# PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET <br> TUESDAY, November 9, 2021 at 5:30 P.M. <br> Virtual Meeting 

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

Beginning: 5:00 p.m.
Location: (Electronic/Virtual)
II. Commission Regular Meeting

Beginning: 5:30 p.m.
Location: (Electronic/Virtual)
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)

## 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. ZM21-00002-0 Nassau Street -Franklin Street Land Trust III landowner, has submitted a Rezoning Application for 0 Nassau Street, identified within the City's Real Estate Tax records by Parcel Identification No. 610079600, 610079700, and a portion of 610079000 (Subject Properties). Pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-41, the purpose of the application is to change the zoning district classification of the Subject Property from R-2 (Residential Two-Family) to R-3 (Residential Multifamily Medium Density) subject to certain proffered development conditions ("Proffers") and development plan. The Proffers include: (1) DESIGN: The design, height, density, and other substantive characteristics of the Project shall remain essentially the same, in all material aspects, as described within the application materials submitted to the City on July 16, 2021, (2) HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES: any buildings and structures located on the Property shall not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height, and (3) LAND USES The Property may be used only for the following: By-right: single-family detached, single-family attached, townhome, two-family, accessory buildings, structures and uses; multifamily dwellings; residential treatment facility (1-8 residents), utility lines; With a provisional or special use permit: home occupations and utility facilities. Any uses other than those listed above shall be prohibited. The proposed development plan indicates 2 multifamily buildings with 5 units in each building for a total of 10 units on the Subject Properties. The proposed density will be 19.4 dwelling units per acre (DUA). The Subject Property is approximately 0.51 acres with frontage on Nassau Street. The Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for Low Density Residential. Information pertaining to this application may be viewed online at www.charlottesville.gov/agenda. Persons interested in this Rezoning may contact NDS Planner Matt Alfele by e-mail (alfelem@charlottesville.gov).

## IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

Continuing: until all action items are concluded.

1. Coleman Street Critical slope
2. 240 Stribling Avenue

## V. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE/ADJOURN

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Tuesday November 23, 2021 -5:30PM | Work Session | Capital Improvement Program |
| Tuesday December 14, 2021 - 5:00 PM | PreMeeting |  |
| Tuesday December 14, 2021 - 5:30 PM | Regular Meeting | Minutes - May 11, 2021, June 8, 2021, July 13, 2021, August 10, 2021, August 31, 2021, September 14, 2021, October 11, 2021, October 12, 2021, October 21, 2021 <br> Capital Improvement Program <br> Rezoning: Park St Christian Church PUD and MAACA site PUD |

## 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, Accessory Dwelling Unit, Middle Density zoning and Affordable Dwelling Unit , $12^{\text {th }}$ and Rosser/CH Brown Historic Conservation District (six properties)
Site Plan -Flint Hill PUD
Site Plan, Critical Slope Waiver - 1223 Harris
Special Use Permit - Fire Station on 250 Bypass
Future Entrance Corridor

- 916 E High Street - Comprehensive Sign Plan Request (Sentara)
- 2005 JPA - New apartment building, requires SUP (Mitchell Matthews Architects)
- 1252 N Emmet - New medical office building (Aspen Dental)
- 1815 JPA - New apartment building (Wassenaar+Winkler Architects)
- 1150 5th Street SW - new convenience store and gas canopy (Wawa, Riverbend)
- 1801 Hydraulic Road - revised Comp Sign Plan, revised design review (Hillsdale Place, Riverbend)


## PLEASE NOTE: THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

PLEASE NOTE: We are including suggested time frames on Agenda items. These times are subject to change at any time during the meeting.

Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator at (434) 970-3182 or submit a request via email to
ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48 hour notice so that proper arrangements may be made.

During the local state of emergency related to the Coronavirus (COVID19), City Hall and City Council Chambers are closed to the public and meetings are being conducted virtually via a Zoom webinar. The webinar is broadcast on Comcast Channel 10 and on all the City's streaming platforms including: Facebook, Twitter, and www.charlottesville.gov/streaming. Public hearings and other matters from the public will be heard via the Zoom webinar which requires advanced registration here: www.charlottesville.gov/zoom . You may also participate via telephone and a number is provided with the Zoom registration or by contacting staff at 434-970-3182 to ask for the dial in number for each meeting.

## LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY 10/1/2021 TO 10/31/2021

1. Preliminary Site Plans
2. Final Site Plans
3. Site Plan Amendments
4. Subdivision
a. 1615 East Market Street - October 12, 2021(not recorded as of 10/25/2021)
b. Grove Street PUD (TMP 230052000 and 230051000) - Major - October 21, 2021 by

Planning Commission (not recorded as of 10/28/2021)
c. Coleman Court - TMP 49-112 \& 112.2 - October 29, 2021 (not recorded as of 11/1/2021

# CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE <br> DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES <br> STAFF REPORT 

# JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATION FOR A REZONING OF PROPERTY APPLICATION NUMBER: ZM21-00002 <br> DATE OF HEARING: November 9, 2021 

Project Planner: Matt Alfele, AICP
Date of Staff Report: October 25, 2021

Applicant: Franklin Street Land Trust III
Applicant's Representative(s): Justin Shimp with Shimp Engineering, P.C. and Nicole Scro Current Property Owner: Franklin Street Land Trust III

## Application Information

Property Street Address: 0 Nassau Street
Tax Map \& Parcel/Tax Status: 610079600, 610079700, and a portion of 610079000 (real estate taxes paid current - Sec. 34-10)
Total Square Footage/ Acreage Site: Approx. 0.51 acres (22,215 square feet)
Comprehensive Plan (General Land Use Plan): Low Density Residential
Current Zoning Classification: R-2 (Residential Two-Family)
Proposed Zoning Classification: R-3 Residential Multifamily Medium Density
Overlay District: None

## Applicant's Request (Summary)

Justin Shimp (Shimp Engineering, P.C.) and Nicole Scro representing the owner, Franklin Street Land Trust III, has submitted a Rezoning Application pursuant to City Code Sec. 34-41 seeking a zoning map amendment to change the zoning district classification of the above parcel of land. The application proposes to change the zoning classification of the Subject Properties from the existing R-2 (Residential Two-Family) to R-3 (Residential Multifamily) with proffers and a development plan. The Subject Properties have road frontage on Nassau Street and the Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for Low Density Residential.

## Vicinity Map



Context Map 1


## Context Map 2-Zoning Classifications



KEY - Orange: R-2, Red: B-3, Yellow: R-1S
Context Map 3-General Land Use Plan, 2013 Comprehensive Plan


KEY: Yellow: Low Density Residential, Green: Park or Preserved Open Space
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## Standard of Review

City Council may grant an applicant a rezoning request, giving consideration to a number of factors set forth within Z.O. Sec. 34-41. The role of the Planning Commission is and make an advisory recommendation to the City Council, as to whether or not Council should approve a proposed rezoning based on the factors listed in Z.O. Sec. 34-42(a):
(a) All proposed amendments shall be reviewed by the planning commission. The planning commission shall review and study each proposed amendment to determine:
(1) Whether the proposed amendment conforms to the general guidelines and policies contained in the comprehensive plan;
(2) Whether the proposed amendment will further the purposes of this chapter and the general welfare of the entire community;
(3) Whether there is a need and justification for the change; and
(4) When pertaining to a change in the zoning district classification of property, the effect of the proposed change, if any, on the property itself, on surrounding property, and on public services and facilities. In addition, the commission shall consider the appropriateness of the property for inclusion within the proposed zoning district, relating to the purposes set forth at the beginning of the proposed district classification.

For applicant's analysis of their application per Sec 34-42 \& Sec. 34-41(d) see Attachment B.

## Sec. 34-42(a)(1): Whether the proposed amendment conforms to the general guidelines and policies contained in the comprehensive plan.

Below are specific areas of the Comprehensive Plan for which the request is in compliance:
a. Land Use
2.3: Enhance pedestrian connections between residences, commercial centers, public facilities, amenities and green space
3.4: Increase both passive and active recreational opportunities for Charlottesville residents.
b. Housing
3.3: Achieve a mixture of incomes and uses in as many areas of the City as possible.
c. Transportation
2.3: Improve walking and biking conditions by discouraging and/or minimizing curb cuts for driveways, garages, etc. in new development and redevelopment.

