

Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET
September 10, 2019 – 5:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
NDS Conference Room

I. COMMISSION PRE-MEETING (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 4:30 pm

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference Room

Members Present: Chairman Lisa Green, Commissioners Hosea Mitchell, Jody Lahendro, Taneaia Dowell, Lyle Solla-Yates, Gary Heaton, Rory Stolzenberg, and Mr. Bill Palmer

Staff Present: Missy Creasy, Lisa Robertson, Brian Haluska, Joey Winter, and Alex Ikefuna

Vice Chairman Mitchell called the meeting to order at 5:08pm. He asked if there were any questions concerning the 503 Rugby Ave application. Joey Winter outlined the lighting condition proposed by staff and noted that the applicant would be requesting a change per the design. There was a brief discussion on the lighting considerations and it was noted that additional information from the applicant would be helpful.

Vice Chairman Mitchell asked if there were questions concerning the 602 W. Main application. Lisa Robertson provided context on the discussions she held with the applicant's attorney and that she forwarded the information to the Church representatives. Brian Haluska noted that the applicant would be requesting changes to the conditions related to parking and building height.

Chairman Green arrived.

There was a brief discussion on the Hillsdale signage plan following a brief explanation of the materials by Staff.

Mr. Winter provided additional clarification on the lighting code noting what was currently in the code and that the condition proposed would be in addition to those basic regulations.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Beginning: 5:30 pm

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference

Members Present: Chairman Lisa Green, Commissioners Hosea Mitchell, Jody Lahendro, Taneaia Dowell, Lyle Solla-Yates, Gary Heaton, Rory Stolzenberg, and Mr. Bill Palmer

A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Commissioner Lahendro: I attended the BAR meeting on August 20 where we approved nine COA applications, which includes the final design for Belmont Bridge and a mural on the wall of the Violet Crown theater that fronts 2nd Street. We had two COA applications deferred for more information. On September 3, the Tree Commission met, and a Charlottesville resident made a presentation on the compaction of tree roots at Meade Park due to the Farmer's Market foot traffic. After discussing possible options, staff is going to follow up with how to solve this. The 2020 Capital Improvement Project requests were also reviewed. Additional money is being requested by the Tree Commission for funds to partner with an initiative to offset the cost for emerald ash borer treatment.

Currently, the funding is only protecting about 38 of the 107 mature ash trees in the City's right of way. A list of recommended trees for planting in City's gateway corridors was also reviewed and approved. We also reviewed the numerous and significant comments to the Friendship Court final site plan and they will be submitted to NDS.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: The Allocations Subcommittee of the Housing Advisory Council met on September 10th to discuss how to spend the Charlottesville housing money. We selected The Crossings 2 project as the priority for funding. Most of my time has been spent on the RFP process and we're working through the procurement process.

Commissioner Dowell: No report.

Commissioner Heaton: No report.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: I attended the form-based code workshop and heard from the consultants and the community. There is still time to submit comments and they can be submitted to Brian Haluska.

Commissioner Mitchell: There is a Parks and Recreation meeting on Thursday at 5:30 pm in the Parks and Rec conference room and there is a Fontaine Steering Committee meeting at 5:45 pm on September 17th.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Bill Palmer: The Board of Visitors is meeting this week and they are going to be reviewing the next phase of the Athletics complex. The next phase is to add some grass fields in U-Hall's place and to tie in pedestrian areas. There will also be a presentation from the UVA Sustainability office. Right now, we are on track to meet our greenhouse emissions goal, which was to reduce by 25% below the 2009 levels by 2025. We should reach that next year. We have a nitrogen reduction goal and we are using 17% less nitrogen over our 2010 levels. We are also using 11.7% less water over our 2010 levels. These are all good efforts, especially when taking into account that we've grown a lot since 2010. UVA is getting 20% of their electricity from solar and we've invested into two offsite solar farms.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Green: I attended the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission last Thursday. They have filled the vacancies and they now have a full Commission at this point. We had a full report on the GO Virginia Region 9 Regional update. GO Virginia is a grant funding program for things in the region and the more communities that get together, the more grant possibilities there are. I encourage everyone to take a look at those opportunities. In a moment we will hear a report from our nominating committee because tonight is our annual election of officers. I have been honored to be your chair for two years to serve the Commission and the public. There are many things that we've been trying to accomplish. In some cases, we didn't cross the finish line, but hopefully we can do that soon.

Nomination report, Commissioner Lahendro: We have such gratitude for our chair, Lisa Green, to have such strong and capable leadership. As the nominating committee, I am delighted to make the following nominations. For Chair, I nominate Hosea Mitchell and for Vice Chair, I nominate Lyle Solla-Yates.

Commissioner Lahendro moves to accept Hosea Mitchell as our Chairman and Lyle Solla-Yates as our Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission. Seconded by Commissioner Dowell. Motion is approved 7-0.

Chairman Mitchell: I would like to start by saying thank you to Ms. Green. The passion with which you led this organization with your desire to see us do smart planning and development that is socioeconomically, culturally

sensitive, diverse, and respectful has made you a force of nature. Your passion is an inspiration to us, and I am most grateful for the patience you use in guiding us in this Commission. You had four new Commissioners on the Board and you were very patient with us. We felt that way because you were very passionate about doing things the way you felt were the right way to do things and we thank you.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy: There is a work session on September 24th to have a preliminary discussion on 218 West Market Street. There will be more information and an opportunity for a discussion at that point in time. On September 30th there will be a workshop on the Standards and Designs Manual. We are hopeful to get good feedback and move forward through the approval process. In October, we will have our work session on the third Tuesday, which is October 15th to discuss the form-based code, as we are getting it ready for a hearing in November.

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

None.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

1. Minutes – August 13, 2019 – Pre- meeting and Regular meeting
2. Minutes – August 27, 2019 – Work Session

Commissioner Stolzenberg moves to approve consent agenda item #1. Seconded by Commissioner Green. Motion is approved 7-0.

