# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET <br> TUESDAY, December 10, 2019 at 5:30 P.M. CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS 

I. Commission Pre-Meeting (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 4:30 p.m.
Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference
II. Commission Regular Meeting

Beginning: 5:30 p.m.
Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers
A. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS
B. UNIVERSITY REPORT
C. CHAIR'S REPORT
D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS
E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA F. CONSENT AGENDA
(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

1. Entrance Corridor Review - Recommendation on SUP for Barracks Road
III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION/ COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 p.m.
Continuing: until all public hearings are completed
Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing

1. Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program FY 2021-2025: Consideration of the proposed 5year Capital Improvement Program totaling $\$ 127,952,881$ in the areas of Affordable Housing, Education, Economic Development, Public Safety \& Justice, Facilities Management, Transportation \& Access, Parks \& Recreation, Technology Infrastructure, Stormwater Initiatives and General Government Infrastructure. A copy of the proposed CIP is available for review at https://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-a-g/budget-and-performance-management/fy-2021-budget-worksessions
Report prepared by Krisy Hammill, Office of Budget and Performance Management.
2. SP19-00009-900-1000 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Street South - Riverbend Development, as the owner's agent, has submitted an application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) request to allow private outdoor parks, playgrounds, and/or basketball courts per City Code Section 34-420, and a reduction of the minimum required setbacks per City Code Section 34-162(a), at 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S, also identified on City Real Property Tax Map 26 Parcel 115 ("Subject Property"). The Subject Property has frontage on $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S and Elliott Avenue. The site is zoned R-3 Multifamily Residential. The property is approximately 7.94 acres or 345,866 square feet. The Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Plan calls for High-Density Residential development at densities greater than 15 dwelling units per acre. Information pertaining to request may be viewed online at http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services or obtained from the Department of Neighborhood Development Services, 2nd Floor of City Hall, 610 East Main Street. Persons interested in this rezoning petition may contact Carrie Rainey by email (raineyc@,charlottesville.org) of by telephone (434-970-3453).
3. CP19-00002 - Fontaine Avenue Streetscape Concept - Pursuant to Virginia Code section 15.2-2232 and City Code sec. 34-28, the Planning Commission will review the proposed Fontaine Avenue Streetscape conceptual design plan, for a planned improvement project located on Fontaine Avenue
between Ray C. Hunt Drive and Jefferson Park Avenue, to determine if the general location, character and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. The conceptual design of the proposed improvements may be examined at the Department of Neighborhood Development Services, 610 East Market Street, Charlottesville, Virginia, Monday - Friday between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.
4. SP19-00008 -Chick-fil-A Barracks Road Drive Through - Landowner Federal Realty Investment Trust by its contract purchaser Chick-fil-A, Inc. is requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-796, to authorize a specific land use (drive-through window for a restaurant) for property identified on City Tax Map 1 as a portion of Parcel 1 ("Subject Property"), having an area of approximately 0.801 acre. The Subject Property is zoned "URB" (Urban Corridor Mixed Use District) with Entrance Corridor Overlay and has frontage on Emmet Street North. The Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for Mixed Use development. Information pertaining to request may be viewed online at http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-developmentservices or obtained from the Department of Neighborhood Development Services, 2nd Floor of City Hall, 605 East Main Street. Persons interested in this SUP application may contact NDS Planner Joey Winter by e-mail (winterj@charlottesville.org ) or by telephone (434-970-3991).

## IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

Continuing: until all action items are concluded.

1. Critical Slopes - 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street South - Phase II
2. Site Plan - Carlton Views - Phase III

## V. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE/ADJOURN

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday, December 24, 2019-5:00PM | Work <br> Session | No meeting |
| Tuesday, January 14, 2020-4:30 PM | Pre- <br> Meeting |  |
| Tuesday, January 14, 2020 - 5:30 PM | Regular <br> Meeting | Minutes - November 12, 2019 - Pre- <br> meeting and Regular meeting <br> Minutes - November 26, 2019 - Work |
| Session <br> ZTA and ZMA - DE- SIA |  |  |

## Anticipated Items on Future Agendas

Zoning Text Amendments -Off-street parking facilities requirements along streets designated as "framework streets" (initiated May 8, 2018), Site Plan Requirements SUP-MACAA (1021 Park Street)
EC - Barracks Road - restaurant site
Site Plan and Entrance Corridor - 1617 Emmet Street
Streetscape - Barracks and Emmet

Persons with Disabilities may request reasonable accommodations by contacting ada@charlottesville.org or (434)970-3182

# LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY 

 11/1/2019 TO 11/30/20191. Preliminary Site Plans
2. Final Site Plans
a. Locust Grove Ting Cabinet Utility Plan - November 14, 2019
b. Shentel Rugby Road Utility Extension Plan - November 20, 2019
3. Site Plan Amendments
a. Dairy Central Phase 2 - November 26, 2019
4. Subdivision

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
Department Of Neighborhood Development Services
Staff Report to the Entrance Corridor Review Board (ERB)

## Entrance Corridor (EC) Special Use Permit Request

Date of Planning Commission Meeting: December 10, 2019
Property Street Address: 1000 Emmet Street North
Zoning: URB
Entrance Corridor: Corridor 1, Route 29 North Sub-Area C
Tax Parcel: 010001000
Site Acreage: 39.83 acres
Date of Hearing: December 10, 2019
Application Number: SP-19-00008
Staff report prepared by: Jeff Werner, Preservation and Design Planner
Relevant Code Section: Sec. 34-157(7) When the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the BAR or ERB, as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.

## Background:

This proposal involves a new structure that will include a covered, drive-through window. The new structure will replace an existing fast food restaurant that also operated a drive-through window.

## Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines:

Within the City's Entrance Corridor (EC) Design Guidelines there is nothing specific to drivethrough windows; however, the guidelines acknowledge the continued commercial nature of this EC and Sub Area and that this area is both pedestrian and auto-oriented. The requested special use permit (SUP) will allow the continuation of a use currently allowed at the existing structure.

The Guidelines Specific to the Zoning within this sub-area acknowledge that the intent is to continue the close-in urban commercial activity that has been the traditional development patterns in these areas. Development in this district is both pedestrian and auto-oriented, but is evolving to more of a pedestrian center development pattern. The regulations provide for both a mixture of uses or single use commercial activities. It encourages parking located behind the structure and development of a scale and character that is respectful to the neighborhoods and University uses adjacent.

Discussion: Before City Council takes action to permit the proposed use, they must consider the ERB's opinion whether there are any adverse impacts to the EC district that could be mitigated
with conditions. An SUP is an important zoning tool that allows City Council to impose reasonable conditions to make a use more acceptable in a specific location, and to "protect the welfare, safety and convenience of the public."

The parcel's zoning allows for a drive-through window via a SUP. In reviewing such a request, the first factor to be considered is if the proposed use will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood. Under the circumstances, allowing a new drive-through window where one exists would not introduce something new or different; neither as a use nor as constructed feature. Additionally, within the Barracks Road Shopping Center there is one fast food restaurant with a drive-through window and three banks with multi-lane drive-through windows. Just south of this shopping center is a fast food restaurant with a drivethrough window and a bank with multi-lane drive-through windows. Immediately north is a fast food restaurant with a drive-through window.

Recommendation: For the reasons stated above, design staff recommends a finding that approval of the requested SUP will not adversely impact Sub-Area C of the 29 North Entrance Corridor.

Note: Staff's recommendation is an evaluation only of the request to allow at this location a restaurant with a drive-through window. This is not a recommendation of approval for any presented design, site elements, materials, etc. Construction details--such as building design, site layout, landscaping, lighting, signage - are subject to ERB review and the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Suggested Motion: I move to find that, as related to the city's Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, the proposed Special Use Permit to allow a drive through window at the proposed Chik-Fil-A will not have an adverse impact on the Route 29 North [Emmet Street] Entrance Corridor.

Alternate Motion: I move to find that, as related to the city's Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, the proposed Special Use Permit to allow a drive through window at the proposed Chik-Fil-A will, for the following reasons, have an adverse impact on the Route 29 North [Emmet Street] Entrance Corridor...

## CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

"To be One Community Filled with Opportunity"

Office of The City Manager<br>P.O. Box 911 • Charlottesville, Virginia 22902<br>Telephone 434-970-3101<br>Fax 434-970-3890<br>www.charlottesville.org

November 19, 2019
Dear Planning Commission Members:
The proposed fiscal year (FY) 2021 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) has projected revenues that supports approximately $\$ 35.8 \mathrm{M}$ in expenditures. This is an increase of $\$ 403 \mathrm{~K}$ from the adopted FY2020 CIP budget. This $1.14 \%$ uptick in allocations is considerably less than it was from FY19 to FY20. However, during those two (2) previously mentioned FYs, there was a $51.27 \%$ increase in CIP expenditures. The aforesaid percentage represents a difference of $\$ 1$ 1.9M.

Based upon the abovementioned monetary figure, both internal departments and external agencies were provided with direction to only submit essential projects for consideration. These submissions were also required to have justification for each annual expenditure. The purpose for this request was to reduce costs that would not be realized in a forthcoming FY. In the current FY (2020), there are several heavily funded CIP projects that have yet to be expended. Those project costs will be incurred in FY2021 or spread across the next five (5) FYs.

Although there will be challenges moving forward in terms of financing new CIP projects, the reconfiguration of public schools and affordable housing remains a top priority for funding in FY2021. In order to adequately finance the entire FY2021 CIP, revenues had to be increased by $1.14 \%(\$ 403 \mathrm{~K})$. This was achieved by transferring $3.84 \%$ of currently projected general fund expenditures to the CJP budget (City Council policy is $3 \%$ ). There were also increases in the revenue lineitems formiscellaneous proceeds and bonds.

These revenue sources, as well as the year end appropriations will play a significant role in funding future CIP projects. Over the next five (5) years, the City of Charlottesville is projected to fund $\$ 128 \mathrm{M}$ in CIP projects. Our long-term financial policy has a debt service maximum of $10 \%$, with a target of $9 \%$. By FY2025, our projections indicate that the debt service rate will reach $8.56 \%$. While we are expecting to stay within our debt service limit, the affordability of additional debt will require an ongoing commitment of increased annual funding.

Lastly, there are some multi-million projects on the horizon that will also have a considerable impact on our annual CIP budget. These are projects that have been recently approved or were in the planning process for many years. As previously discussed at our first CIP Development Work Session, our projections show that the Debt Service Fund Balance will be depleted by FY2026.

Traditionally, these funds have been used to reduce annual transfers from the General Fund for debt service payments. Moving forward, it is imperative that we begin the process of strategically prioritizing our CJP projects, goals and objectives in order for us to remain financially stable.


Tarron Richardson, Ph.D.
City Manager
FY 2021 CIP Budget Outlook - DRAFT

Expenses
Category

| Proposed Capital Improvement Program - DRAFT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY 2021-2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\frac{\text { Adopted }}{\text { FY20 }}$ | $\frac{\text { Proposed }}{\text { FY21 }}$ | $\frac{\text { Projected }}{\text { FY22 }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Projected } \\ \text { FY23 } \end{array}$ | $\frac{\text { Projected }}{\text { FY24 }}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Projected } \\ \text { FY25 } \end{array}$ | 5 Year Total |
| Revenues |  | 3.84\% | 4.65\% | 3.98\% | 4.65\% | 4.01\% |  |
| Transfer from General Fund | 6,968,323 | 7,367,841 | 9,050,203 | 7,867,841 | 9,328,400 | 8,165,164 | 41,779,449 |
| Transfer from General Fund - Mall Vendor Fees | 125,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 125,000 | 625,000 |
| FY18 Year End Appropriation - Affordable Housing Redevelopment | 3,201,082 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Reprogramming of Existing Capital Funds | 1,872,833 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Contribution from Albemarle County (CATEC) | 75,000 | 500,000 | 90,000 | 62,500 | 0 |  | 652,500 |
| Contribution from Albemarle County (Central and Gordon Ave. Library) | 175,000 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |
| Contribution from Schools (Small Cap Program) | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,000,000 |
| PEG Fee Revenue | 47,500 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 200,000 |
| VDOT - Rev Share Hyrdraulic | 0 | 150,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| VDOT - Rev Share East High Signalization | 0 | 500,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CY 2020 Bond Issue | 22,735,413 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| CY 2021 Bond Issue | 0 | 26,920,837 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26,920,837 |
| CY 2022 Bond Issue | 0 | 0 | 24,483,349 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24,483,349 |
| CY 2023 Bond Issue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,385,479 | 0 | 0 | 11,385,479 |
| CY 2024 Bond Issue | 0 | 0 | $\cdots$ | 0 | 12,968,286 | 0 | 12,968,286 |
| CY 2025 Bond Issue | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 7,287,981 | 7,287,981 |
|  |  | - | - |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL AVAILABLE REVENUES | \$35,400,151 | \$35,803,678 | \$33,988,552 | \$19,680,820 | \$22,661,686 | \$15,818,145 | \$127,952,881 |
| Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\longrightarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| BONDABLE PROJECTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EDUCATION | Adopted | Proposed | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | 5 Year |
| Project | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Total |
| Lump Sum to Schools (City Contribution) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,000,000 |
| City Schools HVAC Replacement | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 3,750,000 |
| City Schools Reconfiguration Design and Planning | 00,3000,000 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1,200,000 & 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $1,200,000 \quad 0$ | $1,200,000 \quad 0$ | 1,200,000 0 | $1,200,000 \quad 0$ | 0 |
| City Schools Priority Improvement Projects | 1,250,000 | 1,200,1,250,000 | 1,200,1,250,000 | 1,200,1,250,000 | 1,250,000 | 1,200, 1,250,000 | 6,250,000 |
| Charlottesville High School Roof Replacement |  | 0 | 120,000 | 1,200,000 | 0 | 0 | 1,320,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL | \$6,200,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$3,320,000 | \$4,400,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$3,200,000 | \$17,320,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FACILITIES CAPITAL PROJECTS | Adopted | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | 5 Year |
| Project | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Total |
| Lump Sum to Facilities Capital Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5,727,456 |
| City Facility HVAC Replacement | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 1,250,000 |
| City and Schools Solar PV Program | 045,4975,000 | 1,545,491 75,000 | 1,045,49175,000 | 1,045,49155,000 | 1,045,495,000 | 1,045,4915,000 | 375,000 |
| 4th Street Yard Fuel Tank Replacement | 0 | 1,545,491 0 | 1,045,491 0 | 1,045,491 0 | 0 | 1,045,491 0 | 0 |
| Avon Street Filling Station Replacement | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Energy Performance Contact (Audit) | 150,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Smith Recreation Indoor Air Quality Corrections | 0 | 1,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,500,000 |


| Bulk Fluid Management System - Fleet Shop | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Downtown Mall TARA | 0 | 125,000 | \$302,000 | 2,138,000 | 0 | 0 | 2,565,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL | \$1,520,491 | 3,495,491 | \$1,672,491 | \$3,508,491 | \$1,370,492 | \$1,370,491 | \$11,417,456 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE | Adopted | Proposed | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | 5 Year |
| Project | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Total |
| General District Court | 0 | 3,181,014 | 3,181,014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,362,028 |
| Replacement Fire Apparatus | 0 | 995,500 | 0 | 0 | 1,152,415 | 0 | 2,147,915 |
| Replacement EMS Apparatus | 0 | 377,553 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 377,553 |
| Bypass Fire Station | 3,700,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL | \$3,700,000 | \$4,554,067 | \$3,181,014 | \$0 | \$1,152,415 | \$0 | \$8,887,496 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRANSPORTATION AND ACCESS | Adopted | Proposed | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | 5 Year |
| Project | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Total |
| Undergrounding Utilities | 1,700,000 | 1,430,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,430,000 |
| New Sidewalks | 400,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 |
| Sidewalk Repair | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 500,000 | 2,500,000 |
| West Main Improvements | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8,000,000 |
| SIA Immediate Implementation | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Small Area Plans | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 500,000 |
| Street Milling and Paving | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 7,000,000 |
| Parking Structure | 0 | 4,875,000 | 5,125,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10,000,000 |
| ADA Pedestrian Signal Upgrades | 240,000 | 240,000 | 240,000 | 240,000 | 240,000 | 240,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Downtown Pedestrian Intersection Lighting | 94,000 | - 0 | $\bigcirc 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Minor Bridge Repairs | 218,545 | 225,101 | 231,854 | 238,810 | 245,974 | 253,353 | 1,195,092 |
| State Revenue Sharing | 413,218 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Citywide ADA Improvements - Sidewalks and Curbs | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Traffic Signal Infrastructure Replacement | 0 | 200,000 | 728,000 | 757,120 | 787,405 | 818,901 | 3,291,426 |
| Historic Resources | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 |
| Dairy Road Bridge | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Blight Remediation | 0 | 50,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50,000 |
| Hydraulic/250 Intersection Turn Lane - VDOT Rev Share | 0 | 150,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150,000 |
| East High Street Signalization - VDOT Rev Share | 0 | 500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 500,000 |
| Belmont Bridge - Local Match | 0 | 5,000,000 | 2,500,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,500,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL | \$9,065,763 | \$17,820,101 | 14,924,854 | \$4,335,930 | \$4,373,379 | \$4,412,254 | \$45,866,518 |
|  | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PARKS AND RECREATION | Adopted | Proposed | Projected | Projected | Projected | Projected | 5 Year |
| Project | FY20 | FY21 | FY22 | FY23 | FY24 | FY25 | Total |
| Tonsler Park Master Plan Implementation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pen Park Tennis Court Renovations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| City/County Joint Parks - Darden Towe | 928,963 | 193,370 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193,370 |
| City/County Joint Parks - Ivy Creek | 20,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Washington Park Basketball Court Renovations | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Riverview Park Restrooms | 245,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SUBTOTAL | \$1,193,963 | \$193,370 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$193,370 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  | ｜n |  | 앙 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 8i | $\stackrel{\circ}{2}$ |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ \stackrel{n}{n} \\ \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | 亡ั் | $\stackrel{\circ}{6}$ |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \text { B} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{n} \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | 边 | $\stackrel{\circ}{2}$ |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \\ \stackrel{N}{n} \\ \end{array}\right\|$ |  |  | $\text { ! } \stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ |
|  |  |  | な్సి | $\bigcirc$ |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}}{\stackrel{1}{\circ}}$ | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Proposed F.Y. 2021 C.I.P. Revenue and Expenditure Description Summary

## Revenue Summary

Total proposed revenues for F.Y. 2021, $\mathbf{\$ 3 5 , 8 0 3 , 6 7 8}$, are broken down as follows:

1) The General Fund transfer to the Capital Fund is proposed at a total of $\$ 7,367,841$.
2) Transfer from the General Fund - Mall Vendor Fee revenue of $\$ 125,000$, to offset the cost of Downtown Mall Infrastructure Repairs.
3) A contribution from Albemarle County of $\$ 500,000$ for the County's portion of expenses related to facility improvements at C.A.T.E.C.
4) The annual $\$ 200,000$ contribution from the Charlottesville City Schools for their Small Capital Improvement Program. There is a corresponding expenditure for this purpose.
5) P.E.G. Fee revenue of $\$ 40,000$ which is received as part of the franchise agreement with Comcast.
6) VDOT Revenue Sharing funds $\$ 650,000$ for the Emmet Street Signalization $(\$ 500,000)$ and the Hydraulic Turning Lane $(\$ 150,000)$.
7) The $\$ 26,920,837$ in bond revenue, part of a bond issuance that will take place during C.Y. 2019 to pay for those projects deemed bondable.

## Expenditure Summary

## Bondable Projects

Total expenditures for the F.Y. 2021 Bondable projects, $\mathbf{\$ 3 0 , 7 6 3 , 0 2 9}$, are broken down as follows:

## Education

1) Lump Sum to Schools

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$1,200,000
This sum is the yearly appropriation to the City Schools for their Capital Program. Project types include health/safety, facility asset preservation, code compliance (building \& fire codes, and ADA), scheduled/periodic maintenance, and to a lesser extent, quality of space/functionality. Some of the items proposed to be covered by this appropriation
include: CCS Modular Classrooms, Buford Envelope Restoration, Johnson Pedestrian lighting, School Security.
The balance for the lump sum to schools account as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 1,555,179$.
2) Schools H.V.A.C. Replacement Plan

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$750,000
Facilities Maintenance has developed a 20 -year plan for the replacement of H.V.A.C. equipment. Each piece of equipment has a predictable life cycle, beyond which failure becomes imminent. All aging equipment will be replaced with the most energy-efficient option available on the market, resulting in direct and lasting cost savings. As of January 1,2020 per EPA ruling, R22 refrigerant will be phased out completely, no new or imported R22 allowed in the US. Reclaimed refrigerant would still be available but at a very high cost. FM's plan moving forward is to concentrate our replacement efforts on equipment such as chillers and rooftop units which contain large amounts of R22. The refrigerant from these units as they are replaced will be recovered by our technicians and stored in our warehouse for future needs until our inventory of R22 units is depleted. The balance for this project as of November 22,2019 is $\$ 967,063.83$.
3) C.C.S. Priority Improvements Projects

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$1,250,000
In 2016, City School's Facility Improvement Planning Committee (FIPC) met and selected the following project "themes", as the top CCS project priorities. Subsequently, the School Board reviewed and formally approved the "themes" and the phasing plan.
*Classroom Modernization *Corridor Improvements *Daylighting
*Auditorium Renovations *Cafeteria Renovations
In 2017, FIPC selected Classroom Modernizations as the highest priority project. The Committee recommended that work begin in the 4th grade classrooms, at all six elementary schools. The general scope of work could include: new flooring, ceiling replacement with new LED light fixtures, furniture (flexible), paint - including accent colors \& white board paint (dry erase) for select walls, casework/cubbies/classroom storage/coat racks, daylighting- windows/solar tubes/light shelves/etc., technology upgrades, acoustic treatments, window treatments, minor electrical \& HVAC work.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 1,267,923.44$.

## Facilities Capital Improvements

1) Lump Sum to Facilities Capital Projects

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$1,545,491
Facilities Development uses this lump sum in order to fund improvements and repairs to various City owned facilities. Typical project types include health/safety, facility asset preservation, code compliance (building \& fire codes, and ADA), scheduled/periodic capital maintenance, and quality of space/functionality. The additional $\$ 500,000$ added to this account in FY 21 represents the funds needed for the C.A.T.E.C. roof replacement. This additional expenditure budget for C.A.T.E.C. is offset by Albemarle County's $\$ 500,0000$ payment to the City for its share of the project.
The balance for lump sum to facilities account as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 2,594,019$.
2) City Building H.V.A.C. Replacement Plan

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$250,000
Facilities Maintenance has developed a plan for the replacement of H.V.A.C. equipment in City Facilities. Each piece of equipment has a predictable life cycle, beyond which failure becomes imminent. All aging equipment will be replaced with the most energyefficient option available on the market, resulting in direct and lasting cost savings. As of January 1, 2020 per EPA ruling, R22 refrigerant will be phased out completely, no new or imported R22 allowed in the US. Reclaimed refrigerant would still be available but at a very high cost. FM's plan moving forward is to concentrate our replacement efforts on equipment such as chillers and rooftop units which contain large amounts of R22. The refrigerant from these units as they are replaced will be recovered by our technicians and stored in our warehouse for future needs until our inventory of R22 units is depleted. The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 307,126.98$.
3) City and Schools Solar P.V. Program Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 75,000$

The City and Schools Solar PV Program consists of phased installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels on the roofs of various Charlottesville municipal and school facilities. This request for CIP funding is intended to make a steady investment in the City's commitment to environmental stewardship and "leading by example" with environmentally friendly and economically beneficial strategies and technology. Program decreases operational utility costs. Unlike other facility-related capital programs, costs for solar equipment components been declining and advances in engineering designs have kept installation costs stable and should do so for the foreseeable future. There is ongoing evaluation of options to scale the deployment of solar PV and offset of energy consumption (onsite versus direct purchase versus power purchase agreement).
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 422,790.20$.
4) Smith Recreation Indoor Air Quality Corrections Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 1,500,000$

Smith Recreation Center has a history of Indoor Air Quality (I.A.Q.) concerns that negatively impacts the quality of experiences for both residents and city employees while in this facility. Combining staff input, with a consulting engineer's assessment, this facility has been identified as having infrastructure deficiencies contributing to the I.A.Q. issues. This funding anticipates replacement of 2 PDU, (Pool Dehumidifying Units), installation of a remote Chiller unit to replace 5 existing wells. Additional scope elements may be introduced upon the completion and results of the investigative, design and engineering element of Smith Recreation IAQ remediations.
5) Downtown Mall TARA (Threat and Risk Assessment) Proposed F.Y. $21-\$ 125,000$ Continue analysis and implementation of safety improvements on the Downtown Mall. The previous threat and risk assessment identified many safety related needs in area of the downtown mall. While some of the recommendations have been implemented with the resources that are currently available, there are many recommendations that need to be analyzed in more detail and implemented to improve and ensure safety for pedestrians on the downtown mall. This CIP focuses on the 2nd and 4th Street crossings and addresses the need to continue engagement efforts with the stakeholders and perform design and analysis of the available options. Because the design/analysis phase has not
been completed, implementation costs are largely unknown, but included as a place holder for future needs. The implementation cost is a percentage based value on the anticipated design costs. The FY2021 cost is intended to produce construction documents that can then be implemented in FY 2022 and completed in FY 2023. Operating and maintenance costs have been excluded at this time because the scope of the project has not been clearly defined. If additional funds are remaining, they can be used to address other safety needs beyond the street crossings. The total cost is estimated at $\$ 2,565,600$ and the additional funding is planned for FY $2022(\$ 302,000)$ and FY 2023 (\$2,138,000).