Below are specific areas of the Comprehensive Plan for which the request may not be in compliance:

## a. Land Use

2.1: When considering changes to land use regulations, respect nearby residential areas.

## Comprehensive Plan- Staff Analysis:

The Subject Properties are currently zoned R-2 which is one of the most restrictive zoning categories in the City. All by-right, provisional, and special uses allowed within this zoning district are Residential and Related per Sec. 34-420 and single-family attached and twofamily dwelling are the most common of these uses. The R - 3 district is relatively restricted to residential with allowable densities ranges and dwelling type being the biggest difference to the R-1 and R-2 districts. In addition to density and housing type, the R-3 district allows additional by-right uses for health care and educational facilities. The 2013 Comprehensive General Land Use Plan indicates the Subject Property remain low-density residential. The land use section of the comprehensive plan indicates all single or twofamily type housing and a density less than fifteen (15) DUA is Low Density. A rezoning of the Subject Property to R-3 would not be consistent with the 2013 Comprehensive General Land Use Plan. The density would be above fifteen (15) DUA and the housing type would be multifamily.

## Streets that Work Plan

The Streets that Work Plan labels Nassau Street "Local". Local streets are found throughout the city, and provide immediate access to all types of land uses. Although local streets form the majority of the street network, there is no specific typology associated with them. This is due in part to the many variations in context and right-of-way width, as well as the community's expressed desire to replicate as nearly as possible the feel of older local streets that do not meet current engineering and fire code standards. In addition, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan calls out Nassau Street as a Shared Roadway.

## Bike Ped Master Plan

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan calls out Nassau Street as a Shared Roadway. Shared Roadways are bicycle facilities that designate a vehicular travel lane as a shared space for people to drive and bicycle. This designation is demonstrated to all users through on-road pavement markings, known as "sharrows" or street signage indicating that people bicycling may use the full lane. These facilities do not provide any separation between people driving and bicycling and are best used on neighborhood streets or streets with a low level of bicyclist traffic stress. Currently there are is no signage or sharrows on Nassau Street.

Sec. 34-42(a)(2): Whether the proposed amendment will further the purposes of this chapter and the general welfare of the entire community.
Staff finds that changing the zoning from R-2 to R-3 would have no impact in a positive or negative direction to the general welfare of the entire community. Staff is basing this on the fact the density of the Subject Properties would not exceed ten (10) units and the uses and physical characteristic of the site would be controlled by the proffer restrictions.

Sec. 34-42(a)(3): Whether there is a need and justification for the change.
According to the City's 2013 Comprehensive General Land Use Plan, this portion of the City should be Low Density Residential with a DUA under 15. A rezoning of the Subject Property from R-2 to R-3 would not be consistent with this standard, and staff finds no justification for the change.

Sec. 34-42(a)(4): When pertaining to a change in the zoning district classification of property, the effect of the proposed change, if any, on the property itself, on surrounding property, and on public services and facilities. In addition, the commission shall consider the appropriateness of the property for inclusion within the proposed zoning district, relating to the purposes set forth at the beginning of the proposed district classification.

Most developments within the R-3 district require review and approval of a site plan per Sec. 34-802. Based on the materials provided the proposed development would require a final site plan, but staff believes all public services and facilities would be adequate to support development.

The purposes set forth per Z.O. Sec. 34-350(a) and (b) are:
Two-family (R-2). The two-family residential zoning districts are established to enhance the variety of housing opportunities available within certain low-density residential areas of the city, and to provide and protect those areas. There are two (2) categories of R-2 zoning districts:
R-2, consisting of quiet, low-density residential areas in which single-family attached and two-family dwellings are encouraged. Included within this district are certain areas located along the Ridge Street corridor, areas of significant historical importance;

Multifamily. 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. There are three (3) categories of multifamily residential zoning districts:

R-3, consisting of medium-density residential areas in which medium-density residential developments, including multifamily uses, are encouraged;

It is most likely that any development proposed on the Subject Properties would comply with the purposes set forth at the beginning of the proposed district classification. This cannot be fully determined until a proposed development is under site plan review.