III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION/COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 pm

Continuing: until all public hearings are completed

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing

1. SP19-00004 – (503 Rugby Road Special Use Permit)

Landowner Epsilon Sigma House Corporation (Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority) owns approximately 0.319 acre of land having an address of 503 Rugby Road (fronting on both Rugby Road and Lambeth Lane) and identified on City Tax Map 5 as Parcel 52 (Tax Parcel ID No. 050052000) (“Subject Property”). The Subject Property is currently used as a sorority house for up to 36 residents. Landowner is requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-420, to authorize a specific land use (sorority house with up to 37 residents) The Subject Property is zoned R3-H (“Multifamily”, for Medium density, subject to historic overlay regulations). The Subject Property is within the Rugby Road—University Circle—Venable Neighborhood Architectural Design Control District. The Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for High Density residential development.

Staff Report, Joey Winter: Planning Commission held a preliminary discussion of this item at the August meeting. This is a Special Use Permit request for a sorority of up to 37 residents at 503 Rugby Road. The Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority is proposing to expand and renovate their existing chapter house at this property. The property is zoned R-3H and has a valid SUP for a sorority of up to 36 residents which was granted in 1978. The request is for 1 additional resident. In addition, modifications to front and side yard regulations are being requested. The

property lies in an Architectural Design Control District, so the BAR made a recommendation on this request. BAR recommends that granting this SUP will NOT have an adverse impact on the ADC District. Regarding public comment, there were two neighbors present at the applicant's Community Meeting on August 6th that were in favor of this request. Staff received one email from a nearby property owner in favor of this request. No public comment in opposition to this SUP request has been received. Some issues to consider with this request tonight include whether the proposed use is appropriate for the neighborhood. There are at least 15 fraternities or sororities within 1,000 feet of the Subject Property. It also directly abuts the UVA campus and has already been in use as a sorority house for 35+ years. Are there reasonable conditions that can be set forth to mitigate adverse impacts the proposed use will have on the neighborhood? Staff has several proposed conditions. Should front and side yard regulations be modified with this request? The applicant has stated reasons for requesting modified front and side yard regulations are to permit ornamental features, roof overhangs, and covered porches, and to permit the front and north side walls of the building to remain in their current locations. It is important to note that this request for modified yard regulations is NOT about increasing density. Staff has proposed six conditions for this SUP. At the August meeting, Planning Commission directed staff to use the SUP granted for the Alpha Kappa Service Fraternity at 1713 Jefferson Park Avenue as a guide for this SUP, which served as a basis for these conditions. Condition #1 would set the maximum number of sorority residents at 37. Conditions #2 and #3 would modify the front and side yard regulations as requested by the applicant and recommended by BAR. Condition #4 deals with parking. Due to limited physical space available for on-site parking, additional signing and pavement markings may be necessary in parking areas. This condition would allow Traffic Engineering staff to require these markings and make sure that on-site parking is utilized exclusively for the sorority. Condition #5 would add requirements for site lighting above what our ordinance typically requires. This condition is taken directly from the Alpha Kappa SUP. Condition #6 would require screening of trash receptacles. This condition is taken directly from the Alpha Kappa SUP. The General Standards for Issuance of a Special Use Permit are found in City Code Section 34-157 and are included in your packet. City Code Section 34-162 which allows the modification of yard regulations as a condition of a Special Use Permit is also included in your packet

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Mr. Palmer: There is a lot of pedestrian access in that area. During construction, will pedestrian access be maintained throughout?

Mr. Winter: There is a site plan under review for this project that would include any proposed sidewalk or street closings of that nature.

Commissioner Dowell: During the last meeting we asked about the noise impacts and we received information that it was in their rules that they couldn't have parties. Is there any way to get that memorialized in this in case their rules changed? We are making an SUP for the land, not the occupant.

Commissioner Green: The noise ordinance would apply.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Regarding the proposed condition #5, I am interested in making an edit to the last sentence to make it read, "Fixtures shall completely seal the light source" so we aren't specifying how the light source is concealed.

Mr. Winter: We took direction from what the previous SUP was. The applicant has had some concerns and would like clarification on this that can be discussed further with them.

Applicant – Ms. Erin Hannegan, Mitchell/Matthews Architects: There have been some very small plan changes since we last met and we have added some additional clarifications, but otherwise the proposal is as it was. We discussed the current conditions in the sorority house with very narrow bedrooms that are approximately 9' wide, which is one of the primary reasons the applicant would like to undergo a renovation. By increasing the width, we can get accessibility in all of the bedrooms. The current chapter room is separated by a massive fireplace, which restricts the mass of the room and the amount of people that can fit into the room. The chapter has grown significantly in size from the time of construction of this design and we're removing that fireplace from the basement to the roof. We are instead creating a large chapter room that expands out the back and utilizes operable doors that allow it to open up during chapter meetings and close differently during the rest of the week. There have been no significant changes to the site plan since you have seen it last. The calculation of the current setbacks was modified based on staff comments. The front yard setback had to take into account the existing building. The side yard setback utilized 10', which was the minimum, instead of 1' for every 2' in height. We recalculated it based on the proposed height, which pushed it in even further, however, we did not change the request for what the setback relief is. The first floor site plan modifications have to do with openings for construction detailing, but there were no modifications to the upper two residential floors. There were slight modifications for the elevations including removing light fixtures, but the general detailing and massing remain the same. There is a sunken terrace off Rugby Road that allows you to walk up a few steps to get to the porch. The porch is really important to us to create a character-defining feature on the front of the building that connects it to the street. It also provides an entry point. Staff's rounding rules changed our parking calculation and at this point we are required to have 11 spaces instead of 12. We have also calculated that we are required to have 5 spaces for bikes, and we are providing 5 locations for bike racks. With regards to light, in the previous packet, we had an issue of a fixture that was outside the house director's entry that was causing spillover across the property line. This would not meet the ordinance, so we have removed that to drop the lighting levels. Some of the fixtures we've selected are under the porch or other elements that restrict the light that is emitted from them. Even if light comes out the top, it's being cut off by things like the porch roof, so we hope that you will strike the last line from condition #5 completely, with the understanding that we are in a historic control district and we will appear in front of the BAR to approve all of the lighting fixtures. There will be additional scrutiny of what we're using and where we are putting it and we are hopeful that the Commission will leave it up to them to come up with the appropriate solution.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS:

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Regarding removing the section about recessing fixtures and just saying that the fixtures shall completely conceal the light source, would that work?