## Public Safety and Justice

1) General District Court

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$3,181,014
Funds represent the first portion of the City's share of the costs of a joint General District Court facility with Albemarle County to be located in Court Square. Under the 2018 intergovernmental memorandum of agreement, Albemarle and Charlottesville will undertake a redevelopment of the Levy Building site, located at 350 Park Street. The Levy Building will be renovated for use by the County Commonwealth's Attorney Office and a new 3-story building connected to the Levy Building will accommodate court sets for the City General District Court and County General District Court. In total, the redevelopment will provide 60,730 gross square feet, at an estimated cost of $\$ 30$ million. The City will contribute approximately $\$ 6.8$ million toward the project, based on its use of the new facility.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 500,000$. The remaining funding is currently planned for FY 2022.
2) Replacement Fire Apparatus

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$995,500
A fire apparatus replacement schedule has been developed to accurately reflect the life cycles of the apparatus. These funds will be used to replace a fire truck originally put into service in 2003.
3) Replacement EMS Apparatus

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$337,553
With an expanded role as a transport agency in EMS service delivery, in 2018 we began phasing in the acquisition of three ambulances. The first two were acquired using a combination of grant funding and cost savings realized from a recent engine purchase.

## Transportation and Access

1) Undergrounding Utilities

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$1,430,000
This project provides funding to allow the City to take advantage of strategic opportunities to partner with developers and other City projects to underground utilities on public rights-of-way. In past years, this has worked out to essentially a doubling of funds used to underground electric, phone and cable lines. The State CTB has recently awarded the City successful applications for several major transportation projects, including the Downtown Mall area, the Strategic Investment Area, Emmet Street, Barracks Road, and High Street. However, these funds cannot be spent on betterment
improvements like undergrounding overhead utilities. These funds would allow for undergrounding of utilities in conjunction with these improvement projects.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 3,514,304$.
2) New Sidewalks

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$100,000
This funding continues to remedy the gaps that remain throughout the sidewalk infrastructure of the City. Priority is given to completing the sidewalk network around schools, parks, business centers and community amenities such as libraries, post offices, etc. Sidewalk construction often includes upgrade of ADA ramps, installation of drainage systems, minor road improvements and other items to ensure that the best possible alignment and location is chosen. Project locations will be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council.
For more information on this project please visit the following website: http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services/sidewalks
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 683,139$.
3) Sidewalk Repair and Improvements

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$500,000
This project funds the repair of the City's existing sidewalks. Sidewalk repairs are necessary to keep existing infrastructure safe and hazard free and are necessary for completion of the pedestrian network which in turn, is needed to balance sound transportation alternatives. When the tripping hazards, gaps, and broken sidewalks are repaired it helps to minimize the liability of the City. This project also includes approximately $\$ 200,000-\$ 250,000$ per year to provide for the repair, upgrade, and/or replacement of existing A.D.A. ramps, primarily those ramps on streets scheduled for paving as required by ADA law.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 581,471$.
4) West Main Improvements Proposed F.Y. 21-\$4,000,000

Funding of a significant urban design and streetscape improvement project for the West Main Street Improvements that will include changes to the street profile, undergrounding utilities, green infrastructure, trees and street furniture.
For more information on this project please visit: http://gowestmain.com/
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 18,819,998$.
5) S.I.A. Immediate Implementation

Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 200,000$
This funding is intended to facilitate completion of projects outlined in the Strategic Investment Area Plan completed in December 2013. Examples of capital projects in the plan include 2nd Street Extension to Ix Building with improved streetscape, Pollacks Branch/greenway, improved connectivity and walkability, and improvement to the Monticello Avenue streetscape.
For more information on this project please visit the following website: http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services/strategic-investment-area-7079
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 805,329$.
6) Small Area Plans

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$100,000
The Comprehensive Plan identified several specific areas of the city where planning and design issues or investment opportunities may warrant additional study through the development of specific small area plans in the coming years. The small area planning process is intended to examine areas anew and holistically, with the full engagement of the public, elected and appointed officials and planning professionals. The resulting small area plans will provide the basis for future planning, urban design, investment decisions, and possible changes to zoning and the future land use plan.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 361,937$.
7) Parking Structure

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$4,875,000
These funds represent a portion of the cost to construct a parking structure downtown. This parking structure was included as part of the 2018 intergovernmental memorandum of agreement between the City and Albemarle County regarding expansion, renovation and operation of a set of courts. The total anticipated cost for the parking structure is $\$ 10$ million and the remaining funding is currently planned for FY 2022.
8) ADA Pedestrian Signal Upgrades

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$240,000
These funds seek to comply with requirements of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide access to the sidewalk and street crossing network. A study of the city's signalized intersections conducted by Timmons Group in 2015 identified over \$1.1 million dollars in deficiencies related to pedestrian access - including curb ramp improvements and access to pedestrian pushbuttons. This project aims to increase ADA access at those intersections.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 564,102$.
9) Minor Bridge Repairs

Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 225,101$
This project is the continuation of the required maintenance of the various bridges throughout the City. This request is for lump sum C.I.P. project money to rehab/maintain citywide bridge projects. Work may include repairs to substructure (generally includes parts underneath and out of sight) and superstructure (generally includes the deck, railings, and 'visible to motorists' parts) elements.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 1,927,883$.
10) Citywide ADA Improvements - Sidewalks and Curbs Proposed F.Y. $21-\$ 200,000$ These funds seek to comply with requirements of the federal Americans with Disabilities Act to provide access to the sidewalk and street crossing network. The following budget request aims to improve approx. 460 high priority deficient curb ramps in neighborhoods per the ADA Transition Plan (Adopted 2013) and seeks to fill in gaps (less than 200 feet) in the sidewalk network per the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (Adopted 2015). These funds can be used to leverage federal grants that will help us to achieve ADA compliance more quickly.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 223,321$
11) Traffic Signal Infrastructure Replacement

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$200,000
There has been no historical programmatic funding for replacement of traffic signal hardware and electronic equipment used to direct vehicular and pedestrian traffic: e.g. mast arms, signal heads, electronic controllers, vehicle detection loops, conduit, wiring, uninterruptible power supplies, switches and protected pedestrian crossing systems. Efforts have been made at modernization of some components to leverage technological advances, but items have simply aged beyond their expected useful lives. Per a survey conducted in 2017, the estimated replacement value of all existing traffic signal equipment is in excess of $\$ 10$ million. The estimated replacement value of those items surveyed with a condition rating of Fair (but aging), Poor or technologically Obsolete) is $\sim \$ 2.6$ million (assuming stable funding, adjusted for inflation). The five year CIP plans to establish a continuing Lump Sum capital program, with a first-year commitment of $\$ 200,000$.
12) Historic Resources

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$50,000
Funding is requested for the City's Historic Preservation Program. Funding will be expended on projects such as architectural/historic surveys (documentation) of buildings not yet surveyed, preparation of nominations for the Virginia Landmarks Register and National Register of Historic places, updates to older existing surveys, review of ADC/IPP Design Guidelines and Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines.
13) Blight Remediation

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$50,000
Funding will be used to abate violations of City and State Codes including but not limited to demolition, repairs, emergency repairs, and purchase of distressed property. City Council designated a property as blighted in 2016 and approved an allocation of funding to address numerous code violations as the owner was unwilling to participate. A lien was later placed on the property and treated as a tax lien. Once a property is declared a "blighted property" the City can gain interest on money owed (VA Code 36-49.1:1.E) in the event the amount owed is placed into a lien. Funding repaid by the owner or resulting from the lien would circulate back into this fund to be used for additional properties. Staff knows of 10 properties and counting in need of attention however the City does not have designated funding to address these issues.
14) Hydraulic/250 Intersection Turn Lane

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$150,000 These funds are VDOT revenue sharing funds for the extension of the turn lane at Hydraulic and Emmet Street.
15) East High Street Signalization

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$500,000
These funds are VDOT revenue sharing funds and will be used for signalization upgrades and improvements on East High Street.
16) Belmont Bridge

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$5,000,000
This funds a portion of the local funds needed to leverage the VDOT funding allocated for the construction of the Belmont Bridge.

## Parks and Recreation

1) City/County Joint Parks - Darden Towe Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 193,370$

This will continue a funding stream for recreational properties and facilities that are jointly operated by the City and Albemarle County, specifically Darden Towe Park. The establishment of such funding will permit the systematic and proactive replacement and renovation of these facilities. FY 20 projects $(\$ 928,963)$ would include synthetic turf and lighting of 4 rectangular fields which has not been completed. FY 21 project includes the construction of a new picnic shelter. Costs reflected represent only the City's portion of the anticipated cost of the projects. The current cost share agreement with the County is based upon total aggregated population of the City and County and appropriate percentages.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 1,669,051$.

## Housing Projects

1) Public Housing Redevelopment

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$1,500,000
This project sets aside funding for the future redevelopment of the public housing sites. This funding is the second year of a 6 year City projected commitment of $\$ 15$ million for the redevelopment of the public housing sites.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 3,357,203$.

## Non-bondable Projects

Total expenditures for the F.Y. 2020 Non-Bondable projects, $\mathbf{\$ 5 , 0 4 0 , 6 4 9}$, are broken down as follows:

## Education

1) Schools Small Capital Improvements Proposed F.Y. $21-\$ 200,000$

This sum is to cover some of the small capital improvement projects within the various City Schools which includes a wide range of maintenance and improvement projects. All individual projects funded via this account are fully vetted and prioritized by the Charlottesville City Schools Administration and the individual school principals. This expenditure item is offset by a corresponding dedicated revenue from the Schools. The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 684,485$.

## Economic Development

1) Economic Development Strategic Initiatives Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 150,000$

The City has a history of funding a strategic investments fund so that a ready source of funds is available when unique opportunities arise. The strategic initiative funds are critical to the economic development efforts of the City. These efforts include marketing, business retention, small business support, incubator support, sponsorship of job fairs and workforce development. These funds are also used to assist in long term strategic
improvements, to grow and expand the tax base, as well as allowing the City to respond quickly to take advantage of a variety of strategic opportunities.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 1,561,128$.

## Transportation and Access

1) Intelligent Transportation System

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$147,015
The Intelligent Transportation System (I.T.S.) is comprised of traffic signal related hardware and software that communicates and coordinates with traffic signals citywide from the Traffic Operations Command Center. The system is also comprised of three weather stations related to street surface conditions during weather emergencies, and four (4) variable message boards located on major city entrances. Coordinated signal corridors controlled from the Control Center include Emmet Street, Main Street, Avon Street, Preston Avenue, and Ridge/5th. The project funds maintenance and upgrades of the system, including field and command center hardware and software, as well as ongoing costs for utilities such as phone lines.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 178,802$.
2) City Wide Traffic Engineering Improvements

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$150,000
The request is for lump sum CIP project money to address various traffic engineering issues as they arise. Projects would include traffic control enhancements, reconfiguring intersections, retiming and coordinating traffic signals, addressing parking concerns, mitigating traffic safety problems, and other creative retrofitting to existing traffic operations in lieu of building new roads. Potential projects are coordinated with other state and federal agencies as well as other city departments.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 266,249$.
3) Neighborhood Transportation Improvements

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$50,000
The proposed Neighborhood Transportation Improvements CIP budget request seeks to implement larger neighborhood improvements that would consume $50 \%$ or more of the annual Traffic Engineer's Traffic Improvements fund. Neighborhood Associations advocate for neighbors' requests to address certain corridors or intersections that impact a significant portion of their community. They generally address connectivity and safety issues within the transportation network. Neighborhood transportation improvements for JPA Pedestrian Improvements and Forest Hills have been submitted in previous years and we anticipate adding others, such as Locust Ave, pending results of the pilot project The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 101,539$.
4) Traffic Sign Retro Reflective Compliance Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 119,186$

It is anticipated that a large portion of Right-of-Way signage in the City is out of compliance with FHWA regulations regarding retro-reflectivity. A third-party survey must be performed, identifying the nature, compliance status, condition and priority of each sign, which is scheduled to occur in the fall of 2018. There are approximately 12,000 to 15,000 street signs City wide. Assuming that $75 \%$ of those signs are out of compliance, the expected cost for compliance is approximately $\$ 405,000$. Bringing all of
those signs into compliance will take approximately 3.5 years to complete. This funding represents the first of 3.5 years of funding necessary to achieve compliance.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 106,654$.
5) ADA Ramp Corrections Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 134,930$

The Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of Transportation (DOT) require all ADA ramps that are affected by street resurfacing operations be upgraded (or installed) to meet current standards. In September 2010, the Department of Justice issued regulations with revised accessibility standards for Titles II and III of the Americans with disabilities ACT (DOJ 2010 Standards). Compliance with the DOJ 2010 Standards is required on or after March 15, 2012. Since 2012, there have been a number of City streets that have been resurfaced which has resulted in approximately 131 ramps that need to be adjusted to meet current requirements.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 131,000$.

## Parks and Recreation

1) Parks and Schools Playground Renovations Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 112,000$

The Parks and Recreation Department maintains twenty-nine (29) playgrounds across the City. This project includes the replacement of the City Parks playground equipment and of playground equipment at Charlottesville City School Parks, to ensure user safety and comply with current codes. This project will provide improved safety for the residents who use playgrounds daily.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 418,939$.
2) Urban Tree Planting

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$75,000
The protection of the Urban Tree Canopy has a direct affect upon air quality, stormwater management and quality of life for City residents and is a highly held value among residents of the City. These funds will also be used for the procurement of replacement trees and the planting of new trees in areas of where invasive species are prevalent and along riparian buffers to enhance water quality and stormwater management strategies. The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 7,650$.
3) Parkland and Trails Acquisition

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$125,000 and Development
These funds will be used to pursue land acquisition opportunities to preserve open space, protect natural resources and improve riparian buffers and provide future trail connections. This will also provide funding for the development of the City's trails and greenways. Green infrastructure and open space conservation are often the cheapest way to safeguard drinking water, clean the air and achieve other environmental goals. Prior to FY20 Parkland Acquisition and Trails development were separate projects. They were combined in FY20 to allow Parks and Recreation to prioritize the greatest needs on these projects and provide some additional funding to address those priorities.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 169,384$.
4) Refurbish Parks Restrooms

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$50,000
This funding will assist in addressing renovation issues of outdoor facility restrooms which are presently outdated and tired and provide users with a negative impression of our parks system in high traffic park areas. Specific components include: materials and finishes, ventilation, lighting and fixture updates. Restrooms in need of renovation include: Pen Park, Belmont Park, Greenleaf Park, Washington Park and McIntire Park. Restrooms will be effectively gutted and totally renovated with additional upgrades such as constant ventilation being installed where not present.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 38,461$.
5) Downtown Mall Infrastructure Repairs Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 125,000$

This account creates a funding source for major repair and maintenance initiatives on the mall, activity which currently does not have regular funding from any other sources. Examples of work would include runnel repair or renovation, crossing repairs, repairs to section from Omni to Water Street, reworking/repairing larger fields of pavers that have failed or are failing, light relocation or replacement, upgrading electrical systems to include more efficient lighting fixtures, banner and flag bracket replacement and repairs, twice a year cleaning and sanding and similar activities. A transfer from the General Fund of the revenues collected from the vendor and cafe fees paid annually to the City by merchants on the Mall is used to offset the cost of this project.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 112,708$.

## Technology Infrastructure

1) Communications Technology Account/ Proposed F.Y. $21-\$ 40,000$

## Public Access Television

This funding will allow the City to continue upgrading and improving its cable network services and programming to the citizens by providing technology equipment and maintenance of that equipment to the Public Access Offices providing technology and equipment to Channel 10 located in City Hall. This funding is tied to the P.E.G. Fee Revenue.
The balance for this project as of December 11, 2018 is $\$ 163,425$.
2) City Wide IT Strategic Infrastructure Proposed F.Y. $21-\$ 250,000$

Information Technology systems and software needs have grown from sporadic workgroup and departmental specific functions to integrated organization-wide technology platforms for analysis and decision-making. These important technology investments need to be reviewed outside of department specific needs, in a holistic and comprehensive manner, that takes into account the strategic direction and overall business needs of the City as whole. This project would establish a separate funding stream for City wide strategic technology needs. The projects funded by the Citywide IT Strategic Infrastructure account would support enhancement needs, such as the expansion
of resources and emerging technologies, and projects/systems that would improve efficiency and effectiveness of our services and employees.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 \$172,017.

## Housing Projects

1) Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund (CAHF) Proposed F.Y. $21-\$ 800,000$ The primary focus of CAHF is to accomplish the goal adopted by Council in February 2010 (as contained in the 2025 Goals for Affordable Housing report) to grow the supported affordable housing stock to $15 \%$ of overall housing stock by 2025. CAHF funds are specifically targeted toward assisting with creation of new supported affordable housing opportunities for persons/households of low to moderate-income levels or preserving existing supported affordable units. Based upon these goals $\$ 800,000$ of F.Y. 2021 CIP funding is earmarked for the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund.
For more information on this project please visit the following website: http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services/housing-grants/charlottesville-affordable-housing-fund
2) Supplemental Rental Assistance Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$900,000

These funds continue the City's support for the Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program, or C.S.R.A.P., which provides monthly tenant-based rental assistance for Extremely Low-Income households. Prior to F.Y. 20 funding was designated from the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund for these purposes.
3) Housing Rehabilitation

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$500,000
This would provide a continued source of funds for the housing rehabilitation projects that were previously funded through the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund.
4) Friendship Court Redevelopment - Phase I

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$394,841
This funding is for the redevelopment of Friendship Court which will construct 450 new residential units in addition to an early childhood center and other commercial spaces that will serve the community. The four phases of redevelopment will create an equitable income mix of tiered affordability, including the necessary replacement of the existing 150 project-based Section 8 homes at Friendship Court and the creation of approximately 300 additional affordable units for low- and very-low income households ( $30-80 \%$ AMI). In F.Y. 20 the City included $\$ 4,005,159$ in the C.I.P. for Phase I. The $\$ 394,841$ included for F.Y. 21 funds the balance of the full request.

## Other Governmental Commitments

1) Home Energy Conservation Grant Program Proposed F.Y. 21 - $\$ 125,000$

The Home Energy Conservation Grant Program is a grant/loan program for residential owner-occupied housing that would fund energy conservation measures for the recipients by either providing a grant to low-income families, or a low interest loan to non low-
income families, as incentive for energy conservation. The intent of the program is to provide savings on utilities; to facilitate low-income families to be able to afford energy saving measures; and to reduce the usage of nonrenewable energy. Participants first receive a home energy audit to identify the biggest culprits of energy waste and to determine an appropriate scope of work. Any homeowner in the City of Charlottesville whose income is less than $80 \%$ A.M.I. is eligible to participate in the program. The City of Charlottesville has partnered with the Local Energy Alliance Program (LEAP) to carry out the Home Energy Conservation Grant program.
The balance for this project as of November 22, 2019 is $\$ 250,000$.
2) Citywide Fee Study

Proposed F.Y. 21 - \$200,000
The last comprehensive user fee study was completed in 2008. The purpose of this project is to ensure that the City has a basis of applying comprehensive overhead rates and is accurately accounting for the true cost of providing various services by Neighborhood Development Services through a cost allocation plan. This plan is necessary to allocate indirect costs for inter-fund transfers and calculations in other departments that provide review or inspection services. The City's goal is to have a welldocumented and defensible cost allocation plan that will identify rates that can be used to recover billable hourly costs for services and develop user fees.
FY 2021-2025 Capital Improvement Program Unfunded List In Order of Amount Unfunded

| Project Title | Requested FY21 | Requested FY22 | Requested FY23 | Requested FY24 | Requested FY25 | 5 Year Total | Notes/Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Department - New Facility | 500,000 | 9,750,000 | 9,750,000 | 9,750,000 | 9,750,000 |  |  |
| Land Acquisition |  |  | 5,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Jefferson-Madison Regional Libarary Renovation | 5,000,887,608 | 5,000,000 |  | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 39,500,000 |  |
| West Main Streetscape Improvements | 0.000 | 6,136,5,700,000 | $6,136,515$ | 1,00,000 | 5,000,000 | $\begin{aligned} & 25,000,000 \\ & 13,080,638 \\ & 10,450,000 \end{aligned}$ | Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in FY20-24 CIP. |
| McIntire Park Master Plan Implementation | 2,250,000 | 400000 | 1,500,000 | - | - |  |  |
| Dairy Road over Route 250 Bridge Replacement | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 |  | - | - 2,000,000 |  |  |
| Revenue Sharing Grant Match Funds | 250,000 | 2501,0160,000 | 250,000 | 2,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 8,000,000 | Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in CIP. |
| Tonsler Park Master Plan Implementation |  |  | 1,500,000 | 1,000,000 | - | 4,750,000 |  |
| New Sidewalks | 3,500,000 |  | 300,000 | - |  | 4,650,000 | Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in CIP. |
| Stribling Avenue Sidewalk | 300,000 | 300,00才25,000 |  | 300,000 | 300,000 | 3,500,000 |  |
| Meadowcreek Valley Master Plan Implementation |  | - | - |  |  | 1,500,000 |  |
| Parks and Recreation Lump Sum | $\begin{aligned} & 750,000 \\ & 400,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 200,000 \\ & 500,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 125,000 \\ & 200,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 600,000 \\ & 200,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 600,000 \\ & 200,000 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 1,450,000 \\ 1,250,000 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$400k per year was requested, \$0 was funded in FY21 and \$200k per year for FY22FY25 was included in the CIP |
| Crow Recreation ADA Improvements |  |  |  |  |  | 1,200,000 |  |
| Park Trails and Land Acquisitions | 1,000,000 | 125,000 |  |  | 125,000 |  | \$250k per year was requests, \$125k per year was included in CIP |
| Citywide ADA Improvements - Sidewalks \& Curbs | 125,000 |  | 125,000 | 125,000 |  | $1,000,000$ | Represents the difference between amount requested and amount proposed in CIP. |
| Automation and Processing fo AP Invoices |  |  |  |  | 131,225 | ,00 |  |
| Key Recreation Roof Replacement | 106,000 |  | 118,362 | 124,729 | 25,133 | 592,436 |  |
| Yorktown Drive Sidewalk | 247,000 | 23,000 | 23.690 | 244,001 |  |  |  |
| Skatepark Lighting |  |  | 23,680 | 20,000 | 465,000 | 562,824 |  |
| Bicycle Infrastructure | 90,000, 200,000 | 366,50®200,000 |  |  | - | 485,000 |  |
| Park Lighting Replacements | 450,000 | 75,000 | - |  |  | 456,500 |  |
| Green Infrastructure Opportunities |  |  | - | - | 75.000 | 450,000 |  |
| Onesty Youth Aquatic Play Features Replacement | 75,000 - | - 7588,000 | 75,000 | 75.000 | 75,000 | 400,000 |  |
| Key Rec Center Restroom/Locker Room Renovations | 75,00050,000 |  | 7-,000 |  | 75,000 | 375,000 |  |
| Forest Hills Spray Pad Shade Structure |  |  | 15,000 | 75,00 |  | 375,000 |  |
| Meadowcreek Golf Course Cart Trail Paving |  | 250200000 |  |  |  | 356,000 |  |
| SIA Implementation | 25.000 | 125000 | - | - |  | 300,000 |  |
| Wayfinding | 125,000 |  | - 250,000 |  | - | 270,000 |  |
| Bridge Inspections | 50,000 | 0,000 | - 50,000 |  | 50,000 | 250,000 |  |
| Blight and Code Enforcement Fund | 50,000 |  | - | 75,000 | 25,000 | 250,000 |  |
| Meadowcreek Golf Course Bunker Renovations | 121,137 | 121,137 |  | 7,000 |  | 250,000 |  |
| Sprayground Surface Renovations | 100,000 | 189,000 |  | - | 50,00 | 242,274 |  |
| Bulk Fluid Management System Fleet Shop | 200,000 |  | -0,00 | - |  | 200,000 |  |


| Project Title | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Requested } \\ \text { FY21 } \end{gathered}$ | Requested FY22 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Requested } \\ \text { FY23 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Requested } \\ \text { FY24 } \end{gathered}$ | Requested FY25 | 5 Year Total | Notes/Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Neighborhood Transportation Improvements |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Downtown Mall Infrastructure Repairs |  | 25.000 |  |  | 25,000 |  | \$150k per year requested, \$125k per year included in CIP |
| Washington Park Pool Shade Structure Replacement | $25,000^{125,000}$ | 50,000 | $50,000$ | 50,000 |  | 150,000 |  |
| Historic Preservation Program - Historic Surveys |  |  |  |  | - | 125,000 |  |
| Parks and Recreation Facility Security Upgrades 7 Enhancements | - |  | - | 50,000 |  | 125,000 |  |
| Citywide Tree Planting | 95,000 | 50,000 | - | 50,000 | 25,000 | 100,000 <br> 95,000 | \$75k requested and budgeted in FY21 and FY22. $\$ 100 \mathrm{k}$ requested in FY23-FY25 but only $\$ 75 \mathrm{k}$ included in CIP |
| Meadowcreek Golf Course Parking Lot Light Installation |  |  | 25,000 | 25,000 |  |  |  |
| Meadowcreek Golf Course Tee Box Leveling | 75,000 |  |  |  |  | 75,000 |  |
| Citywide Lighting Study - Phase I |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Forest Health Improvement Initiative | 75,000 |  |  | - |  |  |  |
|  | 58.410 | - - - | - |  | - |  |  |
|  | 50.000 |  | - |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  | - | - | - |  |  |
|  |  |  | - |  | - | 50,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total for all Requests | 21,531,155 | 36,624,272 | 25,403,567 | 19,788,730 | 19,921,358 | 123,269,082 |  |

# APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT 

# JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING 

DATE OF HEARING: December 10, 2019 APPLICATION NUMBER: SP19-00009

Project Planner: Carrie Rainey
Date of Staff Report: December 2, 2019

Applicant: Riverbend Development
Applicant's Representative(s): Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development
Current Property Owner: Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA)

## Application Information

Property Street Address: 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S ("Subject Property")
Tax Map/Parcel \#: Tax Map 26 Parcel 115
Total Square Footage/ Acreage Site: Approx. 7.94 acres (345,866 square feet)
Comprehensive Plan (General Land Use Plan): High Density Residential
Current Zoning Classification: R-3 Multifamily Residential
Tax Status: Tax Exempt
Completeness: The application generally contains all of the information required by Zoning Ordinance (Z.O.) Secs. 34-41(d), and 34-158(a) and (b).