The applicant is proposing to rezone the Subject Property from R-2 to R-3 with proffers and a development plan. Key aspects of the development plan include:

- Two (5) unit multifamily buildings.
- (3) one-bedroom and (2) two-bedroom units in each building.
- Not more than 10 units.
- Central parking between the two buildings.
- An outdoor recreation area behind the southernmost building.
- A greenhouse behind the recreation area.
- New sidewalk on the south side of Nassau Street.

As part of the rezoning application, the developer is proposing certain proffers related to the development.

Summary of Proffers: The proffered development conditions include:

1. DESIGN: The design, height, density, and other substantive characteristics of the Project shall remain essentially the same, in all material aspects, as described within the application materials submitted to the City on July 16, 2021, including, but not limited to, the Conceptual Site Plan, dated July 10, 2021, prepared by Shimp Engineering, P.C. Except that the characteristics of the Project may subsequently be modified to comply with City zoning regulations not modified by this application, any other material change of the Project as represented within the application materials shall require a modification of this rezoning application.
2. HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES: any buildings and structures located on the Property shall not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height. (Height is to be measured in accordance with City Code Section 34-1110 in effect as of the date this ordinance, which specifies that height, when applied to a building or structure, shall refer to the vertical distance measured perpendicularly from grade to the highest point on such building or structure.)

## 3. LAND USES

a. Permitted Uses: the Property may be used only for the following. Any uses other than those listed below shall be prohibited:
i. Residential and related uses.

1. By-right: single-family detached, single-family attached, townhome, two-family, accessory buildings, structures and uses; multifamily dwellings; residential treatment facility (1-8 residents);
2. With a provision use permit: home occupations.
ii. Other uses.
3. By-right: utility lines;
4. By special use permit: utility facilities.

Staff finds the restrictions within the development plan and proffer statement will create a development on the Subject Properties that is harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood. Staff would not support a wholesale rezoning of the Subject Property to R-3 as density, height, and uses would not be consistent with the City's Land Use Map or fabric of the neighborhood. The restriction provided for within the development plan and proffer restricts what can be developed and provides assurances it will be compatible with this part of the City.
*Highlighted sections indicate physical characteristics that can be modified through a Special Use Permit per Sec. 34-162(a).
*Highlighted sections indicate restriction outlined in the Proffer Statement.

| Current R-2 Zoning <br> Consist of quiet, low-density residential <br> areas in which single-family attached and <br> two-family dwellings are encouraged. | Proposed R-3 Zoning <br> Consist of medium-density residential areas <br> in which medium-density residential <br> developments, including multifamily uses, <br> are encouraged. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Physical Characteristics | Physical Characteristics |


|  |  |  | 25' min (Non-residential) <br> 20' min (Corner Street <br> Side) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear Setback | 25' min (Residential) <br> $50^{\prime} \mathrm{min}$ (Non-residential) | Rear Setback | 25' min (Residential) |
| Additional <br> Yard and <br> Setback <br> Requirements | None | All Yards and Setbacks | 50' from the façade of any multifamily building to the boundary of any lowdensity residential district: 22-43 DUA <br> 75 ' from the façade of any multifamily building to the boundary of any lowdensity residential district: 44-87 DUA <br> Within a residential development containing any multifamily dwellings there shall be a minimum distance between the facade of the multifamily dwelling and the boundary of any low-density residential district, as follows: <br> 50' for 22-43 DUA <br> 75' for 44-87 DUA |
| Land Coverage | No limit within setbacks | Land Coverage | 75\% max for 0-21 DUA 80\% max for 22 - 87 DUA |
| Height | 35' max | Height | 45' max (35' per proffer) |
| Min Lot Size | 6,000sqft (Single Family <br> Detached) <br> 2,000sqft (average of <br> 3,600sqft)(Single Family <br> Attached) <br> 7,200sqft (Two-family) | Min Lot Size | 6,000sqft (Single Family <br> Detached) <br> 2,000sqft (average of <br> 3,600sqft (Single Family <br> Attached) <br> 7,200sqft (Two-family) <br> 2,000sqft (Townhouse) |