Ms. Hannegan: The reason we request that it not be a condition is because one of the fixtures that we're utilizing has the bulb visible. It is on the front porch on the pilasters that are back at the house. That statement would conflict with this and we would need to replace this fixture under this condition.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Would that create an aesthetic issue?

Mr. Hannegan: Yes. The BAR would have purview over that, which is why we're asking you to strike that and allow the BAR to control it.

PUBLIC HEARING

Addie Croft: I am the chapter president and I lived in the house last year, so I can speak to why this is necessary. While living in the house, if you were to reach your arms across you could hold your roommate's hand. It is uncomfortable living in cramped conditions. Additionally, we hold chapter meetings every Sunday and we have to put everyone into our main chapter room where it is uncomfortable for everyone to sit in there. It would be great if we could expand that. We are also a chapter that is constantly growing. One of the main things you do as a sorority is recruitment and aesthetically our house just doesn't suit our needs. If you've seen the pictures, it's really hard to compete with some of the really beautiful sorority houses when we're inviting potential members into our house every January. This would be another great way to recruit awesome new members into our house.

Karen Dougald: I was here in 1978 when the house was being designed and interest rates were 17%. The architects designed a beautiful house, but when the prices came in it was absolutely unaffordable. They tried to minimize it and as a result, many did not feel that it fit this particular area. When the house was built there were 60 members. Currently it has almost tripled in membership, so everything is being very squashed in the interior. By accepting this new design, not only is Rugby Road being enhanced, but the entire sorority is being enhanced. I am a resident of University Circle and everyone is very happy about this change, as well as the Venable Neighborhood.

Woody Oakey: I was a member of this sorority in the mid-1990s and I am a local resident now. I am also a member of the House Board, so I am involved with the sorority very frequently. The rooms are very small and cramped. Everyone was squeezed in like sardines during our chapter meetings and I can't imagine how they do it now with being 30% bigger than it was when I was there. The revised design is beautiful and it is in keeping with the historical neighborhood. This design also significantly increases the amount of study spaces and lounge spaces available to the residents and the other members who can stop by and study there. There are lounges on the 2nd and 3rd residential floors. I would propose that you move this SUP forward.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Green: I understand where Commission Solla-Yates is coming from with his potential condition with the need for concealment. That being said, I'm not sure these two porch lights are going to be any different from the porch lights all along the corridor. Based on what we heard in the pre-meeting, I am comfortable with the site lighting meeting the dark skies ordinance, which does not allow for any horizontal spillover. The bike parking is also important and I don't know why that wasn't part of our conditions to make sure that happens.

Mr. Winter: It's a requirement in 34-881 and they are meeting that. It would be 1 space per 500' of bedroom space. The site plan is not approved, but they will not get an approved site plan without proposing at least that much.

Commissioner Green: The improvement is a vast improvement over what is there now.

Commissioner Lahendro: When this design was done in 1979, this was a notable and interesting building. It was a transition between the traditional neo-revivals and modern architecture. It remains an interesting building despite what anyone thinks. I am resigned to the fact that it's going to be replaced with this.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Personally, I don't feel that we need the lighting requirement. I think dark sky rules are important, but even if there is some spillover of light that is not upward, this is a pretty good place for it. I don't feel that restricting lighting in this area is necessarily the way to go.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: This is a huge improvement and I'm excited about it.

Commissioner Green moves to recommend approval of the SUP, allowing the specific development proposed within the application materials for SP19-0004 on the basis that the proposal would service public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice, I move to recommend approval of this application for a Special Use Permit to authorize a boarding (fraternity or sorority) house use with up to 37 residents at 503 Rugby Road, within a building of the size and location depicted within the proposed Preliminary Site Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The sorority house shall have a maximum of thirty-seven (37) residents. Any expansion of the sorority house beyond thirty-seven (37) residents will require an amendment to this Special Use Permit.
 2. For the building and use described above, modifications of generally-applicable yard regulations (City Code 34-353) are approved, as follows:
 - (a) The following side yards shall be required:
 - i. North Side Yard abutting TMP 5-53: A side yard of five (5) feet, minimum will be required instead of one (1) foot of side yard per every two (2) feet of building height with a minimum of ten (10) feet.
 - ii. South Side Yard Corner, street side abutting Lambeth Lane: A side yard of fifteen (15) feet, minimum will be required instead of twenty (20) feet, minimum.
 - (b) The following front yard shall be required:
 - i. East Front Yard abutting Rugby Road: A front yard of twenty-five (25) feet, minimum will be required instead of the average depth of the existing front yards within five hundred (500) feet.
 3. Except as specifically modified within condition (2), buildings and structures, and the uses thereof, located on the Subject Property shall be in accordance with the provisions of City Code Sec. 34-353 and any other applicable provision of Chapter 34 (Zoning) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville.
 4. On-site parking will be provided in the general location and configuration shown within the preliminary site plan dated 07/16/2019. The final site plan shall demonstrate compliance with all of the following:
 - (a) All on-site parking shall be used exclusively by residents of the sorority house and their guests. No selling or leasing of on-site parking for off-site functions is permitted.
 - (b) Additional signing and pavement markings, including both lane lines and text, may be required by the City's Traffic Engineer to designate the travel ways and specify the direction of traffic in parking area(s).
 5. All outdoor lighting and light fixtures shall follow the lighting ordinance as a guide, as well as the BAR.
 6. All trash receptacles must be hidden from view when not set out for curbside pickup.
- Seconded by Commissioner Solla-Yates. Motion is approved 7-0.

IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

1. SP19-00003 – 602-616 West Main Special Use Permit request for a mixed-use building

Chairman Mitchell recused himself from this application and left Chambers.