## Applicant's Request (Summary)

Ashley Davies of Riverbend Development, representing Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA), requests a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow for private outdoor recreational facilities, including parks, playgrounds, and basketball courts per Z.O. Sec. 34-420 and a reduction of the minimum required yard setbacks to five (5) feet per Z.O. Sec. 34-162(a). The subject property has street frontage on $1^{\text {st }}$ Street $S$ and Elliott Avenue.

The application narrative (Attachment B) requests development of private outdoor recreational facilities, including parks, playgrounds, ball fields, ball courts, and picnic shelters, as part of a larger redevelopment plan for the subject property. The redevelopment of the subject property is Phase 2 of CRHA's South First Street overall redevelopment plan. The Phase 1 development was previously approved and is shown below in the exhibit Phasing and Layout from Special Use Permit Application Plan. As shown in the application plan (Attachment C), the redevelopment of the subject property includes 113 multifamily residential units, a community center, and space for CRHA offices. The Phase 1 development includes 62 multifamily units and a community space.

The application narrative requests a reduction in all required yard setbacks to five (5) feet to allow for better utilization of the buildable area of the site, create a more comfortable street frontage, and allow for better outdoor amenity spaces within the development.

The proposed development as shown in the application plan also requires a Critical Slope Waiver prior to approval. Per Z.O. Sec. 34-1120(b)(6), no building, structure, improvement, or land disturbance activity to establish such shall be located on a critical slope unless a modification or waiver is granted by City Council. The applicant has submitted an application, which is the Commission's regular agenda for a recommendation to City Council.

## Vicinity Map



Context Map


Area Topography


## Zoning Classifications



Yellow: Residential (R-1S) Single-Family, Orange: Residential (R-2) Two-Family, Dark Orange: Residential (R-3) Multi-family, Pink: Commercial (B-1), Red: Commercial (B-2), Dark Red: Commercial (B-3), Purple: Mixed Use (DE) Downtown Extended, Green: Varies (PUD) Planned Unit Development

## 2013 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map



Yellow: Low Density Residential, Orange: High Density Residential, Red: Neighborhood Commercial, Purple: Mixed Use, Green: Park or Preserved Open Space

## Phasing and Layout from Special Use Permit Application Plan



## Standard of Review

City Council may grant an applicant a special permit or special use permit, giving consideration to a number of factors set forth within Zoning Ordinance Sec. 34-157. If Council finds that a proposed use or development will have potentially adverse impacts, and if Council identifies development conditions that could satisfactorily mitigate such impacts, then Council may set forth reasonable conditions within its SUP approval. The role of the Planning Commission is to make an advisory recommendation to the City Council, as to (i) whether or not Council should approve a proposed SUP and if so, (ii) whether there are any reasonable development conditions that could mitigate potentially adverse impacts of the propose use or development.

Section 34-157 of the City's Zoning Ordinance lists a number of factors that Council will consider in making a decision on a proposed SUP. Following below is staff's analysis of those factors, based on the information provided by the applicant.
(1) Whether the proposed use or development will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood.
The properties immediately surrounding the subject property are described as:

| Direction |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Mixed Use | DE |
| South | Multifamily Residential (Phase 1) | R-3 |
| East | Single-family and Two-family Residential | R-2 |
| West | Single-family Residential, House of Worship | R-1S, B-1 |

The majority of the area surrounding the subject property is residential with unit types varying unit from single-family dwellings to two-family to multifamily. A house of worship is located to the northwest, and across Elliott Avenue, the IX property is home to a variety of commercial uses. The larger community around the subject property to the east, west, and south is predominantly single-family and two-family dwellings, while areas farther north are closer to downtown and have a greater variety of uses.

The application narrative (Attachment B) notes the proposed development complies with the height and density requirements of the R-3 zoning district. The application narrative states the on-site residents have worked for months with the applicant team to design their own community, including a variety of housing types and outdoor recreational space and a community center at the heart of the development. Outdoor recreational facilities are also located throughout the site, allowing access for all residents.

Staff Analysis: The surrounding area is a mix of single-family and two-family dwelling units, with some multi-family dwelling and commercial buildings. The proposed uses of outdoor recreational facilities, including private parks, playgrounds, and ball courts, are harmonious with the existing patterns of use within the neighborhood.

## (2) Whether the proposed use or development and associated public facilities will substantially conform to the city's comprehensive plan.

The application narrative (Attachment B) notes the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map designates the subject property as High Density Residential, which contemplates density greater than 15 dwelling units per acre (DUA). The narrative notes the proposed development is approximately 15 dwelling units per acre (DUA), while providing a variety of affordable housing options. The narrative states the private recreational facilities provide a benefit to the residents and the City, in that these amenities reduce the burden on City public parks.

Below are areas of the Comprehensive Plan for which the development is in compliance:

## a. Community Values

Value 3: Our neighborhoods retain a core historic fabric while offering housing that is affordable and attainable for people of all income levels, racial backgrounds, life stages, and abilities. Our neighborhoods feature a variety of housing types, including higher density, pedestrian and transit oriented housing at employment and cultural centers. We have revitalized public housing neighborhoods that include a mixture of income and housing types with
enhanced community amenities. Our housing stock is connected with recreation facilities, parks, trails, and services.
b. Land Use
2.1: When considering changes to land use regulations, respect nearby residential areas.
2.3: Enhance pedestrian connections between residences, commercial centers, public facilities, amenities and green spaces.
c. Housing
1.3: Evaluate the effects new developments have on transit, the environment, density, open space configuration, commuter costs and affordable housing.
3.1: Continue to work toward the City's goal of $15 \%$ supported affordable housing by 2025.
7.1: To the greatest extent feasible, ensure affordable housing is aesthetically similar to market rate.
d. Transportation
2.6: Promote urban design techniques, such as placing parking behind buildings, reducing setbacks and increasing network connectivity, to create a more pedestrian friendly streetscape and to reduce speeds on high volume roadways.

## e. Historic Preservation and Urban Design

1.4: Develop pedestrian-friendly environments in Charlottesville that connect neighborhoods to community facilities, to commercial areas and employment centers, and that connect neighborhoods to each other, to promote a healthier community.

## Comprehensive Plan

The General Land Use Plan calls for the subject property and Phase 1 area to be High Density Residential land use, areas immediately north to be Mixed Use land use, and the remaining surrounding areas to be Low Density Residential land use. High Density Residential is described as multi-family residential types with a density more than 15 dwelling units per acre (DUA). Low Density Residential is described as single or two-family housing types, with a density of no greater than 15 dwelling units per acre (DUA).The Comprehensive Plan specifies that Mixed Use areas are intended to be zones where the City encourages development of a moderate or high intensity, and where a large variety of uses will be permitted, including many commercial uses, residential uses, and some limited research and manufacturing where appropriate.

Staff Analysis: The General Land Use Plan calls for the subject properties to be High Density Residential land use with a DUA over 15. The proposed development will have a DUA of 14.23 according to the application plan (Attachment C) and does not quite meet this goal.

However, the proposed outdoor recreational facilities and overall development project meet several goals in the Comprehensive Plan, which speak to a desire for high-quality affordable housing options, enhanced community facilities, and pedestrian-accessible green spaces.
(3) Whether proposed use or development of any buildings or structures will comply with all applicable building code regulations.
Based on the information contained within the application, the proposed development would likely comply with applicable building code regulations. However, final determinations cannot be made prior to having the details required for final site plan and building permit approvals.
(4) Potential adverse impacts, including, but not necessarily limited to:
a) Traffic or parking congestion

Traffic
Traffic impacts for the proposed development are generated from the proposed multifamily dwelling units, and not the private outdoor recreational facilities contemplated in the Special Use Permit application, which are for the use of on-site residents. The City Traffic Engineer will review the Traffic Memorandum provided by the applicant as part of the final site plan process.

## Parking

Parking impacts for the proposed development are generated from the proposed multifamily dwelling units, and not the private outdoor recreational facilities contemplated in the Special Use Permit application, which are for the use of on-site residents. The applicant must demonstrate all required off-site parking requirements per Division 2 Off-Street Parking (Sections 34-970 through 34-986) are met before final site plan approval.

Staff Analysis: The private outdoor recreational facilities do not create adverse traffic or parking congestion impacts.
b) Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, and other factors which adversely affect the natural environment
The application narrative (Attachment B) states any outdoor lighting installed for the outdoor recreational facilities will comply with the Outdoor Lighting regulations (Sections 34-1000 through 34-1005), including use of full cut-off fixtures.

Staff Analysis: No impacts due to dust, odors, fumes, and vibrations are anticipated from outdoor recreational facilities. Minimal noise may be generated from recreational facilities, with children playing outside, but staff does not believe the impact to be adverse. The lighting of the outdoor recreational facilities will be governed by the Outdoor Lighting regulations if fixtures meet the applicability threshold of Section 341001. However, additional conditions can be placed to ensure all lighting complies with the regulations, regardless of applicability.
c) Displacement of existing residents or businesses

The application narrative (Attachment B) indicates the construction of the development will be phased so only minimal temporary displacement of existing residents, if necessary, will take place during construction.
d) Discouragement of economic development activities that may provide desirable employment or enlarge the tax base
The subject property is located in the R-3 Multifamily Residential District. Few commercial uses are permitted in the district to provide a desirable employment or enlarge the tax base.
e) Undue density of population or intensity of use in relation to the community facilities existing or available
The Special Use Permit request does not include an increase of residential density.
f) Reduction in the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood

The application narrative (Attachment B) notes the primary goal of the development is to increase the availability of affordable housing units in Charlottesville. Through the proposed design, affordable housing will be substantially increased while maintaining a community design that is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.

Staff Analysis: While the inclusion of outdoor recreational facilities does result in less land available for additional affordable units, staff believes the layout proposed provides a higher-quality and livable community for residents while still providing an increase in overall affordable units in development.
g) Impact on school population and facilities

The application narrative (Attachment B) notes there may be an increase in school population by providing family-friendly affordable housing options. CRHA plans to work
with the Charlottesville Superintendent of Schools to ensure they are fully aware of the project and can plan ahead for when new units become available to families.

Staff Analysis: There is a possibility that families with children could take residence in the proposed. However, the Special Use Permit request does not include an increase of residential density.
h) Destruction of or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts The subject property is not within any design control district.
i) Conformity with federal, state and local laws, as demonstrated and certified by the applicant
Based on the information contained within the application, the proposed development would likely comply with applicable federal and state laws. As to local ordinances (zoning, water protection, etc.), it generally appears that this project, as detailed in the application, can be accommodated on this site in compliance with applicable local ordinances; however, final determinations cannot be made prior to having the details required for final site plan and building permit approvals. Specific Z.O. requirements reviewed preliminarily at this stage include massing and scale and general planned uses.

## j) Massing and scale of project

Per Z.O. Sec. 34-353(a), buildings in the R-3 Multifamily Residential District may be a maximum of 45 feet in height. The application narrative (Attachment B) states residents participating in the master planning process strongly felt building on the subject property should be primarily two (2) to three (3) stories in height, consisting of townhouse building styles and smaller apartment buildings. The application plan (Attachment C) states the approximate maximum building height will be 35 feet. Townhouse style units are proposed mostly along $1^{\text {st }}$ Street $S$ and internally to the site while apartment buildings are placed closer to Pollocks Branch and Elliott Avenue. The buildings immediately surrounding the subject property are mostly one (1) to two (2) stories in height.

Staff Analysis: The proposed private outdoor recreation facilities do not include structures other than playground equipment, and do not create an adverse impact through massing or scale. In addition, the massing and scale of the residential component of the development appear harmonious with the general scale of neighborhood.

## Setbacks

As part of this SUP application, the applicant is requesting a reduction in the required yard setbacks to five (5) feet, per Z.O. Sec. 34-162(a). The application narrative (Attachment B) states this will allow for better utilization of the buildable area of the site, create a more comfortable street frontage, and allow for better outdoor amenity spaces within the development.

Per Z.O Sec. 34-353(a), a 25 foot front yard setback is current required for Elliott Avenue, a 25 foot rear yard setback is required on the southern side of the subject property, and a side yard setback of 17.5 feet is required on 1 Street $S$ and along Pollocks Branch if the proposed density and building height remain as shown.

## Streets that Work Plan

The May 2016 Streets that Work Plan (approved September 2016 as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan) labels Elliott Avenue as a Neighborhood A typology, and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street $S$ as a Local Street typology. The full plan can be viewed at: http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services/streets-that-work/streets-that-work-plan

Neighborhood A streets are characterized as having sidewalks on at least on side, dedicated bicycle facilities, some on-street parking, and adjacent low and mediumintensity residential land use. The Streets that Work Plan recommends a minimum clear zone width of five (5) to six (6) feet for sidewalks, which are noted along with bicycle facilities as the highest priority items in the Neighborhood A typology. Local Streets are characterized as the majority of the street network and have no specific associated typology due to the variation of context and available space. The Streets that Work Plan notes design elements on Local Streets should not exceed the dimensions specified for Neighborhood B streets. A minimum of five (5) to six (6) feet of clear zone width for sidewalks is recommended for Neighborhood $B$ streets. Sidewalks and on-street parking are noted as the highest priority street elements. Both Neighborhood $A$ and $B$ typologies recommend a three (3) to six (6) foot curbside buffer zone, noting a minimum four (4) feet of width for street trees. The Streets that Work Plan recommends 250 cubic feet of soil volume for small street trees and 400 cubic feet for medium and large trees (with 700 cubic feet preferred for large trees).

Staff Analysis: Staff notes the property line for the subject is approximately five (5) feet behind the existing public sidewalk on $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S , and the application plan (Attachment C) proposes residential units along the street with six (6) average front porches,
resulting in building façades approximately 16 feet from the public sidewalk (with front porches approximately 10 feet away). The property line on Elliott Avenue is approximately 15 feet behind the public sidewalk, and the proposed building façade is at least 10 feet from this property line. Staff believes these setbacks are appropriate, as they are close enough to activate the street while deep enough to be in line with the existing neighborhood character.

While neither $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S nor Elliott Avenue currently have curbside buffer zones, as recommended by the Streets that Work Plan, the proposed development as shown does provide adequate space for streetscape tree plantings, as required per Section 34-870 and generally shown in the application plan (Attachment C). Streetscape tree plantings will provide shade and other benefits for pedestrians traveling on the existing sidewalks.

Staff finds the reduction in required yard setbacks allow adequate space on site for the location of the private outdoor recreational facilities, per Section 34-162(a)(2). In addition, staff finds a reduction in required yard setbacks could alleviate impacts to Critical Slopes found on the site (see Critical Slope Waiver Application for more information), which may be desirable per Section 34-162(a)(2).
(5) Whether the proposed use or development will be in harmony with the purposes of the specific zoning district in which it will be placed;
In 1949 the property was zoned C Industrial District. In 1958 the property was zoned R-3 Multiple Dwelling District. In 1976 the property was maintained as zoned R-3 Multiple Dwelling District. In 1991 the property was zoned R-3 Residential Multiple Dwelling District. In 2003 the property was zoned R-3 Multifamily Residential District.

The description for Multifamily Residential Districts states the purpose of the multifamily residential zoning district is to provide areas for medium- to high-density residential development. The basic permitted use is medium-density residential development; however, higher density residential development may be permitted where harmonious with surrounding areas. Certain additional uses may be permitted, in cases where the character of the district will not be altered by levels of traffic, parking, lighting, noise, or other impacts associated with such uses. (Z.O. Sec. 34-350(c)). The R-3 District is further described as consisting of medium-density residential areas in which medium-density residential developments, including multifamily uses, are encouraged. (Z.O. Sec. 34350(c)(1)).

Staff Analysis: Staff believes the private outdoor recreation facilities are appropriate additional uses where the character of the district will not be altered by levels of traffic, parking, lighting, noise, or other impacts.
(6) Whether the proposed use or development will meet applicable general and specific standards set forth within the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, or other city ordinances or regulations; and
Based on the information contained within the application, the proposed development would likely comply with applicable local ordinances. However, final determinations cannot be made prior to having the details required for final site plan and building permit approvals.
(7) When the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the BAR or ERB, as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.
The subject property is not located in a design control district.

## Public Comments Received

Community Meeting Required by Z.O. Sec. 34-41(c)(2)
The applicant held a community meeting on November 7, 2019 at the existing South First Street Community Center on the Subject Property. The letter, affidavit, and sign-in sheet provided by the applicant can be found in Attachment D. The attendee noted the larger community may be concerned with impacts to vehicular traffic flow in the neighborhood due to the proposed increase in residential units. The attendee discussed with the development team the proposed reduction in setbacks, including the resulting anticipated street activation and reduced impacts to critical slopes. The attendee noted there appeared to be adequate play areas proposed and expressed support of the work the development team completed to determine the appropriate number of residential units and maximum proposed building heights.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff finds that the proposed private outdoor recreational facilities, for which the SUP is requested, could contribute to many goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan. In this regard, staff finds the proposal conforms with the general guidelines and policies contained in the City's Comprehensive Plan, per Z.O. Sec. 34-42(a)(1). Staff finds the reduction in required yard
setbacks allow adequate space on site for the location of the private outdoor recreational facilities, per Section 34-162(a)(2). In addition, staff finds a reduction in required yard setbacks could alleviate impacts to Critical Slopes found on the site (see Critical Slope Waiver Application for more information), which may be desirable per Section 34-162(a)(2).

## Recommended Conditions

Should the Planning Commission find it appropriate to recommend approval of the SUP request as presented, staff proposes the following conditions are considered:

1. No improvements shall be commenced prior to approval of a critical slope waiver request, approval of a final site plan, and approval of a permit authorizing landdisturbing activities pursuant to Z.O. Sec. 10-9.
2. All outdoor lighting fixtures in the outdoor recreation areas shall be full cut-off luminaires.

## Suggested Motions

1. I move to recommend approval of this application for a Special Use Permit in the R-3 zone at 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S (Tax Map 26 Parcel 115) to permit private outdoor recreational facilities (parks, playgrounds, basketball courts) with the following listed conditions:
a.
b.

OR,
2. I move to recommend denial of this application for a Special Use Permit in the R-3 zone at 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S (Tax Map 26 Parcel 115).

## Attachments

A. Special Use Permit Application dated October 14, 2019
B. Special Use Permit Narrative dated October 15, 2019
C. Special Use Permit Application Plan dated November 8, 2019
D. Community Meeting Materials dated October 18 through November 7, 2019



## City of Charlottesville

## Pre-Application Meeting Verification

## Project Name: <br> CRHA SOUTH FIRST PLAGE?

 PreApplication Meeting Date: OCTOBER 3; 2019 Applicant's Representative: ASLILCM DAVIES Planner: CARRIE RAINEL?Other City Officials in Attendance:
MIKE MURPHY
MISSY GREASY
BRENNAN DUNCAIV
JACK DAWSON

The following items will be required supplemental information for this application and must be submitted with the completed application package:

1. $\qquad$
2. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
3. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
4. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
5. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Planner Signature:


## City of Charlottesville

## Application Checklist

## Project Name:

 South First Street, Phase 2
## I certify that the following documentation is ATTACHED to this application:

$\square$ 34-158(a)(1): a site plan (ref. City Code 34-802(generally); 34-1083(communications facilities)
34-158(a)(3): Low-impact development (LID) methods worksheet (required for developments that include non-residential uses, and developments proposing 3 or more SFDs or TFDs)

34-158(a)(4): a building massing diagram, and building elevations (required for applications proposing alteration of a building height or footprint, or construction of any new building(s))

34-158(a)(5) and 34-12: affordable housing data. (i) how many (if any) existing dwelling units on the property are an "affordable dwelling unit" by the city's definitions? (ii) Will existing affordable units, or equivalent affordable units, remain following the development? (iii) What is the GFA of the project? GFA of residential uses? GFA of non-residential uses?

34-157(a)(1) Graphic materials that illustrate the context of the project, and a narrative statement as to compatibility with existing patterns of use and development

34-157(a)(2) Narrative statement: applicant's analysis of conformity with the Comprehensive Plan 34-157(a)(3) Narrative statement: compliance with applicable USBC provisions

34-157(a)(4) Narrative statement identifying and discussing any potential adverse impacts, as well as any measures included within the development plan, to mitigate those impacts 34-158(a)(6): other pertinent information (narrative, illustrative, etc.)

All items noted on the Pre-Application Meeting Verification.

## Applicant

Signature $\qquad$ Print $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ 10-14-19

By Its: $\qquad$
(For entities, specify: Officer, Member, Manager, Trustee, etc.)


# City of Charlottesville 

 Community MeetingSection 34-41(c)(2) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville (adopted $\qquad$ 2015) requires applicants seeking rezonings and special use permits to hold a community meeting. The purpose of a community meeting is to provide citizens an opportunity to receive information about a proposed development, about applicable zoning procedures, about applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, and to give citizens an opportunity to ask questions. No application for a rezoning shall be placed on any agenda for a public hearing, until the required community meeting has been held and the director of neighborhood development services determines that the application is ready for final review through the formal public hearing process.

By signing this document, the applicant acknowledges that it is responsible for the following, in connection to the community meeting required for this project:

1. Following consultation with the city, the applicant will establish a date, time and location for the community meeting. The applicant is responsible for reserving the location, and for all related costs.
2. The applicant will mail, by U.S. mail, first-class, postage pre-paid, a notice of the community meeting to a list of addresses provided by the City. The notice will be mailed at least 14 calendar days prior to the date of the community meeting. The applicant is responsible for the cost of the mailing. At least 7 calendar days prior to the meeting, the applicant will provide the city with an affidavit confirming that the mailing was timely completed.
3. The applicant will attend the community meeting and present the details of the proposed application. If the applicant is a business or other legal entity (as opposed to an individual) then the meeting shall be attended by a corporate officer, an LLC member or manager, or another individual who can speak for the entity that is the applicant. Additionally, the meeting shall be attended by any design professional or consultant who has prepared plans or drawings submitted with the application. The applicant shall be prepared to explain all of the details of the proposed development, and to answer questions from citizens.
4. Depending on the nature and complexity of the application, the City may designate a planner to attend the community meeting. Regardless of whether a planner attends, the City will provide the applicant with guidelines, procedures, materials and recommended topics for the applicant's use in conducting the community meeting.
5. On the date of the meeting, the applicant shall make records of attendance and shall also document that the meeting occurred through photographs, video, or other evidence satisfactory to the City. Records of attendance may include using the mailing list referred to in \#1 as a sign-in sheet (requesting attendees to check off their name (s)] and may include a supplemental attendance sheet. The City will provide a format acceptable for use as the supplemental attendance sheet.

