, and protecting the land below the Green Line from overly dense development.

P132 (p131) – Green Line Context Area Objectives

Rural and Agricultural land protection (add these bullets from P23):

- Continue protecting properties through acquisitions and conservation easements south of the Green Line
- Continue to **stop** urban service expansion south of the Blue Line
- Continue the Agricultural Reserve Program
- Support access to expansive nature, ecotourism and agri-tourism opportunities.

P134 (p133) - Para2 – Refer to the ITA & **Vicinity Master Plan**

P135 (p134):

- Extend the Blue Line along the eastern portion of the Green Line to the Atlantic Ocean
- Figure 5-5 title correction to 'ITA Area and Green Line **Context** Area Planning Areas'

P136 (p135)

- Para1, Bullet 2: Refer differently to the plans in the ITA and Vicinity Master Plan. There are no Special Use Place Types defined in the ITA & Vicinity Master Plan.
- Development Review Bullet 2: Change to read: Limit building heights to **three** stories at the Municipal Center and **four** stories in the area's northwest center.

P137 (p136)

- Development Review – The bulleted points refer to a multitude of options and future updates that can negate the planning policies within the Transition Area Design Guidelines that are foundational to upholding the intention of the Green Line. New policies should not be put in place that conflict with the goals for the Transition Area.
- Remove Bullet 5 – it is unrealistic to meet the Transition Area policies and conform to differing policies at the same time.

(p136) – Newly added policy section found in 10/08/2025 draft:

- Courthouse Corner and South Holland – these new guidelines being added to the Green Line Context Area, while existing within the Inland Context Area, **are considerably different than the adjacent properties**. It is confusing that these policies have been added here. At a minimum, they should be repeated within the designated Context Area.

- It is alarming that the controlled access roadway (Nimmo Parkway) is being compromised by the potential of a rezoning to a level that requires this change to the roadway.

(p137) – Neighborhood Safety and well being

- Bullet 2: Recommend removal of ADUs from this section. With a primary goal of maintaining open space and less dense neighborhoods in the Transition Area, the concept of ADUs is contradictory, adding impervious surface to land use areas already prone to flooding, and causing concern for stormwater consequences. It seems we are trying to achieve two different things at once, things that are at odds with each other.
- In general, the policy directive is important but seems awkward and inappropriate placed here. “The design of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) should complement the design of the primary dwelling.”
- Below the Green Line, the current zoning for Flex Suites can accommodate the senior housing goals for this Context Area.

Chapter 7 – Place Type Policies and Design Guidelines

P164 – Properly notate the Chart to mark the City Center Core and Edge Zones - Building Heights and Footprint Coverage - as different in the Green Line Context Area

- **Change:** ***In the Green Line Context Area, limit building heights to **three** stories in the Municipal Center and **four** stories in the area’s northwestern Center.
- **Add: **** In the Green Line Context Area, maintain a maximum footprint coverage of 50%**

P182 – Design Guidelines

- Reference the Transition Area Design Guidelines as the primary design policy
- Bullet 1: Add R15 zoning.
- Change Bullet 2 to read: Net density **maximum** of one dwelling unit per **developable** acre (remove ‘at least’).

Appendix A: P207 – Green Line Context Area – Recommendation for the Zoning Area Chart

- 1) Transition Neighborhood Column: Remove all inaccurate zoning districts including Apartment districts, PD-H1 and PD-H2, incompatible Business and Office Districts, and Residential Districts lower than R15.
- 2) Center Core and Center Edge: Remove A-18 through A-36, higher intensity Business and Office Districts, Industrial (Light and Heavy)
- 3) Special Use Institutional: Remove Industrial
- 4) Special Use Industrial: Remove

Transition Area / Interfacility Traffic Area Citizens Advisory Committee

July 6, 2026

Virginia Beach City Council
Building 1, City Hall
2401 Courthouse Drive
Virginia Beach, VA 23456

RE: Recommendations for the proposals regarding VB National Golf Club and the ITA Master Plan Update

Dear Mayor and Members of the Virginia Beach City Council,

On June 22, 2026, at a special meeting, the TA/ITA Citizens Advisory Committee reviewed the proposals for both the "Interfacility Traffic Area (ITA) and Vicinity Master Plan Update" and the "Request for Proposals - Virginia Beach National Golf Club" that were presented to the City Council on June 16, 2026. At this meeting, both proposals were discussed at length. An attempt was made to discuss them separately, however, there were numerous instances where the two proposals shared a connection, therefore, we are sending you this one letter to recommend that both proposals are denied further consideration by City Council. Please note that the committee noted valuable elements of both proposals, however, those elements do not outweigh the conflict with the expectations for this area of Virginia Beach that they include.