Staff Report, Brian Haluska: This is a continuation of an item that was on a previous agenda and it was tabled so that staff could work on revised conditions for the SUP located at 612 West Main Street. We've discussed the revised condition about monitoring the adjacent property at 620-624 West Main Street and have come up with

condition #4, which details all of the monitoring that should be undertaken for that building. The applicant drafted a letter regarding two conditions under condition #1.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dowell: Thank you for considering our concerns, especially regarding protecting the landmarks around it.

Commissioner Lahendro: I need to be clear that I do pro bono advising to First Baptist Church, but I receive no payment for that, and I do not believe my advising them affects my ability to be objective with this application. Where did you all find the protective plan recommendations?

Ms. Robertson: The broad general outline came from a publication of the Department of Interior.

Applicant – Jeff Levien: I respectfully request a modification to one of the conditions and some clarity on one of the other conditions. The parking spaces that were provided in the original plan was just a very general outline, no different than the building design. The 53 spaces were not created by any particular design and it did not take into account what the BAR and the Planning Commission has in the condition as far as setting back the garage opening from West Main Street. We looked at it again to see what the parking would yield and about 40 spaces would be much more appropriate for that. It complies with zoning and 40 spaces complies more than required from the zoning ordinance because you can have a large amount of the parking off-site in this zone. I would respectfully ask that you change the 53 spaces to a minimum for 40 spaces, which is looking for no relief for what the zoning ordinance may require. The second thing is just a small clarification. I was talking about possibly getting more stories in this envelope that is in the ordinance. I am willing to concede that, understanding that four stories are appropriate, but I would not like to decrease the height limit that is permitted under the ordinance. That ordinance was specifically revised in this corridor by the City to decrease height to 52'. I do not know why we would further decrease that by 2'.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Does that mean you will do four stories no matter what, or you would prefer five?

Mr. Levien: I think that is the right design and I am willing to limit it to the four stories. I think it's appropriate.

Commissioner Dowell: What is the parking requirement through the zoning ordinance?

Mr. Levien: It depends on the unit mix and right now we don't have a definitive unit mix. Once we request density and determine how many units we can do, we can create the layouts. Based on a certain mix, we think we'd probably only have to do 20 spaces on-site because of the permission of off-site spaces.

Commissioner Dowell: Where would the off-site parking be located?

Mr. Levien: I haven't figured that out yet, but I don't know if I will need it yet. At 600 West Main, we provide them at Jefferson School and I would make similar provisions for that, but it's determined upon how many spaces we would need.

Commissioner Lahendro: I have some concerns with the protection plan. I don't know how you'd do visual documentation without color photographs and I would like to make that a requirement. The plan says it "may

include seismic monitoring or other monitoring measures.” I would like for it to say “shall include seismic monitoring or other specific monitoring measures, as recommended by the engineer, and will minimally include installation of at least five crack monitors that will be inspected weekly during ground disturbing activities during demolition and construction. The reports of the monitor reading shall be submitted to the City Building Official and adjacent landowner within two days of the inspection.” It doesn’t do any good to have seismic monitoring if no one is looking at it during the process of construction and demolition.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: What are the ceiling heights in the phase 1 of this project?

Mr. Levien: The finished floor to ceiling is around 8-9’.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lahendro: I want to thank the developer and his consultants for considering this and including something to help protect the historic building next door.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Regarding the stories requirement, it seems like we are talking about 52’ either way, but we’re going to be imposing a limit of four stories within that. From my perspective, we shouldn’t be mandating that within the exact same building you have 12-13’ soaring ceiling heights. The extra feet of ceiling height is naturally going to make those apartments higher end. We want you to have more less expensive apartments and a fifth story within the same envelope would be good.

Commissioner Lahendro: I’m fine with leaving that up to the developer to decide how many floors he wants within that 52’ limit.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: How do we feel about parking? I don’t see much value in making a parking requirement at this time.

Commissioner Dowell: Parking is very important. We have a lot of new projects that have gone up on West Main Street and we’ve heard from the public that it is an issue. We don’t need to be over-parked, but we have to keep in mind that where there are people, there are cars and they have to go somewhere.

Commissioner Green: There is 53 spaces on this condition. Is that because of the commercial aspect on the lower floor?

Mr. Haluska: The 53 was part of the condition that was drafted based on the original submission, which showed a template of parking that the applicant provided and there were 53 spaces there. That’s where that number comes from. Regarding the parking requirement, any retail space of 5,000 sq. ft. or less is exempt from any parking calculations in West Main East. As long as they keep the retail space under 5,000 sq. ft., there is no parking required for that. It’s also in the Parking Modified Zone, so residential units require one space per unit, regardless of size. There are provisions for affordable units not counting towards the parking requirement as well.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Is that 5,000 sq. ft. for a retail store or all of the retail in a building?

Mr. Haluska: I believe it’s for a retail store because it is an attempt to make small retail more attractive, as opposed to a large storefront that takes up everything.

Commissioner Heaton: How many of these parking spots are reserved for the residents? How many are for daily parking? There are often arrangements made ahead of time on Sundays when you're near a church. Is there anything in the application about that?

Mr. Haluska: There is nothing in the application about that. The code is silent on the management of parking. People are required to provide parking in accordance with the code, but how they manage that is up to them.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: In phase 1, we imposed a condition that they submit their parking plan to the City every year for how they are going to provide those shared parking spaces and off-site spaces, right?

Mr. Haluska: There is language regarding the off-site spaces. We have an agreement about the lease length and how that's managed, they aren't stuck in a long lease. The applicant would have to comment on how they are managing the spaces.

Commissioner Heaton: With residential reserved spots, what is the number of public spots that would be available?

Mr. Levien: It's likely that all of them would be for the residential units. As far as special Sunday provisions, that would just be private conversations with the adjacent landowners to figure out how to accommodate that.

Commissioner Heaton: So, all of the spots would be leased by residents?

Mr. Levien: I can't assure you of that because it depends on how many units we do. That's what we're doing at 600 West Main, but we only have 21 spaces onsite and the rest are off-site. Part of why we have it revisited in five years is because we tend to overpark and parking issues tend to come more from poor parking management plans within the City. I can't tell what it will be like three years down the road when I open this building, but we would want to make it as efficient as possible and not overpark.

Commissioner Green: What's your plan for the commercial aspect of this for parking?