## Applicant: Ashley Davies

By :
Signature
 Print Ashley Davies Date $\qquad$
Its: _Riverbend Development, Vice President (Officer, Member, Trustee, etc.)


## City of Charlottesville

## Owner's Authorizations

(Not Requixed)

## Right of Entry-Property Owner Permission

I, the undersigned, hereby grant the City of Charlottesville, its employees and officials, the right to enter the property that is the subject of this application, for the purpose of gathering information for the review of this Special Use Permit application.

Owner: Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority Date_ 10-14-19
By (sign name): $\qquad$ Print Name: Grant Duffield

Owner's: LLC Member
LLC Manager
Corporate Officer (specify):_Executive Director
Other (specific): $\qquad$

## Owner's Agent

1, the undersigned, hereby certify that I have authorized the following named individual or entity to serve as my lawful agent, for the purpose of making application for this special use permit, and for all related purposes, including, without limitation: to make decisions and representations that will be binding upon my property and upon me, my successors and assigns.

Name of Individual Agent: Ashley Davies
Name of Corporate or other legal entity authorized to serve as agent: $\qquad$
Riverbend Development
Affordable Housing Group, LLC
Owner: Charlattesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority Date: $\qquad$
By (sign name): $\qquad$ Print Name: Grant Duffield

Circle one:
Owner's: LLC Member
LLC Manager
Corporate Officer (specify): $\qquad$ Other (specific): Executive Director


## City of Charlottesville Disclosure of Equitable Ownership

Section 34-8 of the Code of the City of Charlottesville requires that an applicant for a special use permit make complete disclosure of the equitable ownership "real parties in interest") of the real estate to be affected. Following below I have provided the names and addresses of each of the real parties in interest, including, without limitation: each stockholder or a corporation; each of the individual officers and directors of a corporation; each of the individual members of an LLC (limited liability companies, professional limited liability companies): the trustees and beneficiaries of a trust, etc. Where multiple corporations, companies or trusts are involved, identify real parties in interest for each entity listed.
$\qquad$ Address $\qquad$
Name_Hersing Auttrority Address $\qquad$
Name $\qquad$ Address $\qquad$
Name Address $\qquad$
Attach additional sheets as needed.
Note: The requirement of listing names of stockholders does not apply to a corporation whose stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange and which corporation has more than five hundred (500) shareholders.

Applicant: Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development

By:
Signature A Shay Dan Print $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$
Its: Vice President, Riverbend Development (Officer, Member, Trustee, etc.)


GiniA-

| Application Type | Quantity | Fee | Subtotal |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Special Use Permit (Residential) |  | $\$ 1,500$ |  |
| Special Use Permit (Mixed Use/Non-Residential) | 1 | $\$ 1,800$ | $\$ 1,800$ |
| Mailing Costs per letter |  | $\$ 1$ per letter |  |
| Newspaper Notice |  | Payment Due <br> Upon Invoice |  |
| TOTAL |  |  | $\$ 1,800$ |

## Office Use Only

Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Received By: $\qquad$
Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Received By: $\qquad$ Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Recelved By: $\qquad$
Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Received By: $\qquad$

| City of Charlot <br> LID Checklis <br> Project Name: $\qquad$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LID Measure | LID Checklist Points | Points |
| Compensatory Plantings (see City buffer mitigation manual). $90 \%$ of restorable stream buffers restored. | 5 points or 1 point for each $18 \%$ of the total acreage |  |
| Pervious pavers for parking and driveways with stone reservoir for storage of 0.5 inches of rainfall per impervious drainage area. Surface area must be $>1,000 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ or $\geq 50 \%$ of the total parking and driveway surface area. | 7 points or 1 point for each $7 \%$ of parking and driveway surface area. |  |
| Shared parking (must have legally binding agreement) that eliminates $>30 \%$ of on-site parking required. | 5 points or 1 point for each $6 \%$ of parking surface eliminated. | 4 |
| Impervious Disconnection. Follow design manual specifications to ensure adequate capture of roof runoff (e.g. cisterns, dry wells, rain gardens) | 8 points |  |
| Bioretention. Percent of site treated must exceed $80 \%$. Biofilter surface area must be $\geq 5 \%$ of impervious drainage area. | 8 points or 1 point for each $10 \%$ of site treated. |  |
| Rain gardens. All lots, rain garden surface area for each lot $\geq 200 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{2}$. | 8 points or 1 point for each $10 \%$ of lots treated. |  |
| Designed/constructed swales. Percent of site treated must exceed $80 \%$, achieve non-erosive velocities, and able to convey peak discharge from 10 year storm. | 8 points or 1 point for each $10 \%$ of site treated. |  |
| Manufactured sand filters, filter vaults (must provide filtering rather than just hydrodynamic). Percent of site treated must exceed 80\%. Sizing and volume for water quality treatment based on manufacturer's criteria. | 8 points or 1 point for each $10 \%$ of site treated. |  |
| Green rooftop to treat $\geq 50 \%$ of roof area | 8 points | 6 |
| Other LID practices as approved by NDS Engineer. | TBD, not to exceed 8 points |  |
| Off-site contribution to project in City's water quality management plan. This measure to be considered when on site constraints (space, environmentally sensitive areas, hazards) limit application of LID measures. Requires pre-approval by NDS Director. | 5 points |  |
|  | Total Points | 10 |

## Applicant's Signature

Signature_Ashey Dar _ Print_Ashley Davies__ Date 10-14-19

## SOUTH FIRST STREET, PHASE 2 <br> SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION NARRATIVE <br> October 15, 2019

## Special Use Permit Requests:

Private outdoor recreational facilities including: parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts, and picnic shelters.

Pursuant to Sec. 34-162, we request a reduction to yard requirements as follows: Minimum setback of 5 feet along all yards/property lines.

## Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Designation:

High Density Residential


Zoning:
R-3


## Sec. 34-157. - General standards for issuance.

In considering an application for a special use permit, the city council shall consider the following factors:
(1) Whether the proposed use or development will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood;

The proposed development of South First Street, Phase 2, fully complies with height and density allowances within the by-right $R$-3 zoning regulations. On site public housing residents have worked for months with our team to design their own community, including a variety of housing types, outdoor recreational space and a community center at the heart of the development. This Special Use Permit request is for private outdoor recreational facilities including: parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts, and picnic shelters. These spaces are included throughout the site, allowing all residents access to outdoor recreation spaces. Also, many outdoor amenities, including the basketball court, are sited within close proximity to the community center, in the center of the development. This development also contemplates the Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority Offices remaining onsite as the property management entity. CRHA Offices will either locate along Elliott Avenue or within the Community Center.

As shown on the zoning map on page one, the surrounding neighborhood includes primarily $R$-1S and $R-2$ zoning. This property will include a variety of housing types, creating a harmonious transition towards Elliott Avenue and IX Art Park, which will likely increase in density in the future (DE Zoning).


South First Street, Phase $1+2$, Conceptual Master Plan
(2) Whether the proposed use or development and associated public facilities will substantially conform to the city's comprehensive plan;

The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation for this property is High Density Residential. This designation contemplates for residential densities that are greater than 15 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development has a residential density of approximately 15 dwelling units per acre, while providing a variety of affordable housing options. The proposed parks, playgrounds and basketball courts provide a benefit to the residents and the City, in that these amenities reduce the burden on City public parks.
(3) Whether proposed use or development of any buildings or structures will comply with all applicable building code regulations;

All buildings and structures will apply with the applicable building code regulations.
(4) Whether the proposed use or development will have any potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, or the community in general; and if so, whether there are any reasonable conditions of approval that would satisfactorily mitigate such impacts. Potential adverse impacts to be considered include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:
a. Traffic or parking congestion;

A traffic study for this development was reviewed and approved by the City Traffic Engineer during the South First Street, Phase 1 approvals. Carl Hultgren of Ramey Kemp, the author of the
original traffic study, has provided written confirmation that the approved study fully covers the requested improvements and development in Phase 2 of South First Street. No adverse impacts are anticipated. According to the approved traffic study, no improvements are warranted or recommended at this intersection at build out of the proposed redevelopment.
b. Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, and other factors which adversely affect the natural environment;

The existing South First Street development includes parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts. No additional impact is anticipated, and all lighting will comply with the City's lighting ordinance regulations including full cut-off lighting and no impact to adjacent residential properties.
c. Displacement of existing residents or businesses;

The site work and construction of the South First Street development is being completed in multiple phases, such that there should be no external displacement of existing residents. The site construction may, in some cases, involve temporary relocation, either on or off-site, but this will only be minimal. The primary purpose of the South First Street development is to create new and modern affordable housing options that are available to public housing residents while increasing the overall supply of affordable housing within the City of Charlottesville.
d. Discouragement of economic development activities that may provide desirable employment or enlarge the tax base;

Throughout the redevelopment and renovation of CRHA's public housing properties, CRHA will be developing a strong Section 3 program to ensure public housing residents have access to job and business development opportunities related to the construction and management of these properties. Free training courses for advertised positions will be offered through the City's Go Program.
e. Undue density of population or intensity of use in relation to the community facilities existing or available;

The proposed development is consistent with both the $R$-3 zoning of the property and the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation of High Density Residential. Given the 58 units on site now, the population density will double for Phase 2 portion of the South First Street, thus aligning with the Comprehensive Plan's vision for this area. As a reminder, additional density is not part of this Special Use Permit request.
f. Reduction in the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood;

The primary goal of the South First Street development (Phase 1 and 2), is to increase the availability of affordable housing units in Charlottesville. Through this development, affordable housing will be substantially increased while maintaining a community design that is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood.
g. Impact on school population and facilities;

By providing family-friendly affordable housing options at South First Street, this development will likely increase the number of school aged children within this school district. Again, density is not the subject of this Special Use Permit request, however CRHA will work closely with the Superintendent of Schools to ensure that they are fully aware of the project and can plan ahead for when these units become available to families.
h. Destruction of or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts;

No impact.
i. Conformity with federal, state and local laws, as demonstrated and certified by the applicant; and,

South First Street, Phase 2, will conform with all federal, state and local laws.
j. Massing and scale of project.

An extensive resident engagement process has been underway since early summer, through which we created the master plan for South First Street. The resident-led master planning process and plan is the guiding document for the site plan exhibit of this Special Use Permit. Residents felt strongly that Phase 2 buildings would primarily be 2-3 stories tall, consisting of townhouses and smaller apartment buildings. The full documentation of the master planning process can be found by following this link: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/08quq5ex1o2b/rw/AAABgxEPRJCxt/LTpX dDUjwa?dl=0
Smaller buildings are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and allow for ample access to outdoor recreation spaces that are throughout the development.


Conceptual Project Massing from South First Street, Phase 2 Master Planning Process
(5) Whether the proposed use or development will be in harmony with the purposes of the specific zoning district in which it will be placed;

The proposed development is harmonious with the intent of the R-3 zoning district, which contemplates medium density, residential developments with a by-right density of up to 21 dwelling units per acre.
(6) Whether the proposed use or development will meet applicable general and specific standards set forth within the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, or other city ordinances or regulations; and

The proposed development will comply with all applicable regulations.
(7) When the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the BAR or ERB, as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.

The property is not within a design control district.

Information and data identifying how many, if any, existing dwelling units on the development site meet the city's definition of an "affordable dwelling unit" and whether any such existing units, or equivalent affordable units, will remain following the development;

The existing property consists of 58 affordable dwelling units. All 58 units will be replaced with new affordable housing as a part of this development, and affordable housing options will be greatly expanded at this site.


Neighborhood Characteristics, as developed by the residents of South First Street

## Sec. 34-162. - Exceptions and modifications as conditions of permit.

(a) In reviewing an application for a special use permit, the city council may expand, modify, reduce or otherwise grant exceptions to yard regulations, standards for higher density, parking standards, and time limitations, provided:

In this Special Use Permit Request, we are requesting a reduction to the yard regulations. Specifically, we ask that all yard requirements be reduced to a minimum 5-foot setback from the property lines.
(1) Such modification or exception will be in harmony with the purposes and intent of this division, the zoning district regulations under which such special use permit is being sought; and

The requested modification is in keeping with the intent of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan, which contemplate higher densities at this location, while also being respectful and harmonious with the surrounding residential neighborhood.
(2) Such modification or exception is necessary or desirable in view of the particular nature, circumstances, location or situation of the proposed use; and

Smaller yard setbacks will allow for better utilization of the buildable area of this site to create a significant amount of new affordable housing stock for Charlottesville. Smaller setbacks also create a more comfortable street frontage and allow for better outdoor amenity spaces within the development. By moving buildings closer to the street frontage, we are able to have less impact on critical slopes while providing an ample number of affordable housing units.


The resident master planning team has been meeting weekly since the beginning of summer to design their community.










## AFFIDAVIT

1. I am Ashley Davies, and I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.
2. I am Vice President of Riverbend Development. Riverbend Development is serving as the applicant and owner's representative to the Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority in connection with the redevelopment of the property located at 900 1000 First Street South (the "Property"). The Property is the subject of a pending special use permit application with the City of Charlottesville.
3. As required by the special use permit process, on October 21 st, 2019, I mailed notices to all property owners within 500 feet of the Property at those addresses determined and provided by Carrie Rainey of the City of Charlottesville. The letters provided notice of the application and proposed use and of the informational community meeting to be held at the Property on November 7, 2019, from 6:30 to 8:00 pm.
4. A sample copy of the notification letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A and a copy of the list of addresses to which the letter was mailed is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

By my signature below, I certify the above facts to be true.
WITNESS the following signature:

(Signature)
Ashley Davies, Vice President


Riverbend Development
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29 ty dy of Otter, 2019, by Ashley Laves, Vice President of Riverbend Development.

My commission expires:


October 18, 2019
Dear Neighbor,
On behalf of Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the residents of South First Street, please join us for a community meeting to discuss a proposed Special Use Permit at 900 South First Street. This property, which currently includes 58 residential units, a community center and outdoor recreation space, will be redeveloped in multiple phases (as conceptually depicted below). Phase 1 of the property, 62 apartment units and a community center, will be under construction starting the first quarter of 2020.


South First Street, Phase $1+2$, Conceptual Master Plan

In Phase 2, the residents of South First Street and CRHA propose a variety of townhouse units, small apartment buildings, a community center and retaining CRHA offices on site. The Special Use Permit under review for Phase 2 is a requirement for private outdoor recreational facilities including: parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts, and picnic shelters.

The applicant and planning staff from Neighborhood Development Services will be available at the community meeting to present the project details and answer questions regarding the proposal.

COMMUNITY MEETING DETAILS
DATE: November 7, 2019
TIME: 6:30pm-8pm
LOCATION: South First Street Community Center (1000 South First Street)
APPLICANT CONTACT: Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development
ashley@riverbenddev.com
434-245-4971
South First St. Neighborhood Input Meeting - Nov. 7, 2019

Property Address
114 LANKFORD AVE
108 LANKFORD AVE
$900-1000$ 1ST ST S
106 LANKFORD AVE
104 LANKFORD AVE
102 LANKFORD AVE
100 LANKFORD AVE
213 HARTMAN'S MIL
211 HARTMAN'S MIL
207 HARTMAN'S MIL
205 HARTMAN'S MIL
208 HARTMAN'S MIL
206 HARTMAN'S MIL
202 HARTMAN'S MIL
1501 ROSA TER
200 HARTMAN'S MIL
1503 ROSA TER
116 HARTMAN'S MIL
1507 ROSA TER
508 ROCKLAND AVE
510 ROCKLAND AVE
113 HARTMAN'S MIL
1511 ROSA TER
512 ROCKLAND AVE
514 ROCKLAND AVE
1515 ROSA TER
1504 ROSA TER
516 ROCKLAND AVE
1519 ROSA TER
1508 ROSA TER
1512 ROSA TER
1505 ROSA TER
506 ROCKLAND AVE
1509 ROSA TER
1513 ROSA TER
1517 ROSA TER
1506 ROSA TER
1510 ROSA TER
$01 S T ~ S T ~ S ~$
$1 S T ~ S T ~ S ~$

| 2 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 8 OAK GROVE ROAD | PALMYRA VA 22963 |
| 375 ROCKY HOLLOW RD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22911 |
| P O BOX 1405 | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 175 SWEETBRIAR DRIVE | DANVILLE VA 24540 |
| 104 LANKFORD AVENUE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 2450 LOST HOLLOW PAT | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22911 |
| P O BOX 1467 | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 213 HARTMAN'S MILL ROA | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 211 HARTMAN'S MILL RD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 139 TIMBER RIDGE RD | ZION CROSSROADS22942 |
| 1117 RIVER CT | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22901 |
| 206 HARTMAN'S MILL ROAD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 206 HARTMAN'S MILL ROAD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 202 HARTMAN'S MILL ROAD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 2073 TAVERNOR LANE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22911 |
| 200 HARTMAN'S MILL RO | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 357 MARTIN KINGS RD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 116 HARTMAN'S MILL R | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 121 FAITH DR | TROY VA 22974 |
| 508 ROCKLAND AVE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22901 |
| 6310 UNION MILLS ROAD | TROY VA 22974 |
| 111 HARTMAN'S MILL ROAD | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 7726 ABLEVANNA SPRING RD | SCOTTSVILLE VA 24590 |
| 512 ROCKLAND AVENUE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 514 ROCKLAND AVENUE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 1515 ROSA TERRACE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 1504 ROSA TER | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 1001 E MARKET ST \#202 | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 415 S WEST ST | FALLS CHURCH VA 22046 |
| 1508 ROSA TERRACE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 308 11TH ST NW | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903 |
| 1505 ROSA TERRACE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 977 SEMINOLE TRAIL, PMB 152 | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22901 |
| 121 FAITH DR | TROY VA 22974 |
| 7726 ALBEVANNA SPRING RD | SCOTTSVILLE VA 24590 |
| 820 E HIGH ST STE A | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| 1342 SINGLETON LANE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903 |
| 246 PFISTER AVE | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22903 |
| P O BOX 1467 | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |
| P O BOX 1405 | CHARLOTTESVILLE 22902 |

Owner $\quad$ Address 1
LUDWIG, DALE
GREEN RETRO SALVAGE II HOLDINGS, LLC
Owner $\quad$ Address 1
LUDWIG, DALE
GREEN RETRO SALVAGE II HOLDINGS, LLC GREEN RETRO GREEN RETRO SALVAGE II HOLDINGS, LLC WILLIAMS, PEGGY T

FORD, JENNIE MAE, LIFE ESTATE GREEN RETRO SALVAGE II HOLDINGS, LLC MATIE, JEROTHY LIEE EST\&JACQUELINE WOMACK, GLORIA, LIFE ESTATE, ETAL
PASCHALL, MICHAEL S \& PASCHALL, MICHAEL S \&

CAREY, HOWARD G \& LINDA M CAREY, HOWARD G \& LINDA M THOMPSON, EDITH B LOCAL BOYS LLC JACQUES, DAVID JR \& BARBARA H
MACNEIL, MARY E
CARTER, BRENDA D JACQUES, DAVID JR \& BARBARA H
MACNEIL, MARY E
CARTER, BRENDA D CARTER, BRENDA D THOMPSON, BARBARA B DOBROW, JEFFRY S \& MEGAHAN, W SCOTT \& CAROLINE C WOODFOLK, IDA R WOODFOLK, IDA R GIBSON, BENJAMIN L \& DOROTHY M JONES, JOY
JOHNSON, MARY FRANCES
JOSEPH, TATAINA T S
FITZGERALD, J CHRISTOPHER
KULMAN, DAVID A \& ALISON LR
TYREE, MYRTLE M
CARTER, MELINDA W
BARBOUR, ALEATA D
HARGRAVES, RYAN E
THOMPSON, BARBARA B
IRVING, DEANDRA F
BODI BROCK REAL ESTATE, LLC
MURRAY, CYNTHIA
JONES, JAMIE \& SODORA
MATTIE, JEFFREY D
CH'VILLE RED \& HOUSING AUTHORITY

| 1002 2ND ST SE |
| :--- |
| 1001 RAYON ST |
| 1003 RAYON ST |
| 1004 2ND ST SE |
| 1005 RAYON ST |
| 1006 2ND ST SE |
| 1002 RAYON ST |
| 403 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 1007 RAYON ST |
| 1004 RAYON ST |
| 405 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 407 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 404 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 501 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 406 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 1104 WARE ST |
| 505 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 408 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 1106 WARE ST |
| 500 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 1107 RAYON ST |
| 1108 WARE ST |
| 502 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 504 ELLIOTT AVE |
| 1106 RAYON ST |
| 400 ROBINSON PL |
| 402 ROBINSON PL |
| 1105 6TH ST SE |
| 1109 RAYON ST |
| 404 ROBINSON PL |
| 1107 6TH ST SE |
| 1111 RAYON ST |
| 501 DRUID AVE |
| 1113 RAYON ST |
| 503 DRUID AVE |
| 1109 6TH ST SE |
| 505 DRUID AVE |
| 507 DRUID AVE |
| 1111 6TH ST SE |
| 1 105 LANT S |




ZED LAYOUT, LLC GARRISON REAL ESTATE, LLC
MCLAUGHLIN, ALISHA M BARTLOW, TAMELA M SBJ PROPERTIES, LLC LASSERE, ANNE M
DOUCETTE, TAMARA MUNKACSY, WILLIA HUTCHENS, SETH WILKINSON, JOHN

## SPROUSE, JAMES E \& PEGGY W

 BURTON, ERNEST L \& CAROLYN M LEONARD, CHARLES F, IVLAWSON, SHIRLEY, LIFE ESTATE DU PONT, WESTLEY THOMPSON, ROBERT J PAYNE, STUART

LUCAS RVP IV, LLC
FITZGERALD, LEONARD J
BEER, ALEXANDER C
SKOGLUND, PAUL M
FINUCANE, JAMES \& TONI F KISTNER
FINUCANE, JAMES \& TONI F KISTNER RHEA, ADAM C \& ANGELA B AMIN

HOWARD, JOHN W
NEDZEL, RAYMOND A
PUTNAM, ROBERT G \& CHRISTINE H FRYE, MELVIN A \& PATRICIA A STONE, JAMES L \& REBECCA M hubbard, VIRGINIA, TRUSTEE TREE HOUSES, LLC

BEHRINGER, JEFFREY C
MC ELDOWNEY, PHILIP F
BYRD, LOGAN W \& TIMOTHY D
WALKER, NIKUYAH R
GREATER C'VILLE HABITAT FOR HUMANITY AUSSIEVILLE INVESTMENTS, LLC KINDLER, REBECCA ASHBY

STEWART, ESSIE M
CH'VILLE RED \& HOUSING AUTHORITY
ALLEN, HOWARD ETAL TR-MT ZION BAP C

111 LANKFORD AVENUE
1868 VALLEJO ST APT 4
511 DRUID AVENUE
513 DRUID AVE
515 DRUID AVENUE
500 DRUID AVENUE
502 DRUID AVE
504 DRUID AVENUE
1200 6TH ST SE
506 DRUID AVE
506 DRUID AVE
510 DRUID AVENUE
512 DRUID AVENUE
1202 6TH ST SE
4810 MECHUNK RD
501 STONEHENGE AVENUE
P O BOX 233
4853 PARSONS GREEN LANE
107 CHAUCER RD
514 STONEHENGE AVE
109 LANKFORD AVENUE
115 LANKFORD AVE
1647 HUBBARD CT
150 BURNET ST
1658 OLD BROOK RD
146 BURNET ST
144 BURNET ST
1602 HARDWOOD AVENUE
117 LANKFORD AVENUE
154 BURNET STREET
156 BURNET ST
158 BURNET ST
160 BURNET ST
162 BURNET ST
1602 HARDWOOD AVENUE
502 OLD LYNCHBURG RD
503 STONEHENGE AVENUE
505 STONEHENGE AVE
507 STONEHENGE AVENUE
310 6TH ST SW
7281 PEANUT LANE

$\forall \exists \supseteq N \exists H \exists N O \perp$ Z

 2567 IVY CREEK FARM RD

MALLAR, JOYCE ELAINE
GREEN RETRO SALVAGE II HOLDINGS, LLC 506 STONEHENGE, LLC WALKER
NORUM, DONALD VERNON LIGHTNER PILS, INGEBORG S DAVENPORT, LENA S BRECKENRIDGE, ROBERT M \& POLLY EMERALD SPRING, LLC CAMPBELL, JAMES L \& KOLLIE, MASSA F \& ELLEN D MOON, THOMAS J JR \& ANGELA G BROWNING, DINA L VOHRA, FIROZ Y \& NASRIN F

[^0]
# City of Charlottesville <br> Department of Neighborhood Development Services Staff Report 

## CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

DATE OF HEARING: December 10, 2019<br>RE: FONTAINE AVENUE STREETSCAPE PROJECT

Project Manager: Kyle Kling<br>Date of Staff Report: December 10, 2019

> | Action Required: | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Pursuant to Virginia Code section 15.2-2232, the Planning } \\ \text { Commission will review the proposed Fontaine Avenue Streetscape } \\ \text { concept, located on Fontaine Avenue from the City limit to }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Jefferson Park Avenue in the City of Charlottesville, to determine if |
| the general character, approximate location and extent of the |  |
| proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's |  |
| adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. |  |

## Background:

Fontaine Avenue serves as a mixed use residential/commercial Gateway corridor into the City of Charlottesville, the University of Virginia, and the UVA Hospital. This Project includes a comprehensive revitalization and a corridor improvement program for Fontaine Avenue from the City Limit (near Stribling Avenue) to the intersection of Fontaine Avenue with Maury Avenue and Jefferson Park Avenue. The corridor has been selected to receive funding for improvements described herein through the VDOT Smartscale process. Key components in the scope of work for the project include:

- Enhanced gateway corridor into the City of Charlottesville
- Improved pedestrian access, including wider sidewalks
- Improved crosswalks at key intersections
- Improved bicycle facilities with the addition of bicycle lanes
- Incorporation of landscaping and street trees
- Implementation of green infrastructure for stormwater treatment
- Improved access to existing transit facilities
- Installation of energy efficient pedestrian lighting

City Staff established the scope and design parameters of this project as part of the Smartscale application that was submitted to VDOT and was awarded the funding based on the scope and
potential value that this project has for the corridor and the community. The scope and elements of the project were established by staff utilizing a variety of initiatives within the City of Charlottesville that are focused on enhancing the vibrancy and quality of life, including the City of Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and Streets That Work. With a firm grasp of background information, the project team has begun the concept design and the public involvement process to ensure agreement with the project's purpose and need during development of a conceptual design for the corridor.