Regarding the VB National Golf Course proposal, I would first like to remind you that TA/ITA CAC wrote you a letter on January 7, 2026 outlining the reasons for the City of Virginia Beach to retain direct ownership of the golf course and preserve its existing design. In short, it is a valuable and vital asset of the city, worthy of maintaining as a city owned amenity without the intrusion of dense development in its vicinity. Please review that letter as you consider this communication. Below is a list that further explains why the now publicly presented proposal to sell the golf course, redesign it, and add 659 homes in close proximity to the course is not recommended by this committee for further consideration by the Virginia Beach City Council. .

1. **This proposal is in direct conflict with Imagine VB 2040, the comprehensive plan that City Council recently adopted.** As stated in the plans six big ideas, which are prominently posted on the City of Virginia Beach website, Imagine VB 2040 aims to:
 - a. Establish an environmental and open space framework that improves flood and sea-level rise resiliency, wildlife migration, ecological diversity, and public enjoyment of nature.
 - b. Create a Linear Park/Active Transportation System with pathways for biking, rolling, and walking between new and existing open spaces, parks, and recreational areas.

- c. Continue the Green Line and Blue Line, and plan based on the unique contexts created by those lines.
- d. Designate centers and multimodal corridors north of the Green Line by redeveloping commercial areas into higher-density, walkable urban centers and invest in walking, rolling, biking, and transit networks to provide travel options for residents and workers.
- e. Create unique community identities and connections, using place-making strategies to uplift community aesthetics and pride with art, history, and centering local stories.
- f. Monitor and ensure neighborhood well-being by identifying ways to improve health outcomes, attainable housing, multimodal access, and safety.

The increased residential density of this development proposal and the alteration of the current publicly accessible golf course is counter to four of the six big ideas. It DOES NOT “improve(s) flood and sea-level rise resiliency, wildlife migration, ecological diversity, and public enjoyment of nature.”, “continue the Green Line”, “designate centers and multimodal corridors north of the Green Line by redeveloping commercial areas into higher-density, walkable urban centers”, or “create unique community identities”.

2. **The TA/ITA is specifically suited to support low density development.** Regardless of the intent to maintain this area as a transition between the more urbanized north of Virginia Beach and the rural South of the city, it has been regularly reported and discussed that the soils in this area of the city do not drain well and are not suitable for high impact or high density development. The volume of homes proposed, 659, and the accompanying impervious space for parking and amenities, far exceeds the reasonable limits in this area of the city and will likely cause greater issues of stormwater management in our future.
3. **The proposal is in direct conflict with the ongoing ITA Master Plan Update proposal.** The proposal to relocate holes 2 and 3 requires the use of land that has already been identified for alternative use in the ITA Master Plan Update. Approving two plans that require or support two different uses on the same piece of land creates confusion and further conflict. This is counter to the work City Council is charged to conduct.

Regarding the proposed ITA and Vicinity Master Plan Update, below is an outline of the reasons the TA/ITA CAC recommends denial of further consideration of the plan by the City Council.

1. **The current ITA Vicinity Master Plan, most recently updated in 2017, proposes development that is specifically suited to support low density land use in this area of sensitive land.** As stated above, it has been regularly reported and discussed that the soils in this area of the city do not drain well and are not suitable for high impact or high density development that includes impervious cover. This currently proposed plan includes a large amount of higher density light industrial development. This type of development and the accompanying impervious space for buildings, parking, and roadways far exceeds the reasonable limits in this area of the city and will likely cause

greater issues of stormwater management in our future. Although stormwater needs have been considered in this plan, it has regularly been noted that the stormwater management needs in our southern watersheds have often outpaced our predictions and plans.