Mr. Levien: The retail is probably going to be under the 5,000 sq. ft. based on the size of the building, so the retail would not be required to have parking. It would be similar as everything on West Main where you'd park on the street or find available parking along the corridor.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Do you know the sort of retail it might be?

Mr. Levien: I have no idea.

Commissioner Lahendro moves to recommend approval of a special use permit allowing the specific development proposed within the application materials for SP19-00003 subject to the following reasonable conditions and safeguards:

1. **The specific development being approved by this special use permit ("Project"), as described within the site plan exhibit required by City Code §34-158(a)(1), shall have the following minimum attributes/ characteristics:**
 - a. **Not more than one building shall be constructed on the Subject Property (the "Building"). The Building shall be a Mixed Use Building.**
 - b. **The Building shall not exceed a height of 52 feet.**
 - c. **The Building shall contain no more than 55 dwelling units.**

- d. The Building shall contain space to be occupied and used for retail uses, which shall be located on the ground floor of the Building facing West Main Street. The square footage of this retail space shall be at least the minimum required by the City's zoning ordinance.
 - e. Underground parking shall be provided within a parking garage structure constructed underneath the Building, which shall provide at least 53 parking spaces serving the use and occupancy of the Building. No direct access shall be provided into the underground parking from the Building's street wall along West Main Street.
2. The mass of the Building shall be broken down to reflect the multi-parcel massing historically on the site, as well as the West Main Street context, using building modulation. The Building and massing refer to the historic buildings on either side.
 3. There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, transparent, and permeable façade at street level.
 4. The Landowner (including, without limitation, any person who is an agent, assignee, transferee or successor in interest to the Landowner) shall prepare a Protective Plan for the Rufus Holsinger Building located on property adjacent to the Subject Property at 620-624 West Main Street ("Holsinger Building" or "Adjacent Property"). The Protective Plan shall provide for baseline documentation, ongoing monitoring, and specific safeguards to prevent damage to the Holsinger Building, and the Landowner shall implement the Protective Plan during all excavation, demolition and construction activities within the Subject Property ("Development Site"). At minimum, the Protective Plan shall include the following:
 - a. Baseline Survey—Landowner shall document the existing condition of the Holsinger Building ("Baseline Survey"). The Baseline Survey shall take the form of written descriptions, and visual documentation which shall include color photographs and/or video recordings. The Baseline Survey shall document the existing conditions observable on the interior and exterior of the Holsinger Building, with close-up images of cracks, staining, indications of existing settlement, and other fragile conditions that are observable.

The Landowner shall engage an independent third party structural engineering firm (one who has not participated in the design of the Landowner's Project or preparation of demolition or construction plans for the Landowner, and who has expertise in the impact of seismic activity on historic structures) and shall bear the cost of the Baseline Survey and preparation of a written report thereof. The Landowner and the Owner of the Holsinger Building ("Adjacent Landowner") may both have representatives present during the process of surveying and documenting the existing conditions. A copy of a completed written Baseline Survey Report shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner, and the Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Baseline Survey Report and return any comments to the Landowner.

- b. Protective Plan--The Landowner shall engage the engineer who performed the Baseline Survey to prepare a Protective Plan to be followed by all persons performing work within the Development Site, that shall include seismic monitoring or other specific monitoring measures of the Adjacent Property as recommended by the engineer preparing the Protective Plan, and minimally shall include installation of at least five crack monitors. Engineer shall inspect and take readings of crack monitors at least weekly during ground disturbance demolition and construction activities. Reports of monitor readings shall be submitted to the city building official and Adjacent Landowner within two days of inspection. A copy of the Protective Plan shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner. The Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Report and return any comments to the Landowner.
- c. Advance notice of commencement of activity--The Adjacent Landowner shall be given 14 days' advance written notice of commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and of commencement of construction at the Development Site. This notice shall include the name,

mobile phone number, and email address of the construction supervisor(s) who will be present on the Development Site and who may be contacted by the Adjacent Landowner regarding impacts of demolition or construction on the Adjacent Property. The Landowner shall also offer the Adjacent Landowner an opportunity to have meetings: (i) prior to commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and (ii) at least fourteen (14) days prior to commencement of construction at the Development Site, on days/ times reasonably agreed to by both parties. During any such preconstruction meeting, the Adjacent Landowner will be provided information as to the nature and duration of the demolition or construction activity and the Landowner will review the Protective Plan as it will apply to the activities to be commenced.

- d. Permits--No demolition or building permit, and no land disturbing permit, shall be approved or issued to the Landowner, until the Landowner provides to the department of neighborhood development services: (i) copies of the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan, and NDS verifies that these documents satisfy the requirements of these SUP Conditions, (ii) documentation that the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan were given to the Adjacent Landowner in accordance with these SUP Conditions.

Seconded by Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Stolzenberg: I lament that we changed our rules so that such a good site with no historic buildings on it that could have fit a lot of reasonably sized apartments now has to have this four or five story building with fewer apartments than the one next door. It's a shame.

Commissioner Lahendro: This is a historic district with a context that has certain height to it and building something much larger would destroy the historic character of this district.

Commissioner Stolzenberg moves to amend the motion and eliminate the parking requirement condition and let it be governed by the parking ordinance. No second; the amended motion dies.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: It's important to have a real plan in place to let that pressure off somewhere besides the residential streets. This could actually be a good source of revenue for both the Jefferson School and the church to rent out the spots they don't need, except on Sundays. We aren't going to get to a place where we have less parking by making sure it's never painful to have a car and that there is never any inconvenience.

Ms. Robertson: To be clear, if this is approved, the site plan has to conform with what is in the SUP. If the applicant submits something to you, you are entitled to rely on it. This applicant is now saying that they gave you something that cannot be developed as they represented it and it was intended to be more of a concept drawing rather than a site plan exhibit. No one expects them to have a site plan done as the time that they come for a SUP, but the ordinance requires that a certain amount of the development of the design concept be completed.

Commissioner Green: Within the zoning ordinance, has anyone had any calculation done so that we aren't going to have an impact on the neighborhoods? Does 40 work?