## Community Engagement:

To help guide the project, the City appointed a project Steering Committee. The process also involves coordination with the following City Council appointed stakeholder groups:

- PLACE Design Task Force
- Planning Commission

The City of Charlottesville and project design team have provided multiple opportunities for the public to provide input into the plan development process. These include:

- A project website
- An on-line survey
- Two Public Workshops
- Four Steering Committee Meetings
- Two meetings with the PLACE Design Task Force
- Planning Commission Work Session

Each of the above meetings have been open to the public and all information is recorded and can be found at www.fontainestreetscape.com, however a summary of each event is below:

## Project Website:

The Project website (www.fontainestreetscape.com) contains information that has been presented to date as part of the process. Information presented includes:

- Project background
- Project schedule
- A "Public Events" page that provides the presentations from Public Open Houses, Steering Committee, Planning Commission, and PLACE, as well as feedback received
- A contact form
- A "resources" page with links to studies and guidelines

Between September 2018 and November 25, 2019, the project website has logged over 67,748page views, and approximately 9,285 users.

## Community Event 1: Public Open House, January 31, 2019

The first Public Workshop was held on January $31^{\text {st }}$ at the Virginia Department of Forestry from 5:30 PM to 7:30 PM. The event was set up as an interactive workshop designed to provide information and gather input on the Fontaine Streetscape project. Presentation boards were set up around the room to display key project information, as well as options on various design elements for public input. A board enabled participants to identify areas of concern along the corridor, along with suggestions on improvements. A comment form was also distributed gathering information on how people use the corridor, their needs, and how to prioritize future conditions.

The comment form was available on the project website, www.fontainestreetscape.com, from January 31, 2019 to February 15, 2019 to enable people unable to make the meeting to participate. Mail in comments were also received by the City. The following feedback as summarized from the meeting:

Problematic Existing Conditions:

- Want safe pedestrian connection at Piedmont/ Appletree/ Mimosa
- Add/ widen sidewalks is desired
- Site distances onto Fontaine are currently poor
- More green space/ trees and/ or maintain existing tree canopy
- Safety for bicycles is needed

Current Conditions in the Neighborhood:

- Biking is dangerous
- On street parking is not a neighborhood benefit (Primarily used by UVA)
- Site distances onto the street

Design Development Recommendations:

- Want safe pedestrian connection at Piedmont/ Appletree/ Mimosa
- Avoid reducing existing front lawns; Maintain existing Right-of-Way
- Include streetlighting
- Follow Streets that Work guidelines
- Include protected bike lanes
- Consider how to best utilize the paper alleys (parking or access)
- Preserve trees and include green infrastructure

Additional Information to Include at Future Meetings:

- Coordinate with the County to include Fontaine Research Park and the Route 29 ramps
- Is UVA contributing to the solution?
- Will Environmental Assessments be completed?
- Production of sections, noting that multiple sections for the street might be required


The full summary document from the meeting can be found on the project website.

## Community Event 2: Public Open House, April 18, 2019

The project team held a Public Open House on April 18, 2019, at the Fire Station located on Fontaine Avenue from 5:30 PM to 7:00 PM. This meeting content reviewed the feedback from the first Public Open House, and presented initial cross sections for comment. The common feedback from the comment form and meeting feedback for this meeting was that users wanted to see trees and green infrastructure, as well as safer/wider sidewalks. Placing a priority on maintaining existing property features and making parking more efficient was also frequently mentioned.

The comment form was available between April 18, 2019 and May 3, 2019 and produced feedback demonstrating the following:


A full summary sheet of the feedback received can be found on the project website, www.fontainestreetscape.com.

## Steering Committee and Stakeholder Meetings

Throughout the process, the design team collaborated with the Steering Committee and various other boards, committees and agencies to receive input and feedback during the design process. Steering committee meetings were open to the public. Meetings with groups took place on the following dates:

- Steering Committee
- November 15, 2018
- February 28, 2019
- March 25, 2019
- September 17, 2019
- PLACE:
- March 14, 2019
- July 18, 2019
- Planning Commission (Work Session):
- July 23, 2019

Meeting agendas and summaries can be found under the "Public Events" tab on the project website www.fontainestreetscape.com. Additionally, a Technical Committee was formed which is comprised of representatives from appropriate City departments. The Technical Committee held meetings on the project on February 25, 2019, and June 21, 2019. The Technical Committee
members validated information provided from the public, and ensured it was technical feasible in accordance with City standards.

## Standard of Review

Pursuant to Virginia Code section 15.2-2232, the Planning Commission will review the proposed Fontaine Avenue Streetscape concept, located on Fontaine Avenue between the City limit and Jefferson Park Avenue in the City of Charlottesville, to determine if the general character and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. The Planning Commission shall communicate its findings to the Charlottesville City Council, with written reasons for its approval or disapproval.

## Comprehensive Plan Alignment:

The following denotes alignment with the City of Charlottesville adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan.

- Economic Development
- Goal 1 - Sense of Place
- 1.1: Examine opportunities in the following areas: Downtown to Elliott between Avon and Ridge; Woolen Mills; West Main/Ridge McIntire; Cherry/Roosevelt Brown; Fontaine Neighborhood Commercial; Rose Hill; Preston Avenue; McIntire/Harris/Allied; River Road; Emmet Street North of the 250 bypass; High Street/Martha Jefferson; and Fifth Street Extended.
- Develop a sense of place entering Charlottesville
- Goal 2 - Mixed Use
- 2.1: When considering changes to land use regulations, respect nearby residential areas.
- Including residential feedback and ensuring character of neighborhood remains
- 2.3: Enhance pedestrian connections between residences, commercial centers, public facilities, amenities and green spaces.
- Enhances pedestrian connectivity throughout the corridor
- Goal 4 - Regional Cooperation
- 4.1: Coordinate with Albemarle County and other regional stakeholders to create a link between the City's pedestrian infrastructure and Monticello.
- Albemarle County and UVA have been active on the Steering Committee
- 4.3: Coordinate with the University of Virginia to take advantage of opportunities that arise from any potential future expansion of the University and in particular the University Health System.
- UVA has been active on the Steering Committee
- Community Facilities
- Goal 1 - Fire Department
- 1.1: Maintain the response time standard of within 6 minutes for $80 \%$ of the
service calls in the City. Take measures to maintain this standard when increased traffic results from growth, tourism, special events and entertainment venues.
- Team has been working with the Fire Chief to ensure project does not reduce response time
- Goal 2 - Emergency Rescue Services
- 2.2: Develop a strategy to address the issue of City-wide and County accessibility so that a quick response time can be maintained.
- Team has been working with the Fire Chief to ensure project does not reduce response time
- Goal 5 - Water Infrastructure
- 5.1: Maintain, repair and replace water lines where necessary.
- Project will minimize impacts to waterlines and replace as necessary
- Goal 7 - Parks and Recreation (Use)
- 9.5: Enhance multimodal access to parks.
- Provides access to existing trails and bicycle facilities
- Goal 11 - Parks and Recreation (Trails)
- 11.1: Fully Implement the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenway Plan that has been approved by City Council.
- Provides access to existing trails and bicycle facilities
- Economic Sustainability
- Goal 2 - Sustaining Business
- Improve access to local businesses
- Environment
- Goal 2 - Urban Landscape \& Habitat Enhancement
- 2.2: Expand and protect the overall tree canopy of the City and increase the canopy of neighborhoods in an effort to achieve American Forest canopy recommendations (urban: $25 \%$, suburban: $50 \%$ and center business zones: $15 \%)$.
- Adding canopy trees in landscape buffers to support the overall City tree canopy
- Goal 4 - Water Resources Protection
- 4.5: Reduce and/or eliminate stormwater runoff impacts from sites that lack adequate stormwater treatment by incentivizing reductions in overall imperviousness (i.e., effective imperviousness) and encouraging retrofits on developed properties to address stormwater management.
- Implementation of green infrastructure practices for stormwater management
- Transportation
- Goal 1 - Complete Streets
- 1.2: Provide convenient and safe pedestrian connections within $1 / 4$ miles of all commercial and employment centers, transit routes, schools and parks.
- Pedestrian crossing methods are to be added at strategic placement throughout the corridor
- 1.3: Provide design features on roadways, such as street trees within buffers, street furniture and sidewalk widths that improve the safety and comfort
level of all users and contribute to the City's environmental goals.
- Sidewalk widths will be increased, and street trees are to be placed within landscape buffers
- 1.4: Explore and implement safe, convenient and visually attractive crossing alternatives to enable pedestrians and bicyclists to cross major thoroughfares.
- Pedestrian crossing methods are to be added at strategic placement throughout the corridor
- 1.5: Continue to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in conjunction with the planning and design of all major road projects, all new development and road paving projects.
- Bicycle lanes and wider sidewalks are anticipated, along with enhanced roadway crossings
- 1.6: Consistently apply ADA standards to facility design and ensure that accessible curb ramps exist at all pedestrian crossings where conditions allow.
- Consistent application of ADA standards
- 1.9: Seek to expand and anticipate traffic calming where applicable throughout the City in collaboration with neighborhood residents and as part of the development process.
- Placement of street trees and bicycle lanes are anticipated to aid in traffic calming throughout the corridor
- Goal 2 - Land Use \& Community Design
- 2.1: Provide convenient and safe bicycle and pedestrian connections between new and existing residential developments, employment areas and other activity centers to promote the option of walking and biking.
- Project designed with new bicycle lanes and wider sidewalks, with enhanced roadway crossings
- Goal 7 - Regional Transportation
- 7.1: Actively work with VDOT, TJPDC, Albemarle County and the University of Virginia to develop a regional transportation network surrounding the City.
- Representatives from VDOT, Albemarle County, and the University of Virginia Parking and Transportation are all active on the project Steering Committee
- Goal 9 - Infrastructure Funding
- 9.3: Coordinate the funding and development of transportation facilities with regional transportation and land use plans and with planned public and private investments.
- Project is fully funded through SmartScale (HB2)
- Historic Preservation \& Urban Design
- Goal 1 - Urban Design
- 1.2: Promote Charlottesville's diverse architectural and cultural heritage by recognizing, respecting, and enhancing the distinct characteristics of each neighborhood.
- Recognizes and respects the distinct characteristics of the adjacent
neighborhoods
- 1.4: Develop pedestrian-friendly environments in Charlottesville that connect neighborhoods to community facilities, to commercial areas and employment centers, and that connect neighborhoods to each other, to promote a healthier community.
- Enhanced sidewalks and bicycle lanes promote connectivity from neighborhoods to businesses and the University of Virginia
- Goal 4 - Resource Inventory
- 4.2: Continue to identify and survey additional significant individual properties located outside historic districts. In addition to historic buildings, consider significant buildings from the recent past (less than 50 years old), structures such as sculptures, landscapes such as public spaces and cemeteries, and archaeological sites.
- Identified cultural and historic resources prior to the development of concepts
- Goal 7 - Comprehensive Approach
- 7.4: Evaluate zoning map districts and amendments to the zoning map, including PUD's, for their consistency with preservation goals, and impacts on the historic character of City neighborhoods. Provide property owners with information on historic rehabilitations, financial incentives and context-sensitive design.
- Consulted zoning maps to ensure compliance with goals and impacts
- 7.8: Coordinate with the Public Works and Parks Departments regarding maintenance and construction that would affect historic features of the City's neighborhoods. Where possible, maintain and repair granite curbs, retaining walls, distinctive paving patterns and other features instead of replacing them.
- Coordination underway with Public Works and Parks Departments
- 7.11: Encourage retaining and replenishing shade trees, particularly large trees where possible, in all neighborhoods as we strive to make the City more walkable.
- Shade trees planned for landscape buffers along central part of corridor
- Goal 8 - Entrance Corridors
- 8.1: Emphasize placemaking elements and examine opportunities to create destinations.
- Emphasizing placemaking to create a sense of place and character with landscaping
- 8.4: Use street trees, landscaping, and pedestrian routes to provide shade, enclosure, and accessibility in streetscapes.
- Shade trees planned for landscape buffers along central part of corridor
- 8.7: When appropriate, coordinate the City's Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines with Albemarle County's Design Guidelines. Encourage continuity of land use, design, and pedestrian orientation between
contiguous corridors in the City and County.
- Guidelines referenced to promote continuity of land use, design, and pedestrian orientation


## Suggested Motions for Amendment of Comprehensive Plan Text and Map

1. I move that the proposed Fontaine Avenue Streetscape Project concept's, located on Fontaine Avenue between the City limit and Jefferson Park Avenue in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan or part thereof.
2. I move to deny that the proposed Fontaine Avenue Streetscape Project concept's, located on Fontaine Avenue between the City limit Hunt Drive and Jefferson Park Avenue in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof for the following reasons:

## Attachments

Resolution

# RESOLUTION <br> OF THE CHARLOTTESVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDING THE FONTAINE AVENUE STREETSCAPE PROJECT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 

Whereas, this Planning Commission and City Council jointly held a public hearing on the proposed Fontaine Avenue Streetscape Project concept, after notice given as required by law, NOW THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED that this Planning Commission confirms that the general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof.

Adopted by the Charlottesville Planning Commission, the $10^{\text {th }}$ day of December 2019.

Attest:
Secretary, Charlottesville Planning Commission


|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
| ssəכoıd pue əןnpə૫ગS - |
|  |






Draft Design Principles
ed on the Charlottesville's Bike/Ped Plan, Streets That Work Plan,
the VDOT Smart Scale Application
Create a Complete Street
-

> Increase Safety and Comfort for Pedestrians and Bicyclists
> Wherible, povide physical sepation
> - Provide landscaping and hardscape materials that provide shade,
> comfort, safety, and increases the attractiveness of the gateway

- Improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities
- Accommodate the needs of all travel modes




Meeting Updates - 11/15/18 - Steering Committee Meeting \#1
- 1/31/19 - Public Information Meeting \#1 - 2/25/19 - Technical Committee Meeting \#1 2/28/19 - Steering Committee Meeting \#2
3/14/19 - PLACE Task Force Meeting \#1
3/25/19 - Steering Committee Meeting \#3
4/18/19 - Public Open House \#2
- 6/21/19 - Technical Committee Meeting \#2
- 7/11/19 - PLACE Task Force Meeting \#2
- 7/23/19 - Planning Commission Work Session
- 9/17/19 - Steering Committee \#4
- 12/10/19 - Planning Commission
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Comprehensive Plan Consistency Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

• Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

- Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan
- Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

• Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

• Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

- Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

• Economic Development Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan

• Economic Development


## Plan Consistency Comprehensive

Based on the City of Charlottesville's 2013 Comprehensive Plan
Economic Sustainability

- Sustaining Business
- Improve access to local businesses


## Environment

- Urban Landscape \& Healthy Habitat / Water Resources Protection
- Implement green infrastructure practices for stormwater management


## Transportation

## - Complete Streets

- Bicycle lanes and enhanced sidewalks incorporated into the corridor
- Street trees in landscape buffers
- Safe, convenient crossing alternatives
- Consistent application of ADA standards
- Land Use \& Community Design
Land Use \& Community Design
- Design to promote walking and bicycling




## CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE DEPT. OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT

## APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT

| JOINT CITY COUNCIL \& PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DATE OF HEARING: | Tuesday, December 10, 2019 |  |
| PROJECT NAME: | Chick-fil-A Barracks Road Drive Through SUP |  |
| APPLICATION NUMBER: | SP19-00008 |  |
| REASON FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT: | To authorize a specific land use (drive through window for restaurant) |  |
| Project Planner: | Joey Winter (winterj@charlottesville.org) |  |
| Date of Staff Report: | December 3, 2019 |  |
| Applicant: | Mr. John Martinez - Chick-fil-A Inc. |  |
| Applicants Representative: | Mr. Ryan Yauger - Bohler Engineering |  |
| Owner of Record: | Federal Realty investment Trust |  |
| Application Information |  |  |
| Property Street Address: | 1000 Emmet Street North ("Subject Property") |  |
| Tax Map \| Parcel Number: | TM 1-1 (portion) \| 010001000 |  |
| Site Area (per application): | 0.801 acres ( $34,892 \mathrm{ft}^{2}$ ) |  |
| Comprehensive Plan (Land Use Plan): | Mixed Use |  |
| Current Zoning Classification: | Urban Corridor Mixed Used District (URB) |  |
| Overlay Districts: | Entrance Corridor Overlay |  |
| Completeness: |  |  |
| - Application contains all info required by Zoning Ordinance Secs. 34-41(d), 34-158(a), \& 34-158(b) |  |  |
| - Existing dwelling units on site: |  |  |
| - Dwelling units proposed by this development: |  |  |
| - Pre-application meeting required by Sec. 34-41(b)(1) was conducted on: |  | June 5, 2019 |
| - Community meeting required by Sec. 34-41(c)(2) was conducted on: |  | November 14, 2019 |
| Meeting location - Venable Elementary School (406 14th St NW, Charlottesville, VA 22903) |  |  |

## Vicinity Map



## Zoning Map



## Application Components

Per Sec. 34-158(a), the procedure for filing and consideration of an application for a special use permit is the same as that required by section 34-41 for an owner-initiated petition for a zoning map amendment, except that a complete application for a special use permit shall also include:
(1) A site plan when required by section 34-802 of the City Code;
(2) A written disclosure of the information required by section 34-8 of the City Code and, if the applicant is not the owner of the property, written evidence of his status as (i) the authorized agent of the property owner, or (ii) a contract purchaser of the property whose application is with the permission of the property owner;
(3) For developments including any non-residential uses, and developments proposing the construction of three (3) or more single- or two-family dwellings, the applicant shall provide a completed low-impact development ("LID") methods worksheet;
(4) For applications proposing the alteration of the footprint or height of an existing building, or the construction of one (1) or more new buildings: (i) a building massing diagram and (ii) elevations;
(5) Information and data identifying how many, if any, existing dwelling units on the development site meet the city's definition of an "affordable dwelling unit" and whether any such existing units, or equivalent affordable units, will remain following the development;
(6) Other supporting data sufficient to demonstrate compliance with the purposes and standards of this Zoning Ordinance, including, without limitation, graphic materials that illustrate the context of the project as well as information and data addressing the factors set forth within section 34-157 above.

ATTACHMENT 2

ATTACHMENT 1, Pages 6-8

ATTACHMENT 1, Page 10

ATTACHMENT 3

## ATTACHMENT 1

See list of attachments on page 14 of this staff report

## Applicant's Request

Mr. John Martinez of Chick-fil-a Inc. has submitted a Special Use Permit (SUP) application to authorize a drive through window for a restaurant at 1000 Emmet Street North in the Barracks Road Shopping Center. This SUP is being requested to authorize a specific land use pursuant to Sec. 34-796 of the City Code. The site is zoned URB with Entrance Corridor overlay and is approximately . 801 acres. The property is further identified on a portion of City Real Property Tax Map 1 Parcel 1. The General Land Use Plan calls for Mixed Use development.

## Background

The contract purchaser, Chick-fil-A, is proposing to demolish the existing Burger King at this location and construct a Chick-fil-A restaurant with a drive through window. The proposed use ("restaurant") is allowed by right within the URB zoning district classification. However, per the use matrix in Sec. 34-796 of the City Code, a Special Use Permit is required for the drive through window. Modifications to yard regulations are being requested by the applicant due to the large utility easements that cross the property near Emmet Street North. A preliminary site plan exhibit was submitted as a supplement to this SUP application and is included with this staff report as ATTACHMENT 2. At the request of the applicant, this site plan is being treated only as a supplement to the SUP application and has not gone through a full staff review.

## Drive Through Window Use

Planning Commission review of this Special Use Permit request should focus solely on whether a drive through window is appropriate for a restaurant in this location. Elements such as restaurant branding, signage, site lighting, landscaping, or building materials should not be considered when evaluating this request if they directly relate to the proposed drive through window. As previously stated in this report, a Chick-fil-A restaurant is allowed by right in the URB zoning district. The role of Planning Commission is to recommend approval or disapproval of this SUP request to City Council.

On Emmet Street North between the interchange with the Route 250 Bypass and the intersection with Massie Road, a distance of just over one mile, there are currently eleven businesses operating drive through windows - six restaurants, five banks, and one pharmacy. There are four drive through windows north of the Barracks Road intersection (Cookout, Zaxby's, Arby's, and SunTrust Bank). There are seven drive through windows south of the Barracks Road intersection (Bank of America, CVS Pharmacy, Burger King, McDonald's, Wells Fargo Bank, Virginia National Bank, and Taco Bell). There are currently businesses operating drive through windows in the Barracks Road Shopping Center- two restaurants and three banks.

## Drive Through Windows in the Barracks Road Shopping Center



Drive Through Windows Along Emmet Street North


## Modification of Yard Regulations

Modifications to yard regulations are being recommended by the City's Utilities Engineer to allow for access to public utility lines on the Subject Property. Pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-162(a), in reviewing an application for a special use permit, the city council may modify yard regulations provided:

1. Such modification will be in harmony with the purposes and intent of [the special use permits] division, the zoning district regulations under which such special use permit is being sought; and
2. Such modification is necessary or desirable in view of the particular nature, circumstances, location or situation of the proposed use; and
3. No such modification shall be authorized to allow a use that is not otherwise allowed by this chapter within the zoning district in which the subject property is situated.

## REQUESTED FRONT YARD MODIFICATION ALONG EMMET STREET NORTH:

A setback of five (5) feet, minimum; forty (40) feet, maximum shall be required.

STAFF ANALYSIS: The City's Utilities Engineer has recommended that front yard regulations be modified to allow for access to the sanitary sewer line and storm sewer culverts that run across the front of the Subject Property.


Sanitary Sewer Line (RED) and Storm Sewer Culvert (BLUE) locations. (Source: applicant)

## Standard of Review

City Council may grant an applicant a special permit or special use permit, giving consideration to a number of factors set forth within Zoning Ordinance Sec. 34-157. If Council finds that a proposed use or development will have potentially adverse impacts, and if Council identifies development conditions that could satisfactorily mitigate such impacts, then Council may set forth reasonable conditions within its SUP approval. The role of the Planning Commission is to make an advisory recommendation to the City Council, as to (i) whether or not Council should approve a proposed SUP and if so, (ii) whether there are any reasonable development conditions that could mitigate potentially adverse impacts of the propose use or development.