2. **The proposed roadways in this plan present a significant safety hazard.** The current configuration of roadways creates a pattern where traffic from the light industrial businesses will pass directly through the sports tourism area. Although it has been regularly stated and displayed that the roadway development will need to happen in phases, permitting the light industrial development in close proximity to sports tourism without intentional separation of traffic patterns, is hazardous to the safety of the participants, which are primarily children.
3. **The current primary roads into and out of this area can not support an increase in the daily traffic that will result from the expansion of light industrial development.** Although sports tourism in this area will increase intermittent traffic, specifically along Dam Neck Road to the Oceanfront and Princess Anne Road to the interstate, the proposal of light industrial in this area will increase daily traffic. As employees, raw materials, other inputs, and finished products flow in and out of the proposed facilities daily, the increase in traffic will be exponential. The traffic currently flowing in and out of Hudome Way has already caused great congestion. As the buildings in current development on Hudome Way are completed, the congestion will only increase. Additional light industrial development in this area is simply not sustainable.
4. **The funding needed for the infrastructure improvements associated with the proposed plan present significant concerns.** Although some preliminary predictions were included in the proposal, the costs presented to develop the multi-phased road improvement are far lower than the most recent actual costs of building less extensive roads such as Hudome Way. There are also many infrastructure projects underway in the City of Virginia Beach, or previously promised to our citizens by City Council, that will compete for funding with this proposal or be pushed back all together. The greatest concern among citizens is that spending on infrastructure to support a few light industrial businesses will take priority over infrastructure expenditures that our tax payers already need, and that citizens have been expecting.
5. **Numerous entities within the Virginia Beach community have supported, and will continue to support, sports tourism expansion in this part of our city.** From the Active Transportation Advisory Committee to the Open Space Advisory Committee, to the Green Ribbon Committee and beyond, our citizens have continually expressed the desire for an increase in sports tourism in the ITA. The focus on sports tourism is the perfect use for this sensitive land, where open space is preserved, recreational activity is increased, and our potential to increase tax revenue is viable. At no point have any of these advisory committees had an expectation for the expansion of light industrial activities to be introduced into the ITA or areas below the Green Line. Additionally, light industrial development is not necessary to move forward with sports tourism development.

6. **The light industrial and flex space proposed is very vague in nature and creates potential for a great variety of industrial developments within the area.** As the proposal does not specifically cite potential companies, or even examples, there is great concern among citizens about the wide range of end users that might locate in this area over time. This concern is a result of the inconsistency that already exists between the current developments in Innovation Park and the expectation of what light industrial would look like in the space South of the Green Line. The guidelines that were established for this area created an expectation that the light industrial zoning in the ITA (originally a biomedical park, now Innovation Park) would create a campus like environment with low density and lower profile of structures, as well as open space and reduced impervious space. That is far different from the in progress development of a very large structure with very limited open space on the corner of Princess Anne Road and Hudome Way.

In conclusion, the TA/ITA CAC recommends that City Council deny further consideration of the current proposals. Although the committee understands that both proposals present several valuable outcomes, for example solutions to mitigate the costs associated with maintaining the golf course and supporting the much anticipated expansion of sports tourism in the ITA, they generate greater negative consequences. **In short, the proposal of dense housing and light industrial development in ITA and its vicinity is not recommended.** These new proposals are not necessary for the expansion of sports tourism and the capital maintenance of the golf course. The ITA and Vicinity Master Plan already outlines a plan for and supports the development of sports tourism. Additionally, the VBDA is already required by its lease with the City of Virginia Beach and its agreement with Virginia Beach Golf Club, LLC to bear the cost of the golf course maintenance. As the City Council seeks further public input on these proposals, and considers that input with fidelity, this committee fully expects that the City Council will see how the public shares the same opinion and expectations.

Thank you for taking the time to review these recommendations and act accordingly. We now put our trust in you to make decisions that are in line with the Imagine VB 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the expectations of your constituents.

Thank you,

Jessica W. Windish
Chair, TA/ITA CAC

CC: Members of the Planning Commission
Amanda Barnes, City Clerk
Bryan Hickman, Chair, ATAC
Jason Barney, Chair, Green Ribbon Committee
Clay Bernick, Chair, Open Space Advisory Committee
Members of the TA / ITA Citizens Advisory Committee
Alexis Bailey, TA / ITA CAC Staff Liaison