Mr. Haluska: In the planning world, the calculation for parking is that if you build it, they will come. If you provide parking, people will use it and if you don't, they will find other means. Our parking regulations are a minimum and if the applicant finds that those don't suite the project, they can provide more. Many Cities are reducing their minimums to allow the free market to decide how much parking is out there. Additionally, if they are mandating a large amount of parking, it typically drives up the cost of the units. The cost of the space gets put in the rent

whether the person renting the unit uses the space or not. No one can say what a development is going to need for parking until we know who is living there.

Commissioner Green: Why can't we get a calculation?

Ms. Robertson: Based on the units represented in the application, that is the minimum number of parking spaces required for those units. They submitted an application with an illustration saying they meet the minimum parking requirements and they are now asking you to reduce those. Commissioner Stolzenberg was suggesting that it still has to be one space per units, but the number of onsite spaces can be reduced if off-site is provided in accordance with the ordinance.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: In either case, they have to provide 53 spots under the ordinance. The condition says it needs to be an underground parking structure with all of those spots. Under the ordinance, they still have to provide that many spots, but they are allowed to rent spots offsite.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is there a public benefit for having onsite vs. off-site parking in this area?

Mr. Haluska: We've heard from the surrounding neighborhoods that there is a tremendous amount of pressure on the existing on-street spaces, particularly on West Main. It has been an ongoing issue for many years and any new space adds to the inventory on that corridor. If they use off-site spaces, those are existing, so you aren't increasing the inventory. It could be perceived as a public benefit. It's also a multi-modal corridor that has pedestrians and bikes, so the more we accommodate cars, the more cars you're going to get.

Commissioner Lahendro: We have a use next door that is a congregation with no lot for that church and the rent from surrounding lots that will now be competing against this development for the same parking spaces.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: What were the results of the West Main parking study that was done a few years ago?

Mr. Haluska: The big takeaway recommendation was for another structured parking facility on West Main Street that was public.

Commissioner Lahendro moves to recommend approval of a special use permit allowing the specific development proposed within the application materials for SP19-00003 subject to the following reasonable conditions and safeguards:

1. **The specific development being approved by this special use permit ("Project"), as described within the site plan exhibit required by City Code §34-158(a)(1), shall have the following minimum attributes/ characteristics:**
 - a. **Not more than one building shall be constructed on the Subject Property (the "Building"). The Building shall be a Mixed Use Building.**
 - b. **The Building shall not exceed a height of four (4) stories.**
 - c. **The Building shall contain no more than 55 dwelling units.**
 - d. **The Building shall contain space to be occupied and used for retail uses, which shall be located on the ground floor of the Building facing West Main Street. The square footage of this retail space shall be at least the minimum required by the City's zoning ordinance.**
 - e. **Underground parking shall be provided within a parking garage structure constructed underneath the Building, which shall provide at least 53 parking spaces serving the use and**

occupancy of the Building. No direct access shall be provided into the underground parking from the Building's street wall along West Main Street.

2. The mass of the Building shall be broken down to reflect the multi-parcel massing historically on the site, as well as the West Main Street context, using building modulation. The Building and massing refer to the historic buildings on either side.
3. There shall be pedestrian engagement with the street with an active, transparent, and permeable façade at street level.
4. The Landowner (including, without limitation, any person who is an agent, assignee, transferee or successor in interest to the Landowner) shall prepare a Protective Plan for the Rufus Holsinger Building located on property adjacent to the Subject Property at 620-624 West Main Street ("Holsinger Building" or "Adjacent Property"). The Protective Plan shall provide for baseline documentation, ongoing monitoring, and specific safeguards to prevent damage to the Holsinger Building, and the Landowner shall implement the Protective Plan during all excavation, demolition and construction activities within the Subject Property ("Development Site"). At minimum, the Protective Plan shall include the following:
 - a. **Baseline Survey**—Landowner shall document the existing condition of the Holsinger Building ("Baseline Survey"). The Baseline Survey shall take the form of written descriptions, and visual documentation which shall include color photographs and/or video recordings. The Baseline Survey shall document the existing conditions observable on the interior and exterior of the Holsinger Building, with close-up images of cracks, staining, indications of existing settlement, and other fragile conditions that are observable.

The Landowner shall engage an independent third party structural engineering firm (one who has not participated in the design of the Landowner's Project or preparation of demolition or construction plans for the Landowner, and who has expertise in the impact of seismic activity on historic structures) and shall bear the cost of the Baseline Survey and preparation of a written report thereof. The Landowner and the Owner of the Holsinger Building ("Adjacent Landowner") may both have representatives present during the process of surveying and documenting the existing conditions. A copy of a completed written Baseline Survey Report shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner, and the Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Baseline Survey Report and return any comments to the Landowner.

- b. **Protective Plan**--The Landowner shall engage the engineer who performed the Baseline Survey to prepare a Protective Plan to be followed by all persons performing work within the Development Site, that may include seismic monitoring or other specific monitoring measures of the Adjacent Property if recommended by the engineer preparing the Protective Plan, and minimally shall include installation of at least five crack monitors. Engineer shall inspect and take readings of crack monitors at least weekly during ground disturbance demolition and construction activities. Reports of monitor readings shall be submitted to the city building official and Adjacent Landowner within two days of inspection. A copy of the Protective Plan shall be provided to the Adjacent Landowner. The Adjacent Landowner shall be given fourteen (14) days to review the Report and return any comments to the Landowner.
 - c. **Advance notice of commencement of activity**--The Adjacent Landowner shall be given 14 days' advance written notice of commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and of commencement of construction at the Development Site. This notice shall include the name, mobile phone number, and email address of the construction supervisor(s) who will be present on the Development Site and who may be contacted by the Adjacent Landowner regarding impacts of demolition or construction on the Adjacent Property. The Landowner shall also offer the Adjacent Landowner an opportunity to have meetings: (i) prior to commencement of demolition at the Development Site, and (ii) at least fourteen (14) days prior to commencement

of construction at the Development Site, on days/ times reasonably agreed to by both parties. During any such preconstruction meeting, the Adjacent Landowner will be provided information as to the nature and duration of the demolition or construction activity and the Landowner will review the Protective Plan as it will apply to the activities to be commenced.