Section 34-157 of the City's Zoning Ordinance lists a number of factors that Council will consider in making a decision on a proposed SUP. Staff's analysis of those factors, based on the information provided by the applicant is as follows:

## Sec. 34-157. - General standards for issuance.

(a) In considering an application for a special use permit, the city council shall consider the following factors:

1. Whether the proposed use or development will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood;
Staff Analysis:
The proposed use (restaurant with a drive through window) is identical to the existing use of the Subject Property. The proposed development is harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood and the Barracks Road Shopping Center. The properties immediately surrounding the subject property are described as follows:

| Direction | Address | Use | TMP | Zoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | $1117+$ Emmet Street North | Barracks Rd. Shopping Center | $1-1$ | URB |
| West |  |  |  |  |
| South |  | Academic Office Building | $1-18$ | ES |

2. Whether the proposed use or development and associated public facilities will substantially conform to the city's comprehensive plan;
Staff Analysis:
The Subject Property is designated as a site for Mixed Use development in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Per Chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan, the goal of the Mixed Use development is to "[e]stablish a mix of uses within walking distance of residential neighborhoods that will enhance opportunities for small group interaction throughout Charlottesville." More specifically (Goal 2.3), Mixed Use development should "[e]nhance pedestrian connections between residences, commercial centers, public facilities, amenities and green spaces." To substantially conform to the Comprehensive Plan, the proposed development should include facilities that establish pedestrian
connections from the restaurant to the sidewalk on Emmet Street North and adjacent areas of the Barracks Road Shopping Center.
3. Whether proposed use or development of any buildings or structures will comply with all applicable building code regulations;
Staff Analysis: Renovation and expansion of the existing structure cannot proceed without approval by the City's Building Code Official. Any buildings or structures on this site will be required to comply with all applicable building code regulations per City Code Chapter 5.
4. Whether the proposed use or development will have any potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, or the community in general; and if so, whether there are any reasonable conditions of approval that would satisfactorily mitigate such impacts. Potential adverse impacts to be considered include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:
a. Traffic or parking congestion;

Staff Analysis: City Traffic Engineering has no concerns with the proposed layout for the proposed development as it pertains to traffic. The traffic will be controlled on private property and should have minimum impact to the city's public right-of-way. The proposed development will be required to comply with all applicable site plan regulations per City Code Chapter 34.
b. Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, and other factors which adversely affect the natural environment;

Staff Analysis: The proposed use (restaurant with a drive through window) is identical to the current use of the Subject Property. Changes in yard regulations will not adversely affect the natural environment.
c. Displacement of existing residents or businesses;

Staff Analysis: The proposed development will not cause displacement of existing residents. The new business will replace an existing business.
d. Discouragement of economic development activities that may provide desirable employment or enlarge the tax base;
Staff Analysis: The proposed development will not cause discouragement of economic development activities that may provide desirable employment or enlarge the tax base.
e. Undue density of population or intensity of use in relation to the community facilities existing or available;
Staff Analysis: The proposed development will not cause undue density of population or intensity of use in relation to the community facilities existing or available.
f. Reduction in the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood;

Staff Analysis: The proposed development will not cause a reduction in the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood.
g. Impact on school population and facilities;

Staff Analysis: The proposed development will not impact on school population and facilities.
h. Destruction of or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts;

Staff Analysis: The proposed development will not cause destruction of or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts.
i. Conformity with federal, state and local laws, as demonstrated and certified by the applicant; Staff Analysis: The applicant has certified that the proposed development will conform to federal, state and local laws. However, the preliminary site plan submitted for this proposed development does not specify an accessible route from the public sidewalk to the primary entrance of the proposed restaurant in accordance with construction standards set forth within the most recent version of the City of Charlottesville Standards and Design Manual as required by Sec. 34-897(b). Therefore, proposed staff condition 3 has been included to ensure that an accessible route from the public sidewalk to the primary entrance shall be provided.

## j. Massing and scale of project.

Staff Analysis: The Entrance Corridor Review Board will review the appropriateness of the massing and scale of this proposed development.
5. Whether the proposed use or development will be in harmony with the purposes of the specific zoning district in which it will be placed;

## Staff Analysis:

URBAN CORRIDOR (URB) DISTRICT: Per City Code Sec. 34-541(10), the intent of the Urban Corridor district is to continue the close-in urban commercial activity that has been the traditional development patterns in these areas. Development in this district is both pedestrian and auto oriented, but is evolving to more of a pedestrian center development pattern. The regulations provide for both a mixture of uses or single use commercial activities. It encourages parking located behind the structure and development of a scale and character that is respectful to the neighborhoods and university uses adjacent.
6. Whether the proposed use or development will meet applicable general and specific standards set forth within the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, or other city ordinances or regulations;
Staff Analysis: The proposed restaurant building on the Subject Property will not conform to specific Streetwall regulations for the Urban Corridor district:

- Per Sec. 34-758(1), the maximum setback where the Subject Property fronts Emmet Street North (road classification= primary street) is thirty (30) feet. The proposed restaurant building will be approximately ninety-two (92) feet from Emmet Street North due to storm sewer and sanitary sewer utility easements.

7. When the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the BAR or ERB, as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.

Staff Analysis: This application will discussed before a meeting of the City of Charlottesville Entrance Corridor Review Board (ERB) on December 10, 2019. ERB will return a written report of its recommendations to City Council.
(b) Any resolution adopted by city council to grant a special use permit shall set forth any reasonable conditions which apply to the approval.
Staff Analysis: Conditions recommended by staff are found on page 10 of this report.

## Public Comments Received

COMMUNITY MEETING: As required by Sec. 34-41(c)(2), the applicant held a community meeting for this SUP application on November 14, 2019, at Venable Elementary School (406 14th St NW, Charlottesville, VA 22903). NDS Staff did not attend this meeting. One member of the public was in attendance.

WRITTEN COMMENT: Staff received no written comment in favor of or against this SUP request.

## Staff Recommendations and Proposed Staff Conditions

Staff recommends Planning Commission focus on the following questions during review:

- Is a restaurant drive through window an appropriate use at this location?
- What is the impact of granting modifications to yard regulations?

If the Planning Commission recommends approval of SP19-00008, staff recommends the following conditions be placed on the Special Use Permit:

1. An accessible pedestrian route from the public sidewalk on Emmet Street North to the primary entrance of the restaurant shall be provided. City staff shall have the authority to require additional safety measures be taken to protect pedestrian traffic in this route from vehicle traffic related to the drive through window use.
2. An accessible pedestrian route from the internal parking areas of the Barracks Road Shopping Center to the primary entrance of the restaurant shall be provided. City staff shall have the authority to require additional safety measures be taken to protect pedestrian traffic in this route from vehicle traffic related to the drive through window use.
3. Setbacks shall be required, as follows:
a. Primary street frontage along Emmet Street North: Five (5) feet, minimum; ninety-two (92) feet, maximum.

## Possible Motion(s)

1. 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 restaurant with a drive through window on the Subject Property, subject to the following conditions:

- The three (3) conditions presented in the staff report
- [alternative conditions, or additional condition(s)....list here]

OR,
2. On the basis that the proposal would NOT service public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice, I move to recommend denial of application SP19-00008.

## Attachments

1. Special Use Permit Application SP19-00008-submitted October 14, 2019
2. Preliminary Site Plan Exhibit for SP19-00008 - submitted October 14, 2019
3. Preliminary Elevations and Renderings for SP19-00008 - submitted October 14, 2019
4. Applicant Narrative for SP19-00008-submitted October 14, 2019
5. General Standards For Issuance Of A Special Use Permit - City Code Section 34-157
6. Exceptions And Modifications As Conditions Of Permit Special Use Permit - City Code Section 34-162



## City of Charlottesville

## Pre-Application Meeting Verification

Project Name: Chick-Fil-A Burruks_Road sup
PreApplication Meeting Date: June $5^{\text {th }}, 2019$ 10:00am (wednesday) Applicant's Representative: Chick: Fit $A$ = John Martinez, Bohter: Ryan Yaugecp Gree Ellwood Planner: Joey Winter
Other City Officials in Attendance:
NOS - Craig Fabio (zanix), chris sibold (engineering), Bremen Duncan (traffic), Jeff werner (entrance corridor)
Fire - Steve Walton
Utilities - Ray Wester

The following items will be required supplemental information for this application and must be submitted with the completed application package:

1. Additional traffic info $\rightarrow$ coordinate w/Brennen Duncan
2. Site plan exhibit (see code sec. $34-827$ for requirements)
3. Resolve Utility Easement issue $\rightarrow$ Coordinate w/ Roy Rester
4. Entrance Corridor requirements $\rightarrow$ coordinate w/Teff Werner
5. $\qquad$
$\qquad$
Planner Signature:




## City of Charlottesville

## Community Meeting

Section 34-41(c)(2) of the Code of the City of Charlottesville (adopted 2015) requires applicants seeking rezonings and special use permits to hold a community meeting. The purpose of a community meeting is to provide citizens an opportunity to receive information about a proposed development, about applicable zoning procedures, about applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, and to give citizens an opportunity to ask questions. No application for a rezoning shall be placed on any agenda for a public hearing, until the required community meeting has been held and the director of neighborhood development services determines that the application is ready for final review through the formal public hearing process.
By signing this document, the applicant acknowledges that it is responsible for the following, in connection to the community meeting required for this project:

1. Following consultation with the city, the applicant will establish a date, time and location for the community meeting. The applicant is responsible for reserving the location, and for all related costs.
2. The applicant will mail, by U.S. mail, first-class, postage pre-paid, a notice of the community meeting to a list of addresses provided by the City. The notice will be mailed at least 14 calendar days prior to the date of the community meeting. The applicant is responsible for the cost of the mailing. At least 7 calendar days prior to the meeting, the applicant will provide the city with an affidavit confirming that the mailing was timely completed.
3. The applicant will attend the community meeting and present the details of the proposed application. If the applicant is a business or other legal entity (as opposed to an individual) then the meeting shall be attended by a corporate officer, an LLC member or manager, or another individual who can speak for the entity that is the applicant. Additionally, the meeting shall be attended by any design professional or consultant who has prepared plans or drawings submitted with the application. The applicant shall be prepared to explain all of the details of the proposed development, and to answer questions from citizens.
4. Depending on the nature and complexity of the application, the City may designate a planner to attend the community meeting. Regardless of whether a planner attends, the City will provide the applicant with guidelines, procedures, materials and recommended topics for the applicant's use in conducting the community meeting.
5. On the date of the meeting, the applicant shall make records of attendance and shall also document that the meeting occurred through photographs, video, or other evidence satisfactory to the City. Records of attendance may include using the mailing list referred to in \#1 as a sign-in sheet (requesting attendees to check off their name(s)) and may include a supplemental attendance sheet. The City will provide a format acceptable for use as the supplemental attendance sheet.

Applicant: Ryan Yauger, PE



## City of Charlottesville

## Owner's Authorizations

```
(Not Required)
```

Project Name: Chick-Fil-A FSU \#04332

## Right of Entry- Property Owner Permission

I, the undersigned, hereby grant the City of Charlottesville, its employees and officials, the right to enter the property that is the subject of this application, for the purpose of gathering information for the review of this rezoning application.
Owner: Federal Realty Investment Trust
Date
10/1/2019
By (sign name):
 Print Name:

Christine McGuirl
Owner's: LLC Member
LLC Manager
Corporate Officer (specify): $\qquad$
Other (specific): Director, Development

## Owner's Agent

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I have authorized the following named individual or entity to serve as my lawful agent, for the purpose of making application for this rezoning, and for all related purposes, including, without limitation: to make decisions and representations that will be binding upon my property and upon me, my successors and assigns.
Name of Individual Agent: Ryan Mauger, PE
Name of Corporate or other legal entity authorized to serve as agent:
Bohler Engineering VA, LLC

Owner: Federal Really In vestment Trust
Date: $\qquad$
By (sign name): $\qquad$ Print Name: Dawn M. Becker

## Circle one:

Owner's: LLC Member
LLC Manager Corporate Officer (specify): $\qquad$ Other (specific):

[^1]

## City of Charlottesville

Disclosure of Equitable Ownership
Project Name: Chick-Fil-A FSU \#04332

Section 34-8 of the Code of the City of Charlottesville requires that an applicant for a special use permit make complete disclosure of the equitable ownership "real parties in interest") of the real estate to be affected. Following below I have provided the names and addresses of each of the real parties in interest, including, without limitation: each stockholder or a corporation; each of the individual officers and directors of a corporation; each of the individual members of an LLC (limited liability companies, professional limited liability companies): the trustees and beneficiaries of a trust, etc. Where multiple corporations, companies or trusts are involved, identify real parties in interest for each entity listed.
$\qquad$ Address 1626 East Jefferson Street, Rockville, MD 20852
Nam
Name $\qquad$ Address

Name $\qquad$ Address $\qquad$
Name $\qquad$ Address $\qquad$
Attach additional sheets as needed. Please see the attached Exhibit A.
Note: The requirement of listing names of stockholders does not apply to a corporation whose stock is traded on a national or local stock exchange and which corporation has more than five hundred (500) shareholders.

Applicant: Federal Realty Investment Trust
By:
Signature
 Print Dawn M. Becker Date $\qquad$ 10/1/2019

Its:
Executive Vice President-Corporate $\qquad$ (Officer, Member, Trustee, etc.)

## Exhibit A to City of Charlottesville Disclosure of Equitable Ownership Form for Chick Fil A at Barracks Road Shopping Center

## 1. Federal Realty Investment Trust:

Federal Realty lnvestment Trust is a Maryland real estate investment trust ("Federal Realty") that is publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the symbol "FRT". As of March 14, 2019, Federal Realty had $74,607,212$ common shares of beneficial interest outstanding. To our knowledge, without any independent investigation or inquiry, there is no person holding more than $5.0 \%$ of our common shares of beneficial interest ("Common Shares") except for the following publicly held entities:
a. Based on a Schedule 13G/A filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 11, 2019, The Vanguard Group, Inc., 100 Vanguard Blvd., Malvern, PA 19355, an investment advisor, holds $11,416,211$ Shares or $15.3 \%$ of the outstanding Common Shares of Federal Realty.
b. Based on a Schedule 13G/A filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 31, 2019, BlackRock, Inc., 55 East $52^{\text {nd }}$ Street, New York, NY 10055, a parent holding company, holds $8,092,781$ Shares or $10.8 \%$ of the outstanding Common Shares of Federal Realty.
c. Based on a Schedule 13G filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on February 14, 2019, State Street Corporation, State Street Financial Center, One Lincoln Street, Boston, MA 02111, a parent holding company, holds $6,314,157$ Shares or $8.5 \%$ of the outstanding Common Shares of Federal Realty.
d. Based on a Schedule 13G/A filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 24, 2019, JPMorgan Chase \& Co., 270 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10017, a parent holding company, holds $5,057,986$ Shares or $6.8 \%$ of the outstanding Common Shares of Federal Realty.
e. Based on a Schedule 13G/A filed the Securities and Exchange Commission on January 24, 2019, Norges Bank, Bankplassen 2, PO Box 1179 Sentrum, NO 0107 Oslo Norway, The Central Bank of Norway, holds $4,492,470$ Shares of $6.0 \%$ of the outstanding Common Shares of Federal Realty.

Federal Realty has no information or other knowledge of any inaccuracy in the statements made by (1) The Vanguard Group, Inc., (2) BlackRock, Inc., (3) State Street Corporation, (4) JPMorgan Chase \& Co. or (5) Norges Bank (The Central Bank of Norway) in its Schedule 13G/A or Schedule 13G, as applicable.

## 2. Names of Trustees and Officers*:

## Trustees:

Joseph S. Vassalluzzo, Non-Executive Chairman of the Board
Jon E. Bortz
David W. Faeder
Elizabeth Holland
Mark S. Ordan
Gail P. Steinel
Donald C. Wood

# Exhibit A to City of Charlottesville Disclosure of Equitable Ownership Form for Chick Fil A at Barracks Road Shopping Center 

Officers*:
Donald C. Wood, President and Chief Executive Officer
Dawn M. Becker, Executive Vice President-General Counsel and Secretary
Daniel Guglielmone, Executive Vice President-Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer
*As a publicly traded company, Federal Realty considers officers to include only officers as defined by Section 16 of the Exchange Act of 1934, which includes all officers responsible for setting policy and direction of the company.


## City of Charlottesville

Fee Schedule

Project Name: Chick-fil-A FSU \#04332

| Application Type | Quantity | Fee | Subtotal |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Special Use Permit (Residential) |  | $\$ 1,500$ |  |
| Special Use Permit (Mixed Use/Non-Residential) | 1 | $\$ 1,800$ | $\$ 1,800.00$ |
| Mailing Costs per letter |  | $\$ 1$ per letter |  |
| Newspaper Notice | Payment Due <br> Upon Invoice |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  | $\$ 1,800.00$ |

## Office Use Only

Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Recelved By: $\qquad$
Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Recelved By: $\qquad$
Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Received By: $\qquad$
Amount Received: $\qquad$ Date Paid $\qquad$ Received By: $\qquad$

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Applicant's Signature

Signature Print RYAN YAUGER, PE Date 9/16/19



8 BLACKWELL PARK LANE, SUITE 201
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20186
Phone: 28


|  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 3.LOCATION OF PROPOSED UTIUTY POLE RELOCATION IS AT THE SOLE DISCRETION OF UTLLTY COMPANY <br>  |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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Neighborhood Development Services

610 East Market Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Attn: Joey Winter

Re: Impact Statement Chick-Fil-A Barracks Road<br>1000 Emmet Street North<br>Charlottesville, VA 22903<br>City of Charlottesville<br>BE \# V176502

The proposed Chick-Fil-A, at the corner of Emmet Street and the entrance to Barracks Road Shopping Center, requires a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow a drive through window within the URB Zoning. This existing site is currently an active fast food restaurant with an existing drive through. The existing building is also setback farther from Emmet street than what is currently allowed by the Streetwall requirements of the URB Zoning District due to underground utility constraints along the property frontage. As such, and as a part of this application, the applicant is also seeking an exception to the Streetwall requirements within the URB Zoning District for the proposed Chick-Fil-A building as well, to maintain existing buffers from the underground utilities. This impact statement is provided with the SUP application to describe any additional impacts to traffic, utilities, environment, and conformance to the Comprehensive Plan.

## Infrastructure Impact

Traffic Access to the proposed Chick-Fil-A pad is to be provided via the existing entrance on Emmet Street (Rt. 29) and within the existing shopping center drive aisles. As the existing infrastructure will be maintained, and the traffic volumes associated with the Use will be similar, no additional traffic impacts are anticipated. The site will also be served by existing public water, sanitary, and storm sewer systems. The footprint of the proposed building was modified to maintain existing clearances to not impact the existing infrastructure. All existing utilities are sized appropriately for the proposed use, and connection tie in locations are shown on the proposed site plan.

## Community Impact

As this proposed Use does not generate an increase in population, it will not have any impact to existing school or recreational infrastructure. To mitigate any pedestrian connectivity concerns, the applicant is proposing an ADA accessible connection point to the right-of-way along Emmet Street in front of the new

July 31, 2019
Page 2 of 2
development, to tie into the existing infrastructure. The proposed site is also within the Entrance Corridor and will be subject to architectural review to ensure an appropriate looking building for the community will be built as shown in the provided elevation package. The proposed development exists within the Barracks Road Planning Neighborhood and is consistent with the Comprehensive plan and surrounding Commercial area. Therefore, due to the reasons above, it is the opinion of the applicant that the proposed development will have no negative impacts to the community and will bring a thriving and wanted Use to the area.

## Environmental Impact

The site does not contain any environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, steep slopes, or streams. Any environmental impacts associated with construction will be mitigated with an approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared along with the Site Plan and approved by the City. Stormwater Management for both water quality and quantity will be designed and implemented in accordance with the applicable State and City requirements. As such, there will be no environmental impact based on the new development.

Should you have any questions regarding this project or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (540) 349-4500.

Sincerely,
Bohler Engineering VA, LLC


RY/pk/bb
H: $\backslash 17 \backslash \mathrm{~V} 176502 \backslash$ Administrative\Letters $\backslash 190916$ - SUP Impact Statement.doc

Sec. 34-157. - General standards for issuance.
(a) In considering an application for a special use permit, the city council shall consider the following factors:
(1) Whether the proposed use or development will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood;
(2) Whether the proposed use or development and associated public facilities will substantially conform to the city's comprehensive plan;
(3) Whether proposed use or development of any buildings or structures will comply with all applicable building code regulations;
(4) Whether the proposed use or development will have any potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, or the community in general; and if so, whether there are any reasonable conditions of approval that would satisfactorily mitigate such impacts. Potential adverse impacts to be considered include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:
a. Traffic or parking congestion;
b. Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, and other factors which adversely affect the natural environment;
c. Displacement of existing residents or businesses;
d. Discouragement of economic development activities that may provide desirable employment or enlarge the tax base;
e. Undue density of population or intensity of use in relation to the community facilities existing or available;
f. Reduction in the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood;
g. Impact on school population and facilities;
h. Destruction of or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts;
i. Conformity with federal, state and local laws, as demonstrated and certified by the applicant; and,
j. Massing and scale of project.
(5) Whether the proposed use or development will be in harmony with the purposes of the specific zoning district in which it will be placed;
(6) Whether the proposed use or development will meet applicable general and specific standards set forth within the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, or other city ordinances or regulations; and
(7) When the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the BAR or ERB, as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.
(b) Any resolution adopted by city council to grant a special use permit shall set forth any reasonable conditions which apply to the approval.

Sec. 34-157. - General standards for issuance.
(a) In considering an application for a special use permit, the city council shall consider the following factors:
(1) Whether the proposed use or development will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood;
(2) Whether the proposed use or development and associated public facilities will substantially conform to the city's comprehensive plan;
(3) Whether proposed use or development of any buildings or structures will comply with all applicable building code regulations;
(4) Whether the proposed use or development will have any potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, or the community in general; and if so, whether there are any reasonable conditions of approval that would satisfactorily mitigate such impacts. Potential adverse impacts to be considered include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:
a. Traffic or parking congestion;
b. Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, and other factors which adversely affect the natural environment;
c. Displacement of existing residents or businesses;
d. Discouragement of economic development activities that may provide desirable employment or enlarge the tax base;
e. Undue density of population or intensity of use in relation to the community facilities existing or available;
f. Reduction in the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood;
g. Impact on school population and facilities;
h. Destruction of or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts;
i. Conformity with federal, state and local laws, as demonstrated and certified by the applicant; and,
j. Massing and scale of project.
(5) Whether the proposed use or development will be in harmony with the purposes of the specific zoning district in which it will be placed;
(6) Whether the proposed use or development will meet applicable general and specific standards set forth within the zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations, or other city ordinances or regulations; and
(7) When the property that is the subject of the application for a special use permit is within a design control district, city council shall refer the application to the BAR or ERB, as may be applicable, for recommendations as to whether the proposed use will have an adverse impact on the district, and for recommendations as to reasonable conditions which, if imposed, that would mitigate any such impacts. The BAR or ERB, as applicable, shall return a written report of its recommendations to the city council.
(b) Any resolution adopted by city council to grant a special use permit shall set forth any reasonable conditions which apply to the approval.

# REQUEST FOR A WAIVER: CRITICAL SLOPES 

# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING DATE OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING: December 10, 2019 

Project Planner: Carrie Rainey<br>Date of Staff Report: December 2, 2019<br>Applicant: Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA)<br>Applicant's Representative(s): Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development<br>Current Property Owner: Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA)

## Application Information

Property Street Address: 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S
Tax Map/Parcel \#: 26-115
Total Project Area (Limits of Disturbance): 7.94 acres or 345,866 square feet
Total Area of Critical Slopes on Parcel: 2.02 acres | $26 \%$ of total site area
Area of Proposed Critical Slope Disturbance: 1.00 acres | $13 \%$ of total site area | $50 \%$ of total critical slopes area
Comprehensive Plan (General Land Use Plan): High Density Residential
Current Zoning Classification: R-3 Multifamily Residential

## Background

Ashley Davies of Riverbend Development, on behalf of Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA), has submitted an application for waiver of critical slopes at 900-1000 $1^{\text {st }}$ Street S on October 16, 2019. Proposed improvements associated with this project will impact critical slopes on-site and approval of a critical slope waiver is required per Section 341120(b). The applicant provided updated materials on November 8, 2019. A final site plan is required prior to redevelopment of the site, and the final site plan must conform to all requirements and standards prior to approval. Details on the critical slope waiver request are provided below.

## Application Details

Ashley Davies of Riverbend Development, on behalf of Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority (CRHA), is requesting a waiver from Section 34-1120(b) of the City Code (Critical Slope Ordinance) to allow for construction of 113 multifamily residential units, a community center, CRHA offices, surface parking lots, and private outdoor recreational facilities. A Special Use Permit application (SP19-00009) has been submitted to authorize establishment of the private outdoor recreational facilities, and is also before the Planning Commission for a recommendation.

Improvements specific to areas where critical slopes would be impacted should the waiver be approved are shown on the Critical Slope Exhibit (Attachment C) and include multifamily residential buildings, sidewalks, parking lots, a basketball court, and stormwater management facilities.

Existing critical slopes areas located on this Property include 2.02 acres or 26 percent of the site. The applicable definition of "critical slope" is as follows:

Any slope whose grade is $25 \%$ or greater, and (a) a portion of the slope has a horizontal run of greater than 20 feet, and its total area is $6,000 \mathrm{SF}$ or greater, and (b) a portion of the slope is within 200 feet of a waterway. See City Code Sec. 34-1120(b)(2).

Based on the information presented within the application materials, Staff verifies that the area for which this waiver is sought meets all of the above-referenced components of the definition of "critical slope".