|  | No requirement (non- <br> residential) | No requirement <br> (Multifamily) <br> No requirement (non- <br> residential) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Road Frontage | 50' (Single Family <br> Detached and Two-family) <br> $20^{\prime}$ (Single Family <br> Attached) <br> No requirement (non- <br> residential) | Road Frontage | $50^{\prime}$ (Single Family <br> Detached and Two-family) <br> $20^{\prime}$ (Single Family <br> Attached) |
| Parking | 1 space per unit | Parking | $16^{\prime}$ (Townhouse) <br> No requirement (non- <br> residential) |


| Residential Use (by-Right) | R-2 | R-3 | Proffer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accessory buildings, structures and uses | B | B | B |
| Adult assisted living | B | B |  |
| Amateur radio antennas, to a height of 75 ft. | B | B |  |
| Bed-and-breakfast Homestay | B | B |  |
| Bed-and-breakfast B \& B |  | B |  |
| Multifamily |  | B | B |
| Dwellings Single-family attached | B | B | B |
| Dwellings Single-family detached | B | B | B |
| Townhouse |  | B | B |
| Dwellings Two-family | B | B | B |
| Family day home 1-5 Children | B | B |  |
| Family day home 6-12 Children |  | B |  |
| Residential Occupancy 3 unrelated persons | B | B |  |
| Residential Occupancy 4 unrelated persons | B | B |  |
| Residential density 1-21 DUA |  | B |  |
| Residential Treatment Facility 1 - 8 residents | B | B | B |


| Non-Residential Use (by-Right) | R-2 | R-3 | Proffer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access to adjacent multifamily, commercial, industrial or mixed- <br> use development or use |  | B |  |
| Accessory buildings, structures and uses |  | B |  |
| Houses of worship | B | B |  |
| Health clinic up to 4,000sqft GFA |  | B |  |


| Public health clinic |  | B |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Attached facilities utilizing utility poles as the attachment <br> structure | B | B | B |
| Attached facilities not visible from any adjacent street or <br> property | B | B | B |
| Daycare facility |  | B |  |
| Elementary School |  | B |  |
| High School | B | B |  |
| Colleges and universities | B | B |  |
| Libraries | B | B |  |
| Indoor: health/sports clubs; tennis club; swimming club; yoga <br> studios; dance studios, skating rinks, recreation centers, etc. (on <br> City-owned, City School Board-owned, or other public property) | B |  |  |
| Outdoor: Parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts, <br> swimming pools, picnic shelters, etc. (city owned), and related <br> concession stands | B | B |  |
| Utility lines |  | B |  |

The Subject Properties are currently vacant. If developed by-right, they could accommodate six (6) units (three two-family dwellings) maximum. The biggest difference between the existing R-2 zoning and the R-3 development the applicant is proposing is the change to multifamily dwelling type. The current density is approximately seven (7) DUA (dwelling units per acre based off the comp plan's 15 DUA for low density residential). A change in the zoning to R-3 would increase the by-right density to twenty-one (21) DUA resulting in a maximum of ten (10) units. The applicant's proffer statement (attachment C) removes most nonresidential uses and ensures any development on the Subject Properties will be residential in nature.

## Zoning History of the Subject Property

| Year | Zoning District |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1949 | B-2 Business |
| 1958 | R-2 Residential |
| 1976 | R-2 Residential |
| 1991 | R-2 Residential |
| 2003 | R-2 Residential |

The Subject Property is bordered by:

| Direction | Use | Zoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Single-family attached | R-2 |
| South | Vacant Lot | R-2 |
| East | Single-family detached | R-1S |
| West | County |  |

Staff finds a rezoning of the Subject Properties would not be consistent with the patterns of development in the neighborhood as it relates to dwelling type. But staff finds the density being proposed would not have an adverse impact. Staff also finds the restrictions placed on the development by the proffer statement would keep the scale of the development in line with the surrounding neighborhood.