- d. **Permits--No demolition or building permit, and no land disturbing permit, shall be approved or issued to the Landowner, until the Landowner provides to the department of neighborhood development services: (i) copies of the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan, and NDS verifies that these documents satisfy the requirements of these SUP Conditions, (ii) documentation that the Baseline Survey Report and Protective Plan were given to the Adjacent Landowner in accordance with these SUP Conditions.**

Seconded by Commissioner Green. Motion is approved 4-2.

2. Entrance Corridor – Hillsdale Place Comprehensive sign package

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This is within the Route 29 North and the Hydraulic Road Entrance Corridors. The approximately 87,000 sq. ft. building will reuse space previously occupied by K-Mart and Gold's Gym and is planned to accommodate 10 tenants, anchored on the west by a 40,000 sq. ft. store and on the east by a 20,000 sq. ft. store. For design review, the Entrance Corridor CoA was approved by the ERB earlier this summer. The applicant is requesting approval of a Comprehensive Signage Plan (CSP), which will be applied to the building signage for the 10 anticipated tenants and includes three monument signs. When a development is subject to a site plan review and design review, the applicant may request approval of a CSP, which is defined as "a written plan detailing the type, quantity, size, shape, color, and location of all signs within the development that is the subject of the plan, where the number, characteristics and/or locations of the signs referenced within the plan do not comply with the requirements of the City Code regarding signs." Per the City Code, Council may approve a comprehensive signage plan, upon a determination that "there is good cause for deviating from a strict application of the requirements of this division, and the comprehensive signage plan, as proposed, will serve the public purposes and objectives at least as well, or better, than the signage that would otherwise be permitted by-right. It's important to note that this CSP will not apply to building signage associated with the adjacent Whole Foods store, which is subject to a CSP approved in 2011. However, space on each of the three, new monument signs will be available to Whole Foods and therefore be subject to the provisions of this CSP. The code identifies 9 signage types. They have awning or canopy that are consistent with the code, 3 monument signs that are consistent with the code, and projecting signs that are consistent with Code provisions, except the maximum sign area allowed within an EC is 15 sq. ft. Additionally, there are sandwich board signs that are allowed with the owner's approval and no sign permit is required. The signage may be placed only on the concrete walk at the storefronts shown in elevation on sheet 7 and must be removed after hours. City will not regulate signs that comply, however those that do not will be treated as a violation. There are temporary signs that are allowed. There are several places within the elevations where they have indicated signage may go for wall signs and there are different sizes and heights that are discussed in the recommendations. None of the other types were proposed and therefore are not permitted. The code says the CSP will serve public purpose. The approval of a CSP shall be submitted in writing to the director of neighborhood development services, and shall be accompanied by the required application fee, as set forth within the most recent zoning fee schedule approved by city council and should include the following information: A written narrative description of the overall plan, including, without limitation; color illustrations or photographs of each sign included within the plan; a written description of the type, size, materials, and proposed location of each sign; a map or other written identification and description of all existing signs on the property comprising the proposed development; color illustrations or photographs of signage existing on adjacent properties; and a written description of the proposed lighting for the signage. There are two provisions that were deviants from the code, one is in the signage area. Per the Code, the

maximum signage area is 75 sq. ft. per parcel, which in a shopping center like this staff has applied as a per tenant maximum. Therefore, by code each tenant would be allowed a maximum aggregate signage area 75 sq. ft. for all signage above. Relative to the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines for Signs, they must: place signs so that they do not obstruct architectural elements and details that define the design of the building; respect the design and visibility of signs for adjacent businesses; use colors and appropriate materials that complement the materials and color scheme of the building, including accent and trim colors (the tenant is limited to two colors and prior to submittal for a sign permit the applications must be reviewed and approved by the building owner); use a minimal number of colors per sign where possible; exterior illumination of signs shall comply with the City's outdoor lighting requirements and exterior neon is discouraged; illumination of any sign shall not be directed toward any residential area or adjacent street; consider using a comprehensive signage plan for larger developments; encourage the use of monument signs (rather than freestanding signs) with accent landscaping at the base along corridors; internally lit signs should use an opaque background so only letters are lit; and flashing lights are prohibited. Upon reviewing the proposed comprehensive plan, staff believes that the conditions of the proposed CSP are appropriate and supports a recommendation of approval with conditions.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS:

Commissioner Solla-Yates: How do dark skies best practices and lit signs mesh?

Mr. Werner: In conversation with the zoning administrator, we are comfortable with how it is met relative to the signage. Parking lot lighting is different, but it is all subject to the ordinance. We are confident with what they've stated and what we've added relative to these code references.

Commissioner Green: What is the enforcement of the signs?

Ms. Creasy: If someone were to go out there, the sign would be acquired and the applicant would be called and told that their sign is there if they want to pick it up and to not do it again. There can be fines as well.

Commissioner Green: Are these CSP requests based on the red lines around this building?

Mr. Werner: The key is that it's based off of the elevations.

Commissioner Green: What happens after they use all of the numbers here and then want to add one of these five future buildings? Does that mean those buildings get no signage?

Mr. Werner: There are a few ways to handle it. One is that any future buildings not covered in this would be subject to the standard signage regulations. One could be to amend the Comprehensive Signage Plan, which is how it is worded now. That was the applicant's decision. The key to this plan is that the chart applies to tenants that are identified in the plan and it says where the signs can be. The owner has to approve it and there would be a checklist for each one. These plans go through the process and become pretty rigid, but the applicants are willing to do it. In my review, this one is reasonable.

Commissioner Lahendro: Are they requesting twice as much as what the code allows?

Ms. Creasy: Each sign type has different allowances. They may equal up to more than the 75', but you can't have more than 75' per site. It's confusing because each type has a specific number and it may add up to something that is not 75', but you can't have more than that.

Commissioner Green: They want 1348' and the code says 750'. You think based off of what we have, they can do it in 907'?