The following information is relevant to the evaluation of this request:

- Large stands of trees: The rear of the site is wooded.
- Rock outcroppings: Not specified.
- Slopes greater than 60\%: Not specified
- Waterway within 200 feet: Pollocks Branch.
- Location of other areas of the Property, outside critical slopes areas, that fit the definition of a "building site" and could accommodate this proposed development: The majority of the proposed building footprints and parking areas, and related grading/ land disturbance, are located outside of the critical slopes areas. Based on the information available to staff at this time: the proposed development, could not be conducted without disturbing critical slope areas. However, a development of similar use and residential density could potentially be accommodated outside of critical slope areas with a different site design.


## Vicinity Map



Provided on Critical Slope Waiver Application Plan, dated November 8, 2019

## Area Topography



## Standard of Review

A copy of Sec. 34-1120(b) (Critical Slopes Regulations) is included as Attachment D for your reference. The provisions of Sec. 34-1120(b) must guide your analysis and recommendations.

It is the Planning Commission's responsibility, when a waiver application has been filed, to review the application and make a recommendation to City Council as to whether or not the waiver should be granted based off the following:
i. The public benefits of allowing disturbance of a critical slope outweigh the public benefits of the undisturbed slope (public benefits include, but are not limited to, stormwater and erosion control that maintains the stability of the property and/or the quality of adjacent or environmentally sensitive areas; groundwater recharge; reduced stormwater velocity; minimization of impervious surfaces; and stabilization of otherwise unstable slopes); or
ii. Due to unusual size, topography, shape, location, or other unusual physical conditions, or existing development of a property, one (1) or more of these critical slopes provisions would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use, reuse or redevelopment of such property or would result in significant degradation of the site or adjacent properties.

If the recommendation is for City Council to grant the requested waiver, the Planning Commission may also make recommendations as to the following:
i. Whether any specific features or areas within the proposed area of disturbance should remain undisturbed (for example: large stands of trees; rock outcroppings; slopes greater than $60 \%$, etc.)?
ii. Whether there are any conditions that could be imposed by City Council that would mitigate any possible adverse impacts of the proposed disturbance?

## Review and Analysis of the Waiver Request

Each applicant for a critical slopes waiver is required to articulate a justification for the waiver (Attachment B), and to address how the land disturbance, as proposed, will satisfy the purpose and intent of the Critical Slopes Regulations, as found within City Code Sec. 34-1120(b)(1). In order to grant a waiver, City Council is required to make one of two specific findings, either:
(1) public [environmental] benefits of allowing disturbance of the critical slope outweigh the benefits afforded by the existing undisturbed slope per City Code 34-1120(b)(6)(d.i), or
(2) due to unusual physical conditions or existing development of a site, the critical slopes restrictions would unreasonably limit the use or development of the property, see City Code 341120(b)(6)(d.ii.).

## Applicant's Justification for Finding \#1

The applicant states that "the proposed development utilizes CRHA property for the creation of new affordable housing units. Our goal as a development team has been to minimize impacts to environmentally sensitive areas of the site, including critical slopes. Because of this goal, $50 \%$ of the entire area of critical slopes remains undisturbed. New dwelling units are generally in the areas of the site that have been previously developed, and setbacks have been minimized to keep new dwelling units away from a majority of the critical slopes. The site will be designed to control stormwater and erosion while creating the primary public benefit of a significant number of new affordable housing units for Charlottesville."

## Applicant's Justification for Finding \#2

The applicant states that "our site design generally follows areas of the site that have been previously developed, with some minimal deviations, As such, City GIS layers show critical slopes under existing buildings and in areas of existing walls and green space. In order to utilize the site for the greatest good and create new affordable housing units and resident amenities some disturbance of the slopes is necessary. There is no anticipated degradation of the site or adjacent properties and all slopes will be appropriately stabilized. The proposed site plan and critical slopes exhibit allow for a conservative amount of spacing around all proposed buildings to ensure adequate access for construction and building maintenance purposes."

## Applicant's Analysis of Potential Impacts

Per Section 34-1120(b)(1), the critical slopes provisions are intended to protect topographical features that have a slope in excess of the grade established and other characteristics for the following reasons and whose disturbance could cause one (1) or more of the following negative impacts.
A. Erosion affecting the structural integrity of those features: The application states the structural integrity of critical slopes is preserved through the proposed layout. In most cases, critical slopes are avoided by concentrating development on previously developed areas of the site.
B. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties: The application states stormwater is handled via on-site detention facilities and areas near the existing stream are left undisturbed.
C. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands: The application states there are no proposed impacts to streams and wetlands.
D. Increased stormwater velocity due to loss of vegetation: The application states vegetation on slopes and areas near the stream are preserved.
E. Decreased groundwater recharge due to changes in site hydrology: The application states no impacts to groundwater recharge are anticipated.
F. Loss of natural or topographic features that contribute substantially to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community, such as loss of tree canopy, forested areas and wildlife habitat: The application states area proposed for redevelopment is not a natural or forested area.

## Staff Analysis

## Environmental Sustainability Department Comments

A. Erosion affecting the structural integrity of those features: No comment.
B. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties: No comment.
C. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands: The applicant states that "There are no proposed impacts to streams and wetlands". However, the applicant is proposing to satisfy their stormwater quality requirements by purchasing nutrient credits off-site. These requirements are meant to ensure that no increase in pollutants occurs as the result of land use conversion from redevelopment. But if the requirements are met, even in part by purchasing credits, then by default the pollutant loading from the site in the post-development state will be higher, and there will be resulting stormwater-related impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as Pollocks Branch, which is situated immediately below the proposed project. The applicant did not include the location of Pollocks Branch on Sheet 4, Critical Slopes Impact Map, of the Critical Slopes Waiver Request submission dated 11/8/19. As a result, it is difficult to assess the full impact of the proposed disturbance of critical slopes on Pollocks Branch.
D. Increased stormwater velocity due to loss of vegetation: The applicant states "Vegetation on slopes and areas near the stream are preserved", however, there are proposed impacts to critical slopes for the creation of two new stormwater outfalls that will indeed have to remove existing vegetation on critical slopes and near Pollocks Branch. The applicant did not include the location of Pollocks Branch on Sheet 4, Critical Slopes Impact Map, of the Critical Slopes Waiver Request submission dated $11 / 8 / 19$. As a result, it is difficult to assess the full impact of the proposed disturbance of critical slopes on Pollocks Branch.
E. Decreased groundwater recharge due to changes in site hydrology: The applicant states that "No impacts to groundwater are anticipated". However, the applicant is proposing to meet their stormwater quality requirements by purchasing off-site nutrient
credits. This undermines the purpose/intent "to recognize that the development of critical slopes may result in concentrated and/or excessive stormwater runoff". The addition of 1.82 acres of impervious cover to the site will decrease the amount of groundwater recharge accomplished by the site as a whole.
F. Loss of natural or topographic features that contribute substantially to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community, such as loss of tree canopy, forested areas and wildlife habitat: The applicant states "Area proposed for redevelopment is not a natural or forested area", however the applicant proposes to disturb critical slopes that are currently forested for installation of two new stormwater outfalls. This loss of existing tree canopy will affect the natural beauty of the community and reduce wildlife habitat.

## Additional Comments Specific to Critical Slope Waiver Exhibit

 Sheet 21. Please depict the extents of critical slopes proposed to be disturbed on this sheet so that staff can determine which areas of critical slopes proposed to be disturbed are already developed.
2. Ensure all existing utility lines that are to be demolished, especially those in critical slope areas, are labeled and depicted as such. Some existing lines that are presumably to be demolished are not labeled/depicted accordingly.
3. Ensure all existing trees to be removed, especially those in critical slope areas, are labeled and depicted as such. Several trees that are presumably to be removed as not labeled/depicted accordingly.
4. Existing chain link fences are not labeled to be removed or to be preserved. Please label accordingly.

## Sheet 4

5. Please depict the location of Pollocks Branch and any other streams; the location of any existing slopes greater than $60 \%$; and the location of any existing rock outcroppings on the Critical Slopes Impact Map.
6. It appears that existing critical slopes in the vicinity of the proposed stormwater outfall on the south end of the property will be impacted beyond those that have been identified. Ensure all critical slopes that will be impacted are depicted and included in the associated calculations of square feet and percentage of critical slopes impacted.
7. There is a thick black line depicted on the south end of the property, within the area of critical slopes proposed to be disturbed, that is not labeled. What is this feature?

## Engineering Department Comments

## General

Insufficient information is presented to determine the extent and locations of impact to the critical slopes on-site. An approved stormwater management plan has not been acquired. To
that end, changes to the site development may result in significant changes to the proposed Critical Slopes Impact Map presented.

## Additional Comments Specific to Critical Slope Waiver Exhibit Sheet 4

The impact of critical slopes outside of parcel area are not shown; utility impact is shown on a Stonehenge Avenue property.

## Planning Department Comments

Per Section 34-1120(b)(6)(d)(ii), the shape and location of the critical slopes may unreasonably restrict the use and development of the subject properties in a manner in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. Alternative site layouts may reduce impacts to critical slope areas, but may also impact other development factors such as achievable residential unit counts due to increased construction costs.

## 2013 Comprehensive Plan

Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider the following goals of the Comprehensive Plan while making a recommendation:

Chapter 1 Land Use, Goal 3.1 Respect natural resources and sensitive environmental areas, including designated flood plain areas, rivers and streams.

Chapter 4 Environment, Goal 3.5 Improve stream and vegetated buffer conditions to increase wildlife and aquatic habitat, groundwater recharge and stream base flow, decrease sedimentation and improve environmental aesthetics.

Chapter 5 Housing, Goal 3.1 Continue to work toward the City's goal of $15 \%$ supported affordable housing by 2025.

Chapter 5 Housing, Goal 5.5 Support redevelopment of public and/or other subsidized housing to re-integrate those properties into existing neighborhoods, consistent with other Comprehensive Plan objectives/strategies. Where applicable, support resident bill of rights as formally adopted.

## General Land Use Plan

The approved Land Use Plan calls for the site to be High Density Residential, which is defined as a density of more than 15 dwelling units per acre (DUA) by the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. The applicant currently proposes a density of 14.23 DUA.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission focuses on whether the public benefits of disturbance of the critical slope outweigh the public benefits of keeping the critical slopes undisturbed, as well as the potential negative erosion and stormwater impacts to
environmentally sensitive areas that may be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

## Potential Conditions

Should the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Critical Slope waiver, staff recommends the consideration of the following conditions:

1. Require erosion and sediment control measures that exceed minimum requirements in order to mitigate potential impacts to undisturbed critical slopes areas, per Section 34-1120(b)(1)(a-c), including but not limited to:
a. Silt fence with wire reinforcement and six (6) feet stake spacing, and
b. Other measures in excess of minimum requirements determined by City Engineering Staff to be necessary to protect Pollocks Branch from sedimentation.
2. The critical slope area outside of approved encroachment boundaries shall be clearly marked in the field, and the approved stormwater management plan and construction plan shall include a note requiring such limits of disturbed area to remain for the duration of construction and land disturbing activities.
3. Final stabilization of the areas of critical slopes disturbed shall be permanent measures to include replanting of native tree and shrub species to restabilize the critical slopes and potential wildlife habitat.
4. Require construction methods to phase construction of the buildings (the buildings adjacent to $1^{\text {st }}$ Street to be constructed first) in order to create a better stabilized site and create a more efficient erosion measure.
5. Prior to disturbance at the site, install a fixed, immoveable barrier to protect root zones of existing trees identified to be preserved at the drip line to remain throughout full completion of the construction.

## Planning Commission Role: Advisory Recommendation

The Planning Commission should consider all of the information presented by CRHA within the waiver application, as well as the information and analysis provided by Staff, and then determine whether or not:
A. Within the critical slope area, do there exist any of the following topographic features whose disturbance may cause negative impacts?
(i) Erosion affecting the structural integrity of the critical slopes, adjacent properties, or environmentally sensitive areas.
(ii) Stormwater impacts to adjacent properties or environmentally sensitive areas.
(iii) Loss of tree canopy and wildlife habitat that contribute to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community.
B. Are there grounds for a waiver, pursuant to $\S 34-1120(b)(6)(d)$ ?
(i) Public benefits of allowing disturbance of the critical slopes outweigh public benefits of keeping the critical slopes undisturbed.
(ii) The Site has issues such as unusual size, unusual topography, unusual shape, unusual location, or other unusual physical conditions, therefore, requiring the critical slopes to remain undisturbed would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use, reuse, or redevelopment of the Site, OR would result in significant degradation of the Site or adjacent properties.
(iii) Would granting the requested waiver be detrimental to the health, welfare, or safety of the public? Detrimental to the orderly development of the Site or adjacent properties? Contrary to sound engineering practices?
C. If the Planning Commission recommends that Council should approve the waiver request, are there any conditions that could mitigate the adverse impacts of disturbing the Critical Slope Area?

## Suggested Motions

1. "I move to recommend approval of the requested critical slope waiver with no conditions, based on a finding that [reference at least one]:

- The public benefits of allowing the disturbance outweigh the benefits afforded by the existing undisturbed critical slope, per Section 34-1120(b)(6)(d)(i)
- Due to unusual physical conditions, or the existing development of the property, compliance with the City's critical slopes regulations would prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use or development of the property, per Section 341120(b)(6)(d)(ii)

2. "I move to recommend approval of the critical slope waiver, subject to conditions, based on a finding that [reference at least one]:

- The public benefits of allowing the disturbance outweigh the benefits afforded by the existing undisturbed critical slope, per Section 34-1120(b)(6)(d)(i)
- Due to unusual physical conditions, or the existing development of the property, compliance with the City's critical slopes regulations would prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use or development of the property, per Section 341120(b)(6)(d)(ii)

My motion for approval includes the following conditions:
$\qquad$ the following features or areas should remain undisturbed [specify]
3. "I move to recommend denial of the requested critical slope waiver"

## Attachments

A. Critical Slope Waiver Application, submitted October 16, 2019
B. Critical Slope Waiver Supplement, update submitted November 8, 2019
C. Critical Slope Waiver Exhibit, update submitted November 8, 2019
D. Critical Slopes Ordinance

## WAIVER REQUEST FORM

Please Return To: City of Charlottesville<br>Department of Neighborhood Development Services<br>PO Box 911, City Hall<br>Charlottesville, Virginia 22902<br>Telephone (434) 970-3182<br>Fax (434) 970-3359

For a Critical Slopes Waiver Request, please include one of the following application fees: $\$ 75$ for single-family or twofamily projects; $\$ 500$ for all other project types. *additional application form required For all other Waiver Requests, please include one of the following application fees: $\$ 50$ for single-family or two-family projects; $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 0}$ for all other project types.

Project Name/Description South First Street, Phase 2 Parcel Number 26011500
Address/Location 900-1000 First Street South
Owner Name CRHA Applicant Name Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development

Applicant Address: 455 2nd Street SE, Suite 201, Charlottesville, VA 22902
Phone ( H ) $\qquad$ (W) 434-245-4971
(F) $\qquad$
Email: ashley@riverbenddev.com
Waiver Requested (review Zoning Ordinance for items required with waiver submissions):
$\qquad$ Sidewalk
*Contact Staff for Supplemental Requirements
__Site Plan Review
Landscape
__SetbacksCommunication Facilities
$\qquad$ Stream Buffer Mitigation Plan
Description of Waiver Requested: See attached narrative and exhibit
$\square$
__Other
Lighting
__Signs

Reason for Waiver Request:

## Disturbance of critical slopes

x Critical Slopes *additional application form required
$\qquad$

Applicant Signature

Property Owner Signature (if not applicant)

Date
10-11-2019
Date


## City of Charlottesville <br> CRITICAL SLOPES WAIVER REQUEST SUPPLEMENT

Please review city zoning ordinance section 34-1120(b) "Critical Slopes" and submit a completed Waiver Application Form, Critical Slopes Waiver Request Supplement and a Critical Slope Exhibit*.

Applicant: Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development

## Property Owner: Grant Duffield, CRHA, Executive Director

Project Description: What are you proposing to do on this site?
Redevelopment of Property to include multifamily and townhouse units, resident amenities and property management.
Existing Conditions: 58 affordable dwelling unit, community center

Total Site Area: 7.94 acres

Zoning (if applying for rezoning-please note existing and intended change): R-3

Percentage of Area that is made up of critical slopes - meets criteria set forth in Sec. 34-1120(b)(2) Definition of critical slope: greater than or equal to $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ slopes and a) a portion of the slope has a horizontal run of greater than twenty (20) feet and its area is six thousand $(6,000)$ square feet or greater; and $b$ ) a portion of the slope is within two hundred (200) feet of any waterway:

## Total Critical Slope Area:

Critical slopes make up $\underline{2.02}$ acres of the site's $\underline{7.9}$ acres, or $\underline{25} \%$ of the site area.
*If critical slopes extend beyond property line, quantify total critical slope area as well as provide area of critical slope that falls within site area.

## Critical Slope Area Disturbed:

$\underline{1}$ acres of the total critical slope area identified above will be disturbed, or $50 \%$ of the total critical slope area. Proposed critical slope area to be disturbed is $12 \%$ of the site area.

[^3]This application should be used to explain how the proposed project meets some or all of the requirements as described in Section 34-1120(6) "Modification or waiver." The applicant is expected to address finding \#1 and/or finding \#2 and justify the finding by utilizing the "critical slope provisions" as a guide. Completing this application will help staff make their recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.

City Council may grant a modification or waiver, upon making one or more of the following findings:

Finding \#1: The public benefits of allowing disturbance of critical slope outweigh the public benefits of the undisturbed slope( public benefits include, but are not limited to, stormwater and erosion control that maintains the stability of the property and/or the quality of adjacent or environmentally sensitive areas; groundwater recharge; reduced stormwater velocity; minimization of impervious surfaces; and stabilization of otherwise unstable slopes)

The proposed development utilizes CHRA property for the creation of new affordable housing units. Our goal as a development team has been to minimize impacts to an environmentally sensitive areas of the site, including critical slopes. Because of this goal, $50 \%$ of the entire area of critical slopes remain undisturbed.
New dwelling units are generally in the areas of the site that have been previously developed, and setbacks have been minimized to keep new dwelling units away from a ma io rity of the critical slopes. The site will be designed to control stormwater and erosion while creating the primary public benefit of a significant number of new affordable housing units for Charlottesville. Finding \#2. Due to unusual size, topography, shape, location, or other unusual physical conditions, or existing development of a property, one (1) or more of these critical slopes provisions would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use, reuse or redevelopment of such property or would result in significant degradation of the site or adjacent properties.

As mentioned previously, our site design generallv follows areas of the site that have been previously developed, with some minimal deviations. As such, City GIS layers show critical slopes under existing buildings and in areas of existing walls and green space. In order to utilize the site for the greatest good and create new affordable housing units and resident amenities some disturbance of the slopes is necessary There is no anticipated degradation of the site or adjacent properties and all slopes will be a appropriately stabilized. The proposed site plan and critical slopes exhibit allow for a conservative amount of spacing around all proposed buildings to ensure adequate access for construction and building maintenance purposes
Please address how Finding \#1 and/or Finding \#2 will be met utilizing the "critical slope provisions" noted below.

1. Erosion affecting the structural integrity of those features. Structural integrity of critical slopes is preserved through the proposed layout. In most cases, critical slopes are avoided by concentrating development on the previously developed areas of the site.
2. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties.

Stormwater is handled via on-site detention facilities and areas near the existing stream are left undisturbed.
$\qquad$
3. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands.
There are no proposed impacts to streams and wetlands.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
4. Increased stormwater velocity due to loss of vegetation.

Vegetation on slopes and areas near the stream are preserved
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
5. Decreased groundwater recharge due to changes in site hydrology.

No impactsto groundwater recharge are anticipated.
6. Loss of natural or topographic features that contribute substantially to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community such as loss of tree canopy, forested areas and wildlife habitat.
Area proposed for redevelopment is not a natural or forested area
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Please list all attachments that should be viewed as support to the above explanations.
Critical Slopes Exhibits included

Please sign the following statement.
I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information I have provided above is based on sound engineering and surveying data and that this site has been carefully inspected and reviewed for the purposes of completing this application accurately. I certify that as the property owner/applicant I have not given false information that may affect the decisions made regarding this development.

| Property Owner |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ashant Duffield, CRHA, Executive Director |  |

## Applicant

Please do not write below this line. For office use onlv. Planner's Comments/Recommendations:








Sec. 34-1120. - Lot regulations, general.
(a) Frontage requirement. Every lot shall have its principal frontage on a street or place (i) that has been accepted by the city for maintenance, or (ii) that a subdivider or developer has been contractually obligated to install as a condition of subdivision or site plan approval and for which an adequate financial guaranty has been furnished to the city. Except for flag lots, stem lots, and cul-de-sac lots, or other circumstances described within the city's subdivision ordinance, no lot shall be used, in whole or in part, for any residential purpose unless such lot abuts a street right-of-way for at least the minimum distance required by such subdivision ordinance for a residential lot.
(b) Critical slopes.
(1) Purpose and intent. The provisions of this subsection (hereinafter, "critical slopes provisions") are intended to protect topographical features that have a slope in excess of the grade established and other characteristics in the following ordinance for the following reasons and whose disturbance could cause one (1) or more of the following negative impacts:
a. Erosion affecting the structural integrity of those features.
b. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties.
c. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands.
d. Increased stormwater velocity due to loss of vegetation.
e. Decreased groundwater recharge due to changes in site hydrology.
f. Loss of natural or topographic features that contribute substantially to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community such as loss of tree canopy, forested areas and wildlife habitat.

These provisions are intended to direct building locations to terrain more suitable to development and to discourage development on critical slopes for the reasons listed above, and to supplement other regulations and policies regarding encroachment of development into stream buffers and floodplains and protection of public water supplies.
(2) Definition of critical slope. A critical slope is any slope whose grade is $25 \%$ or greater and:
a. A portion of the slope has a horizontal run of greater than twenty (20) feet and its total area is six thousand $(6,000)$ square feet or greater; and
b. A portion of the slope is within two hundred (200) feet of any waterway as identified on the most current city topographical maps maintained by the department of neighborhood development services.

Parcels containing critical slopes are shown on the map entitled "Properties Impacted by Critical Slopes" maintained by the department of neighborhood development services. These critical slopes provisions shall apply to all critical slopes as defined herein, notwithstanding any subdivision, lot line adjustment, or other action affecting parcel boundaries made subsequent to the date of enactment of this section.
(3) Building site required. Every newly created lot shall contain at least one (1) building site. For purposes of this section, the term building site refers to a contiguous area of land in slopes of less than $25 \%$, as determined by reference to the most current city topographical maps maintained by the department of neighborhood development services or a source determined by the city engineer to be of superior accuracy, exclusive of such areas as may be located in the flood hazard overlay district or under water.
(4) Building site area and dimensions. Each building site in a residential development shall have adequate area for all dwelling unit(s) outside of all required yard areas for the applicable zoning district and all parking areas. Within all other developments subject to the requirement of a site plan, each building site shall have adequate area for all buildings and structures, parking and loading areas, storage yards and other improvements, and all earth disturbing activity related to the improvements.
(5) Location of structures and improvements. The following shall apply to the location of any building or structure for which a permit is required under the Uniform Statewide Building Code and to any improvement shown on a site plan pursuant to Article VII of this chapter:
a. No building, structure or improvement shall be located on any lot or parcel within any area other than a building site.
b. No building, structure or improvement, nor any earth disturbing activity to establish such building, structure or improvement shall be located on a critical slope, except as may be permitted by a modification or waiver.

## (6) Modification or waiver.

a. Any person who is the owner, owner's agent, or contract purchaser (with the owner's written consent) of property may request a modification or waiver of the requirements of these critical slopes provisions. Any such request shall be presented in writing and shall address how the proposed modification or waiver will satisfy the purpose and intent of these provisions.
b. The director of neighborhood development services shall post on the city website notice of the date, time and place that a request for a modification or waiver of the requirements of these critical slopes provisions will be reviewed and cause written
notice to be sent to the applicant or his agent and the owner or agent for the owner of each property located within five hundred (500) feet of the property subject to the waiver. Notice sent by first class mail to the last known address of such owner or agent as shown on the current real estate tax assessment books, postmarked not less than five (5) days before the meeting, shall be deemed adequate. A representative of the department of neighborhood development services shall make affidavit that such mailing has been made and file the affidavit with the papers related to the site plan application.
c. All modification or waiver requests shall be submitted to the department of neighborhood development services, to be reviewed by the planning commission. In considering a requested modification or waiver the planning commission shall consider the recommendation of the director of neighborhood development services or their designee. The director, in formulating his recommendation, shall consult with the city engineer, the city's environmental manager, and other appropriate officials. The director shall provide the planning commission with an evaluation of the proposed modification or waiver that considers the potential for soil erosion, sedimentation and water pollution in accordance with current provisions of the Commonwealth of Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook and the Virginia State Water Control Board best management practices, and, where applicable, the provisions of Chapter 10 of the City Code. The director may also consider other negative impacts of disturbance as defined in these critical slope provisions.
d. The planning commission shall make a recommendation to city council in accordance with the criteria set forth in this section, and city council may thereafter grant a modification or waiver upon making a finding that:
(i) The public benefits of allowing disturbance of a critical slope outweigh the public benefits of the undisturbed slope (public benefits include, but are not limited to, stormwater and erosion control that maintains the stability of the property and/or the quality of adjacent or environmentally sensitive areas; groundwater recharge; reduced stormwater velocity; minimization of impervious surfaces; and stabilization of otherwise unstable slopes); or
(ii) Due to unusual size, topography, shape, location, or other unusual physical conditions, or existing development of a property, one (1) or more of these critical slopes provisions would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use, reuse or redevelopment of such property or would result in significant degradation of the site or adjacent properties.