## Public Comments Received

Community Meeting Required by Z.O. Sec. 34-41(c)(2) and the Community Engagement meeting Requirements during the COVID -19 Emergency approved by City Council on July 20, 2020
On September 9, 2021 the applicant held a community meeting on Zoom from 6:30pm to 7 pm . No members of the public attended the meeting. The meeting was recorded and is available to the public through the developer.

## Other Comments

As of the date of this report, staff has not received any comments from the public. Should any comments come in after the report posted, those comments will be forwarded to Planning Commission and City Council.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff finds the proposed zoning change could contribute to goals of the City's Comprehensive Plan such as increasing the City housing stock. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning request.

## Suggested Motions

1. I move to recommend approval of this application to rezone the Subject Property from $R-2$, to $R-3$, on the basis that the proposal would service the interests of the general public and good zoning practice.
OR,
2. I move to recommend denial of this application to rezone the Subject Property from R2 to $\mathrm{R}-3$, on the basis that the proposal would not service the interests of the general public and good zoning practice.

## Attachments

A. Rezoning Application dated June 7, 2021
B. Narrative dated July 16, 2021
C. Draft Proffer Statement undated
D. Development Plan Dated July 10, 2021
E. Massing Plan
F. ADU Worksheet


## City of Charlottesville <br> Application for Rezoning

Address of Property: $\qquad$ D Nassau Street
Tax Map and Parcel Number(s): $\frac{610079700,610079600}{610079000}$, p pertien of
Current Zoning: $\qquad$
Proposed Zoning: $\qquad$
Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation: $\qquad$ low density residential

Applicant: Nicole Scro \$ Justin Shimp Address: 912 East High Street, Charlatterille VA 22902 Phone: 434-218-0513 Email: nscro@ gallifreyenterpeises.com Applicant's Role in the Development (check one):

Owner Owner's Agent Contract Purchaser
Owner of Record: Franklin Street Land Trust 111
Address: 912 East High Street, Charlottesville VA 22902
Phone: $434-953-6116$ Email: jurtin@shimp-engineering.com
(1) Applicant's and (2) Owner's signatures
(1) Signature
 Print Nicole Scro Date $6 / 7 / 2021$ Applicant's (Circle One): LLC Member LLC Manager Corporate Officer (specify) $\qquad$ Other specify): Individual
(2) Signature
 Print Justin Shimp Date $6 / 7 / 2021$ Owner's (Circle One); LLC Member LLC Manager Corporate Officer (specify) Other (specify): TRustee

## City of Charlottesville

 Application ChecklistProject Name: $\qquad$
GINIA-10
I certify that the following documentation is ATTACHED to this application:


Applicant
Signature $\qquad$ Print $\qquad$ Date $\qquad$ $6 / 1 / 2021$ By Its: $\qquad$
(For entities, specify: Officer, Member, Manager, Trustee, etc.)


## City of Charlottesville

## Personal Interest Statement

Project Name: $\qquad$
I swear under oath before a notary public that:

$\square$
A member of the City of Charlottesville Planning Commission (identified below), or their immediate family member, has a personal interest in the property or transaction that is the subject of this application.

Planning Commissioners): $\qquad$
Or


No member of the City of Charlottesville Planning Commission, or their immediate family member, has a personal interest in the property or transaction that is the subject of this application.

## And

$\square$
A member of the City of Charlottesville City Council (identified below), or their immediate family member, has a personal interest in the property or transaction that is the subject of this application. City Councilors): $\qquad$

## Or

$x$
No member of the City of Charlottesville planning Commission, or their immediate family member, has a personal interest in the property orftransaetronthat is the subject of this application.

## Applicant:

By:


Signature Nillole ScR Print Justin Shimp Date
 Its: $\qquad$ (Officer, Member, Trustee, etc.)

## Commonwealth of Virginia

## City of Charlottesville

The foregoing instrument was subscribed and sworn before me this $16 t^{\text {th }}$ day of July, 2021 by Nicole Kero + Justin Shimp.