Mr. Werner: Looking at it in total, by some adjustments in the tenants in between, it allowed the overall thing to work better. It is with the understanding that a lot of this is occurring on the two ends of the building.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: If they wanted to put up a sign that is circular, is that measured by height x width?

Ms. Creasy: It is the actual area.

Commissioner Mitchell: How comfortable with the difference between the number they are asking for and the number that you are comfortable with?

Mr. Werner: The three sides of the shopping center with the large block is very compelling. We're talking about using all of that to distribute the signage, which is where I felt okay. Reducing the projecting signs is where I felt most comfortable.

Ms. Creasy: This was done with extensive collaboration with the zoning staff, who review all of the sign permits for the entire City and they constantly reviewed different sign packages going through the City in several places. They had the overall perspective of the general feel for the City as a whole. In this case, we're able to provide insight on something that gives more of a balance to the request.

Mr. Werner: I think it is okay to be at 905' if there were some caps put on the wall canopy in projecting signs. That conversation took place after the information was provided.

Applicant, Ashley Davies: The intent of the Comprehensive Signage Package that we provided is to create a document and code that is specific to this shopping center. It creates a harmonious environment within the development. One of the main reasons to do that is because with a site of this size and nature, you may need some flexibility in the code to suite the specific needs of someone that isn't a standard Charlottesville store. The existing signage ordinance is geared towards smaller parcels with one tenant. The architecture has been carefully designed and we show very specifically where the tenants might choose to place their sign. We are trying to give them flexibility on locations, but in almost every case we've copied the standard by-right allowance for the sign types. We allow this for everyone except for the anchor tenants because the stores are so large. There's also one spot in the middle that gives the possibility for a shopping center sign on the middle architectural feature. Once we saw the chart, it had a lot of deviations from what we proposed to you in our CSP. When you look at it as a whole, we aren't going to allow tenants to do five different sign types. We are designing what we think is a nice commercial center, but we wanted to at least give the standard provisions from the code for each sign type to allow the flexibility of choice for which sign best suites each tenant. We took things right from the City Code, but I don't see anywhere on this site where we would need a 30' projecting sign. If we compromised by taking it down to a potential of 15 sq. ft. per tenant helps in the decision-making process, that is something we are amenable to. The reality of the center is that it's 15' below grade on the 29 side and it's hundreds of feet from most of the public right of ways. I don't agree with penalizing the middle tenants. We are really looking to give something unique to the anchor locations because those are what will drive the success of the entire shopping center. The smaller tenants are only 18-20' wide, so there isn't much space to provide signs there, which means the signs won't be very large. The main deal for the retail tenants are the wall signs and having some visibility of those. The rest of them are just copying the code and providing some flexibility as to what the tenants choose. We're fine having any of the tenants 2-9 having the maximum of 75 sq. ft. that the zoning ordinance gives to any other

standard tenant in the Entrance Corridor. It's more about the deviations to accommodate the larger anchors in the shopping center.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lahendro: It bothers me that you think it's appropriate for the smaller stores to be able to put the kind of large signage necessary to be seen from 29. That is out of scale with those stores and it's the shopping center that's drawing the customers based on the anchor stores and the monument signage. Once they are inside the shopping center, the smaller stores can attract them by creating a walkable experience and a sense of place.

Ms. Davies: I am not asking for larger signage for the regular tenants. I was trying to express that I don't think we should be reducing signage for those tenants more than we would for any other regular business in Charlottesville. The standard application is fine for the smaller tenants, but we didn't want a recommendation that shrinks their signage size to accommodate for the anchor tenants.

Commissioner Green: We scrutinize our Entrance Corridor a lot. I am not a fan of signs and I would vote for the recommendation of what our code allows. Unfortunately, I have to leave before the vote. People are going to be sitting at a red light and they will have ample time to see what is in the shopping center. Additionally, the small area plan we created for this shopping center is based off of a pedestrian model.

Commissioner Green left the meeting.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Looking at the suggested conditions, would condition 4 be an unreasonable burden on the tenants?

Ms. Davies: I appreciate that staff is recognizing the importance of the anchor tenants to the success of the overall shopping center, but I don't think it should be at the expense of the smaller tenants.

Mr. Werner: The applicant is proposing for wall signs to say 50', canopy signs to say 20', projecting signs to say 30', under canopy to stay at 4', with the maximum allowable aggregate at 75'.

Chairman Mitchell: How many additional square feet above the 907 would Ms. Davies' proposal take us?

Ms. Creasy: It would be 1050'.

Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code and the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines for Signs, Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to find that the proposed comprehensive signage plan satisfies the Design Guidelines, meets the requirements for consideration of such a plan, and is compatible with other properties within Route 29 North and Hydraulic Road Entrance Corridors, and that the ERB recommends to City Council that they should approve this application as submitted with the recommended conditions as follows: Revise CSP to clarify condition that allows no more than three signs above 20-feet, but not higher than 28-feet, and that those three signs may be located in any of the five locations noted. Revise CSP conditions regarding sandwich [board] signs (on sheet 5) to indicate that, while such signs will not require permits, they must still comply with provisions of Section 34- 1038(g) items 1 through 6. Revise CSP, sheet 3, under General Tenant Sign Criteria, to include by reference the following components of Division 4, Section 34 to be applied by reference, unless specifically stated otherwise:

- 1024. Definitions
- 1025. Permit requirements—generally
- 1026. Public liability insurance
- 1027. Signs permitted in all districts without permits
- 1028. Signs placed by public authority
- 1029. Prohibited signs
- 1030. Noncommercial signs.
- 1034. Illumination

Revise CSP signage area allocations per table in the staff report, not including the monument signs and shopping center sign. These values, including the number of signs allowed, should be incorporated into the final CSP, replacing the summaries on sheets 4 and 5. This includes the maximum aggregate area for tenant #1 to be 300 sq. ft, the maximum aggregate area for tenants #2-#9 to be 75 sq. ft. each, and the maximum aggregate area for tenant #10 to be 150 sq. ft. Seconded by Commissioner Lahendro. Motion is approved 6-0.

V. Adjournment

8:45 pm – Commissioner Dowell moves to adjourn until the second Tuesday in October 2019.