No modification or waiver granted shall be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, detrimental to the orderly development of the area or adjacent properties, or contrary to sound engineering practices.
e. In granting a modification or waiver, city council may allow the disturbance of a portion of the slope, but may determine that there are some features or areas that cannot be disturbed. These include, but are not limited to:
(i) Large stands of trees;
(ii) Rock outcroppings;
(iii) Slopes greater than 60\%.

City council shall consider the potential negative impacts of the disturbance and regrading of critical slopes, and of resulting new slopes and/or retaining walls. City council may impose conditions as it deems necessary to protect the public health, safety or welfare and to insure that development will be consistent with the purpose and intent of these critical slopes provisions. Conditions shall clearly specify the negative impacts that they will mitigate. Conditions may include, but are not limited to:
(i) Compliance with the "Low Impact Development Standards" found in the City Standards and Design Manual.
(ii) A limitation on retaining wall height, length, or use;
(iii) Replacement of trees removed at up to three-to-one ratio;
(iv) Habitat redevelopment;
(v) An increase in storm water detention of up to $10 \%$ greater than that required by city development standards;
(vi) Detailed site engineering plans to achieve increased slope stability, ground water recharge, and/or decrease in stormwater surface flow velocity;
(vii) Limitation of the period of construction disturbance to a specific number of consecutive days;
(viii) Requirement that reseeding occur in less days than otherwise required by City Code.
(7) Exemptions. A lot, structure or improvement may be exempt from the requirements of these critical slopes provisions, as follows:
a. Any structure which was lawfully in existence prior to the effective date of these critical slopes provisions, and which is nonconforming solely on the basis of the requirements of these provisions, may be expanded, enlarged, extended, modified and/or reconstructed as though such structure were a conforming structure. For the purposes of this section, the term "lawfully in existence" shall also apply to any
structure for which a site plan was approved or a building permit was issued prior to the effective date of these provisions, provided such plan or permit has not expired.
b. Any lot or parcel of record which was lawfully a lot of record on the effective date of this chapter shall be exempt from the requirements of these critical slopes provisions for the establishment of the first single-family dwelling unit on such lot or parcel; however, subparagraph (5)(b) above, shall apply to such lot or parcel if it contains adequate land area in slopes of less than $25 \%$ for the location of such structure.
c. Driveways, public utility lines and appurtenances, stormwater management facilities and any other public facilities necessary to allow the use of the parcel shall not be required to be located within a building site and shall not be subject to the building site area and dimension requirements set forth above within these critical slopes provisions, provided that the applicant demonstrates that no reasonable alternative location or alignment exists. The city engineer shall require that protective and restorative measures be installed and maintained as deemed necessary to insure that the development will be consistent with the purpose and intent of these critical slopes provisions.
(9-15-03(3); 11-21-05; 1-17-06(7); 1-17-12; 7-16-12)

## APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF A FINAL SITE PLAN

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

## DATE OF MEETING: December 10, 2019

Project Planner: Matt Alfele, AICP
Date of Staff Report: December 1, 2019
Development: Carlton Views Apartment III (Tax Map ID 560043000)
Applicant: Tom Papa, Carlton Views III, LLC
Applicant's Representative(s): Scott Collins, P.E., Collins Engineering
Current Property Owner: Carlton Views III, LLC
Applicable City Code Provisions: 34-800-34-827 (Site Plans)
Zoning District: PUD (Planned Unit Development)
Reason for Planning Commission Review: Site plans associated with a property with a designation of PUD are subject to review by the Planning Commission per Section 34-820(d)(1).

## Vicinity Map



## Standard of Review

Approval of a site plan is a ministerial function, as to which the Planning Commission has little or no discretion. When an applicant has submitted a site plan that complies with the requirements of the City's Site Plan Ordinance, then approval of the plan must be granted. In the event the Planning Commission determines there are grounds upon which to deny approval of a site plan, the motion must clearly identify the deficiencies in the plan, that are the basis for the denial, by reference to specific City Code sections and requirements. Further, upon disapproval of a site plan, the Planning Commission must identify the modifications or corrections that would permit approval of the plan.

## Summary

Scott Collins, P.E. of Collins Engineering, acting as agent for Carlton Views III, LLC is requesting the approval of a final site plan to construct the last phase of the Carlton Views PUD. This phase will include forty-eight (48) one and two bedroom apartments, parking, a recreation area, and a dog park. City Council approved the rezoning of the parcel from M-I Industrial to PUD on December 17, 2018 with proffered conditions. During review of the site plan, staff has found the applicant to be in compliance with the approved proffers and development plan with the possible exception of proffer $\mathbf{3 ( f )}$ :

The Landowners shall retain the existing tree canopy on the east side of the Subject property, adjacent to Franklin Street, within an area designated as open space for the PUD. The final site plan for the PUD development shall depict how this requirement will be satisfied.
In order to accommodate a recreational space onsite, the developer is removing three trees from the northeast edge of the property. Staff believes the removal of any existing canopy from the east side of the property would be in violation of proffer 3(f). The applicant has provided a letter (Attachment B) indicating how proffer 3(f) is being satisfied and the removal and replacement of existing trees is not a violation. Per section 34-820(d)(1), Planning Commission is the reviewing body for site plans connected to PUDs. Planning Commission needs to decide if the site plan (Attachment A), as presented, conforms to the signed proffer statement. If Planning Commission finds the removal and replacement of trees on the eastern side of the property is in conformance with the signed proffer statement, staff recommends approval of the site plan (conditioned on all comments within the Comment Letter dated October 31, 2019 be addressed, Attachment D).

## Site Plan Compliance

Site plans are reviewed for compliance with City codes and standards. An overview of site plan requirements and the location of those items on the site plan are outlined below.

## Site Plan Requirements

A. Compliance with applicable zoning district regulation PUD Planned Unit Development (per Sections 34-490-34-517)
The property is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD). The project complies with all requirements of the development plan and signed proffer statement, with the possible exception of proffer statement 3(f).
B. Compliance with the City's Erosion and Sediment Control ordinance, Chapter 10 The applicant's erosion and sediment control plan can be found on pages 10 through 13 of the site plan. Once comments in the letter dated October 31, 2019 are addressed, the plan will be in compliance.
C. Compliance with General Standard for site plans (Sections 34-800-34-827)

1. General site plan information, including but not limited to project, property, zoning, site, and traffic information: Found on Sheets 1 and 1 B.
2. Existing condition and adjacent property information: Found on Sheet 2.
3. Phasing plan: Found on Sheet 1. This is the final phase (phase IV) of the Carlton Views PUD.
4. Topography and grading: Found on Sheet 5.
5. Existing landscape and trees: Found on Sheet 2.
6. The name and location of all water features: NA.
7. One hundred-year flood plain limits: NA.
8. Existing and proposed streets and associated traffic information: Found on Sheets 1 through 3.
9. Location and size of existing water and sewer infrastructure: Found on Sheet 4.
10. Proposed layout for water and sanitary sewer facilities and storm drain facilities: Found of Sheets 4, 6, and 7.
11. Location of other existing and proposed utilities and utility easements: Found on Sheet 4.
12. Location of existing and proposed ingress to and egress from the property, showing the distance to the centerline of the nearest existing street intersection: Found on Sheet 3.
13. Location and dimensions of all existing and proposed improvements: Found on Sheets 3 through 9.
14. All areas intended to be dedicated or reserved for public use: Found on Sheet 3 (Sidewalks).
15. Landscape plan: Found on Sheet 8.
16. Where deemed appropriate by the director due to intensity of development:
a. Estimated traffic generation figures for the site based upon current ITE rates: Found on Sheet 1.
D. Additional information to be shown on the site plan as deemed necessary by the director or Commission in order to provide sufficient information for the director or Commission to adequately review the site plan.
On December 17, 2018 City Council approved the rezoning of the subject property to PUD with a development plan and signed proffer statement. The development plan can be found as Attachment C. Below are the approved proffered conditions:
17. Specific Development—The Subject Property shall be developed in accordance with the PUD Development Plan. (Attachment C)
18. Provision of Accessible, Affordable Dwelling Units--Where the PUD Development Plan indicates residential uses, the portion(s) of the Subject Property that will contain residential dwelling units shall incorporate handicapped-accessible dwelling units and affordable dwelling units, as set forth following below.
a. Affordable dwelling units (ADUs), as defined within the City's Zoning Ordinance, will be provided within the PUD, as follows:
i. at all times: at least thirty percent (30\%) of the affordable dwelling units required by the City's Zoning Ordinance ("Required ADUs") within the PUD shall be occupied by, or reserved for occupancy by, households having income of not more than 60\% AMI; and ii. at all times: at least fifteen percent (15\%) of the Required ADUs within the PUD shall be occupied by, or reserved for occupancy by, households having income of not more than 40\% AMI.
b. Handicapped-accessible units will be provided among the Required ADUs, meeting Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards ("UFAS") standards for accessibility, or Virginia Housing Development Authority ("VHDA") standards for universal design; specifically: at least fifteen percent (15\%) of the Required ADUs within the PUD shall meet UFAS guidelines for accessibility, and at least thirty percent (30\%) of the Required ADUs within the PUD shall meet VHDA guidelines for universal design.
c. The Landowners shall record within the land records of the Circuit Court for the City of Charlottesville one or more instruments containing covenants or restrictions assuring that the Subject Property will provide the Required ADUs referenced in Paragraph 2(a), above, for a period of not less than twenty (20) years from the date the first Required ADU is occupied by a household of persons meeting the applicable AMI requirements. The Landowners shall notify the City's zoning administrator promptly of the date on which the first Required ADU is occupied by a household of persons meeting the applicable AMI requirements.
d. Administration of the Required ADUs shall be conducted in a manner such that books and records will be kept to document the following:
i. section 8 voucher holders will have first priority for occupancy of any available Required ADU within the PUD;
ii. each owner of a residential dwelling unit within the PUD shall maintain records documenting the household income of the occupants of the dwelling unit, and (as to units offered for rental at market rates) of the owner's efforts to obtain funding or financing to facilitate the occupancy of the dwelling unit as an ADU in accordance with the AMI levels referenced in paragraph 2(a), above; and iii. once per year the Landowners shall provide a written report to the zoning administrator, accompanied by evidence that the requirements of paragraphs 2(a)(ii)(1) and (2) have been satisfied.
e. Notwithstanding the foregoing: if, on or before December 31, 2019, both of the following conditions (i) and (ii) have been satisfied, then one hundred percent (100\%) of the residential dwelling units within the PUD will be affordable dwelling units ("Required ADUs") subject to the provisions of 2(b) - (d) preceding above:
i. federal tax credits have been approved and syndicated, AND ii. permanent financing has been obtained for construction of the project as a one-hundred-percent affordable housing project.
iii. Further: if conditions (e)(i) and (e)(ii) are both satisfied on or before December 31, 2019, then thirty percent (30\%) of the Required ADUs provided in accordance with this paragraph (e) shall be occupied by, or reserved for occupancy by, households having income of not more than $60 \%$ AMI, and fifteen percent (15\%) of the Required ADUs shall be occupied by, or reserved for occupancy by, households having income of not more than $30 \%$ AMI. This information cannot be determined at site plan review.
19. Development design and features-in addition to any requirements of the City's zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance, water protection ordinance, or other applicable laws or ordinances, the use and development of the Subject Property shall comply with all of the following:
a. No building or structure within the PUD shall exceed a height of 65 feet Building elevations demonstrating compliance with this requirement shall be included within the final site plan for the PUD development. Found on Sheet 1, satisfied, but will be checked again during building permit review.
b. Each building façade that fronts on Carlton Avenue shall be designed to include a door or other entrance feature. Building elevations depicting how this requirement will be satisfied shall be included within the final site plan for the PUD development. Found on Sheet 3 and will be checked again during building permit review.
c. Within the PUD, the number of on-site parking spaces shall not exceed the minimum required by the City's zoning ordinance; however, if additional parking spaces are required as a condition of receiving grant funding, or other financing, to support the provision of the Required ADUs, then upon presentation of documentation of such requirement to the City's zoning administrator, a landowner may include the additional number of on-site parking spaces necessary for receipt of such funding/ financing. Found on Sheet 3, satisfied. d. All outdoor light fixtures shall be equipped with full-cutoff luminaires, and with devices for redirecting light (e.g., shields, visors, hoods, etc.) to eliminate light glare and block direct light spillover onto neighboring properties. Each light fixture shall be recessed to conceal the light source from all viewing positions except those positions permitted to receive illumination. Directional task lighting (e.g., floodlights, spotlights, sign lights, etc.) shall illuminate only the intended task, and no light from any fixture(s) used in such task lighting shall shine directly onto neighboring properties or roadways, nor shall any task lighting have the effect of causing an excessive amount of light to be released skyward. Found on Sheet 9, satisfied.
e. Upon written request from a public official of the City of Charlottesville, a landowner shall provide a location within the Subject Property at which Charlottesville Area Transit can, without charge, establish a bus stop/ shelter. The City shall bear the cost of providing, installing and maintaining the bus stop/ shelter. Not requested to date.
f. The Landowners shall retain the existing tree canopy on the east side of the Subject property, adjacent to Franklin Street, within an area designated as open space for the PUD. The final site plan for the PUD development shall depict how
this requirement will be satisfied. This is the question before Planning Commission.
20. Site design shall provide pedestrian linkages connecting on-site buildings, buildings on-site open space, and neighborhoods adjacent to the PUD. These pedestrian linkages shall be depicted within the final site plan proposed for the PUD development. Found on Sheet 3, satisfied.
E. Compliance with Additional Standards for Specific Uses (Sections 34-930-34-938) A Dumpster is being proposed per Section 34-932. Found on Sheet C3.

## Public Comments Received

One member of the public has stopped by to review the plan and had concerns with doors on the dumpster. Carlton Views I has a dumpster with doors, but they are always open. A Site Plan Conference was held with the public on September 18, 2019.

## Recommendation

If Planning Commission finds the applicant has satisfied proffer 3(f), staff recommends approval of the final site plan conditional on all comments within the October 31, 2019 Comment Letter being addressed.

If Planning Commission finds that applicant has not satisfied proffer 3(f), staff recommends denial of the final site plan.

## Attachments

A. Final Site Plan dated October 9, 2019
B. Letter to Planning Commission from the applicant dated November 11, 2019
C. Approved Development Plan
D. Staff Comment Letter Dated October 31, 2019

















November 11, 2019

Planning Commission
City of Charlottesville
610 East Market Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902

## RE: Carlton Views III - Tree Canopy Proffer

Commissioners,

Please accept this letter as an explanation of how the above referenced project proposes to meet the accepted proffer 3(f) related to "retaining the existing tree canopy on the east side of the Subject property, adjacent to Franklin Street".

In order to accommodate the necessary site amenities for the project, including an active recreation area and dog park, three (3) of the existing trees within the wooded area adjacent to Franklin Street will be removed. The existing canopy from these (3) trees is calculated (based on the field survey of the canopy and dripline) to be approximately 860 square feet.

To mitigate the loss in tree canopy, additional trees will be planted in the area adjacent to Franklin Street. The addition of these trees will add approximately 1,496 square feet in tree canopy, replacing the existing canopy on the east side of the property with over $11 / 2$ times as much new tree canopy.

The following is a list of the proposed trees to be removed and planted:

## Existing impacted Tree Buffer Area:

18" Oak - approximately 385 SF existing tree canopy
Medium shade tree - approximately 290 SF existing tree canopy
Medium shade tree - approximately 185 SF existing tree canopy
Total impacted tree canopy: $\mathbf{8 6 0}$
Proposed mitigation for Tree Buffer Area:
(1) London Planetree $=368$ sf tree canopy
(2) Willow oaks $=740$ sf tree canopy
(1) Dogwood $=124$ sf tree canopy
(6) Nellie Stevens = 264 sf tree canopy

Total proposed new tree canopy: 1,496 sf
The proposed trees will not only increase the overall tree canopy but will also serve to mitigate street and neighboring property exposure to the parking area and proposed parking lights. The project anticipates a total tree canopy of 9,055 sf, which is twice the required tree canopy for the overall development.

Sincerely,

Scott Collins


CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE<br>"A World Class City"<br>Neighborhood Development Services 610 East Market Street Charlottesville, VA 22902<br>Telephone 434-970-3182<br>Fax 434-970-3359<br>www.charlottesville.org



October 31, 2019
Collins Engineering
Attn: Scott Collins, P.E. 200 Garrett Street
Suite K
Charlottesville, VA 22902

## RE: Carlton Views Phase IV (Carlton Views Apartments III) (1339 Carlton Avenue TMP: 560043000) FINAL SITE PLAN

Scott,
The above referenced final site plan was submitted to the office for an initial round of review on August 27, 2019 and a second round of review on October 10, 2019. Staff has reviewed proposed development and found the following deficiencies. Per Section 34-820(2) the proposed development is denied. You have a ninety day "grace period" to address these deficiencies and resubmit the plan without fees for review. This grace period will expire on December 15, 2019. Revisions not submitted by this date will be considered a new submittal and new fees will be assessed. If you are unable to re-submit by this date, you can request an extension on the project per Section 34-823(e) of the City Code.

1. Comments from Hugh Blake, Engineer, may be sent under separate cover
2. Comments from Matt Alfele, City Planner, are attached.
3. Comments from Amanda Poncy, Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator, are attached.
4. Comments from Roy Nester, Utilities, are attached.

Please revise the plan and resubmit 4 hard copies and a digital file for additional review. If you have questions, please contact me at 434-970-3636 or alfelem@charlottesville.org

Sincerely yours,


Matt Alfele
C: Collins Engineering, Attn: Scott Collins, P.E., scott@collins-engineering.com Carlton Views III, LLC
7 E 2nd ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Street
Richmond, VA 23224
Missy Creasy
Hugh Blake
Amanda Poncy
Roy Nester

City Staff have made a good faith effort to identify all deficiencies within August 27, 2019 and October 10, 2019 submissions; however, in the event that there remains any other deficiency which, if left uncorrected, would violate local, state or federal law, regulations, or mandatory engineering and safety requirements, such other deficiency shall not be considered, treated or deemed as having been approved. These comments are based on the current submission; future submissions may generate additional comments. The following items need to be addressed in the revised site plan: Be advised that major changes to the site plan may result in new comments not reflected in this review

## Engineering

City Engineer - Hugh Blake

## (May be sent under separate cover)

## Planning

City Planner - Matt Alfele

1. Proffer 3(f) states: The Landowners shall retain the existing tree canopy on the east side of the Subject property, adjacent to Franklin Street, within an area designated as open space for the PUD. The final site plan for the PUD development shall depict how this requirement will be satisfied. The supplemental letter (dated October 9, 2019 and titled Carlton Views III -Parcel D Letter of Modification), and corresponding site plan indicates trees will be removed from this area. Only City Council can modify a proffer condition through Section 34-66(d). The developer has three options as it relates to this proffer:
a. Update the site plan to show all existing trees to remain and indicate on the site plan how the trees will be protected during construction;
b. Petition City Council through Section 34-66(d) to modify proffer 3(f);
c. Per Section $34-820(\mathrm{~d})(1)$ the Planning Commission is the reviewing authority for PUDs. The applicant can make a case that the development, as proposed, complies with proffer 3(f). December 10, 2019 would be the earliest Planning Commission agenda to address this question.

## Traffic <br> Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator - Amanda Poncy

2. I agree with the amount shown on Sheet 1, but please include the specific calculation (1 space/2 units).
3. REPEAT COMMENT: (P) Sheet 2: Please include existing street widths, right of way widths and pavement widths per Sec. 34-827 d(8). I realize these are included on

Sheet 3, but they should also be shown on the Existing Conditions exhibit. They should also be shown for Franklin Street.
4. REPEAT COMMENT: (P) Sheet 2: Please include dimensions of existing and proposed walkways and locations of curb ramps at Franklin and Carlton per Sec. 34827 d(13). I realize these are included on Sheet 3 and 6, but they should also be shown on the Existing Conditions exhibit.
5. Sheet 3: As drawn, it appears that there is curbing across the dumpster pad. There should be ramp here, but no truncated dome. Please revise.
6. Sheet 3: The note about transitioning to from a CG-2 to flush curb does not clarify things. There is still curb shown between the bike racks and the turnaround area. Please remove unless there is reason to keep it.

## Utilities

Utility Engineer - Roy Nester

## General:

7. Please show where electrical / telephone / cable / fiber-optic service is provided to the proposed building. Please clearly differentiate between above ground and below ground lines. If these proposed lines are below ground and in City ROW, please provide a profile for these lines. Power lines in ROW will need to be in a concrete encased duct-bank.

## Water:

8. Thank you for the water demand calculations. Based on a peak demand of 95 GPM , a 2 -inch water meter will be required for this project. Please revise the notes to reflect this.
9. Repeat Comment: On sheet 7, the W6.1 and W6.2 details have been superseded. Please use current versions as applicable.
10. Please add a note below the updated W6.2 detail that the current City standard 2inch meter setter is a McDonald 720B712WFFF 775.
11. On sheet 4 , please move the 2 -inch water meter further into ROW. We want the box at least 5 -feet from the concrete stairs so if we ever have to excavate the box, we have room to work and are less likely to damage / undermine the steps.

## SANITARY SEWER

12. The sanitary sewer flow calculations submitted are not acceptable. In these calculations, the methodology and assumptions have changed from the previous 3 phases. Please refer to your previous calculations and update them as needed for this development. We have provided you via email the previous calculations that were acceptable for Phase 3.

# Memorandum 

Neighborhood Development Services<br>Office of the City Engineer City Hall Annex, 610 East Market St., Charlottesville

To: Matt Alfele
From: Hugh K. Blake, PE
Date: 31 October 2019
Subject: 1335 Carlton Avenue Phase III (Carlton Views III Parcel D) - Engineering Review Comments

Hello Matt:
Below are my engineering review comments for this project.

## GENERAL

1. REPEAT COMMENT: Provide the appropriate fees for final engineering review: SWM plan review.
2. REPEAT COMMENT: The LOD linetype could not be located. Provide the linetype for this.
3. REPEAT COMMENT: Provide a retaining wall report for proposed walls that meet the threshold as shown in the Standards and Design Manual.
4. REPEAT COMMENT: "Delay work as long as possible..." is not a design note that can be enforced by an inspector. Provide additional construction instructions for the erosion and sediment control notes: As one example, explain how the building and footers will be constructed in close proximity to the sediment trap. Is this feasible?

## SHEET 2

1. REPEAT COMMENT: Clarify the location of the ROW along Carlton Avenue. Provide the approved plat. There has been a question concerning the extent of the ROW.

## SHEET 14

1. Provide the stormwater management analysis in the pre-developed condition for Parcel C. This was granted from the previous approved plan (confirmed, recently, over the telephone, as I understand this).
2. The watershed summary table shows On-site pre-developed and post-developed areas that are different ( 0.90 and 0.96 acres). These areas need to be equal. Revise analysis.

## Attachment D

3. Revise stormwater text to reflect the areas for Parcel D, only.

SWM

1) REPEAT COMMENT: (Emphasis added.) Provide a VRRM spreadsheet (Redevelopment) for the entirety of parcel D (and LOD beyond the parcel where relevant). Furthermore, regarding quality, identify all site outfalls (from parcel D), Limits of Analysis, and provide either the energy balance for each or otherwise compliant channel protection analysis. Provide details of the Flood Protection analysis as well. -In association with the above, provide all relevant Tc paths (with flow regime data), drainage areas, curve numbers, etc. for existing and proposed conditions.

TR-55 Worksheet 2 and 4 shows DA SO-1 (Pre-Dev) and DA SO-1 (Post-Dev.) with different areas. These areas need to be equal. Revise analysis.

Future reviews may generate additional comments.

Sincerely,

Hugh K. Blake, PE


[^0]:    HOHENBERGER, ANN

[^1]:    Executive Vice President-Corporate

[^2]:    
    

[^3]:    *Critical Slope Exhibit: Survey indicating location and area of critical slopes and what portions of critical slopes are proposed to be disturbed. Survey should be prepared, sealed, signed and dated by a professional engineer or land surveyor licensed to practice within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