## City of Charlottesville <br> Disclosure of Equitable Ownership

Project Name:
O Nassau street

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 diractors 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.
Name Justin Ship Address $1 / 2$ East High Street

Name $\qquad$ Address Charlettesville VA 22902

Name $\qquad$ Address $\qquad$
Name $\qquad$ 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: Justin chump \& NieCe Sure
By:
Signature


Print
 Date


Its: $\qquad$ (Officer, Member, Trustee, etc.)


| Application Type | Quantity | Fee | Subtotal |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Rezoning Application Fee | 1 | $\$ 2000$ | 2000 |
| Mailing Costs per letter |  | $\$ 1$ per letter |  |
| Newspaper Notice | Payment Due <br> Upon Invoice |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  | 2000 |

## Office Use Only

Amount Received: $\qquad$
$\qquad$ Received By: $\qquad$


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

1. Massing Plan
2. Traffic Study (contact Brennan)
3. Keep in mind any termindogy usib should match that used in the city cod.
4. Fillout and retain ADU work sheet
5. $\qquad$
$\qquad$

Planner Signature:


## Attachment B

Application Narrative
July 16, 2021
0 Nassau Street Rezoning

## Summary

| Tax Map Parcels | Owner | Acreage | Zoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 610079000 (portion) | Franklin Street <br> Land Trust III | 0.1734 | R-2 |
| 610079700 | Franklin Street <br> Land Trust III | 0.1710 | R-2 |
| 610079600 | Franklin Street <br> Land Trust III | 0.1710 | R-2 |
| Total Acreage: | $\mathbf{0 . 5 1 5 4}$ |  |  |

Justin Shimp and Nicole Scro (together, the "Applicant"), on behalf of the Franklin Street Land Trust III (the "Owner"), the owner of real property designed on the City of Charlottesville, Virginia (the "City") tax maps as parcels 610079000 (portion of), 610079700, and 610079600 and having an address of 0 Nassau Street (collectively, the "Property"), request to rezone the Property from R-2 to R-3 to allow for the construction of two 5-unit multifamily dwellings (or "five-plexes"). The Property is overlaid with a star and outlined in red on the City's existing zoning map shown below.


As shown above, the Property is currently zoned R-2, which would allow for the construction of three duplexes (or 6 units total). Enclosed is the approved site plan for two of the three potential by-right duplexes. By contrast, the proposed zoning, R-3, would allow for the construction of two 5 -unit multifamily dwellings (or 10 units total). The resulting proposed density would be 19.4 dwelling units per acre.

The proposed 10 units will consist of the following:
6 one-bedroom units, approximately 500 square feet in size, and
4 two-bedroom units, approximately 730 square feet in size.

Each of the 2 multifamily buildings will consist of the following:
3 one-bedroom units on the ground floor, and
2 two-bedroom units in on the second floor.

The footprint of each multifamily dwelling is approximately 1,680 square feet, which is nearly identical to the by-right duplexes adjacent to the Property that are currently under construction (as well as the approved, potential by-right duplexes that could be constructed on the Property). The building footprints of the by-right duplexes per the site plan are 1,716 square feet each. (Though, the actual duplexes under construction per the building permits are slightly smaller at $24^{\prime} \times 64^{\prime}$, or 1,536 square foot footprints.) Each duplex consists of 2, three-bedroom units. Our request is to build a similar building to the by-right dwellings, but by rezoning the Property, we can allow for more families to live within the same (or nearly the same) buildable footprints.

The proposed rezoning of the Property to R-3 also allows for further diversity of housing types and sizes in this neighborhood, matching the varied preferences of prospective residents, as well as existing conditions. The picture on the next page shows the varied housing types and sizes along Nassau Street.

As you can see, just on this stretch of Nassau Street, homes range from 4 to 1-bedroom units. There is non-profit construction adjacent to private construction. Habitat typically constructs homes for those with $30-60 \%$ of the area median income (AMI), which are adjacent to marketrate rental homes and newly constructed market-rate, single-family detached homes for-sale.

The addition of two 5-unit, multifamily dwellings would be consistent with the existing "neighborhood character" and add value to the City in the form of increasing the depth of variety and choice of housing for existing and future residents.
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Thomas Jefferson Community Land Trust


Habitat for Humanity


Two Duplexes, Private Development


Single-Family Detached


28-unit Apartment

The Property is directly bordered by:

| Direction | Use | Zoning |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Two-family residential unit | R-2 |
| South | Two-family residential unit | R-2 |
| East | Agricultural, Rural Area (Albemarle County) | RA |
| West | Single-family residential unit | R-1 |

As demonstrated above, rezoning of the Property would be consistent with the patterns of development on Nassau Street.
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## R-3 Amenity Requirements

Pursuant to Section 34-366 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, certain amenities are required in R-3 developments. Each unit will have its own laundry facilities, satisfying Section 34-366(a)(1). The storage facilities will be located internal to the building footprint, adjacent to the stairways, satisfying Section 34-366(a)(2).

Pursuant to Section 34-366(a)(3), the required recreational areas are as follows:

For each one-bedroom unit, 200 square feet of adult space is required.
For each two-bedroom unit, 200 square feet of adult space plus 20 square feet of child space is required.

Therefore, the proposed development is required to have the following:

2,080 square feet of recreational space
2,000 square feet of adult recreational space (6*200 SF + 4*200 SF), and 80 square feet of child recreational space (4*20 SF).

In addition, Section 34-366(c) requires $25 \%$ of the total required recreational space to be indoor or weather protected, which equals 520 square feet ( 0.25 * 2080 SF)

The proposed development will satisfy the above recreational requirements by offering:

520 square foot greenhouse, to be used by residents to grow produce or other plants for the full year, and complimenting the farm located to the rear of the Property.

630 square foot recreational space, consisting of playground equipment and natural playscapes.

13,080 square feet of pervious area (consisting of landscaping, open greenery, potential dog area or lawn games, etc.)
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Below is a picture of the greenhouse that will be installed on the Property (a Riga XL Greenhouse). One of the two individual Applicants currently has such a greenhouse on his Property in Nelson County.


## Conformity with Comprehensive Plan

The proposed development is in alignment with various goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

## Land Use Chapter:

Goal 2.3, "Enhance pedestrian connections between residences, commercial centers, public facilities, amenities and green spaces."

The Property is located across the street from Rives Park, and to the rear of the Property is the location of the future, private farm, Rootstock Farm (previously named Hogwaller Farm). In addition, less than a quarter mile from the Property, at 1011 Linden Avenue, is the future location of the International School. Higher density within close proximity of these public and private facilities and amenities, as well as greenspace, allows for more residents to enjoy and utilize such benefits of the City, and encourages non-vehicular transportation to such places.

## Transportation Chapter:

Goal 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."

The proposed development satisfies off-street parking requirements, with a portion of parking located behind the proposed structures. In addition, the proposed
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development will connect the newly constructed sidewalk from the adjacent two byright developments. The extension of the sidewalk, and the location of parking internal to the site, will allow for an enhanced pedestrian experience along Nassau Street, satisfying the above goal.

## Housing Chapter:

Vision: "The quality and diversity of the City of Charlottesville's housing stock creates the basis for viable neighborhoods and a thriving community. In order to be a truly world class city, Charlottesville must provide sufficient housing options to ensure safe, appealing, environmentally sustainable, and affordable housing for all population segments and income levels, including middle income. Consequently, City neighborhoods will feature a variety of housing types, housing sizes, and incomes all within convenient walking, biking, or transit distances of enhanced community amenities that include mixed use, barrier free, higher density, pedestrian and transit-oriented housing at employment and cultural centers connected to facilities, parks, trails and services."

Goal 3, "Grow the City’s housing stock for residents of all income levels."
Goal 3.2, "Incorporate affordable units throughout the City, recognizing that locating affordable units throughout the community benefits the whole City."
Goal 3.3, "Achieve a mixture of incomes and uses in as many areas of the City as possible."
Goal 3.4, "Encourage creation of new, on-site affordable housing as part of rezoning or residential special use permit applications."
Goal 7.1, "To the greatest extent feasible, ensure affordable housing is aesthetically similar to market rate."

Allowing more density on the Property will allow more existing and future residents the opportunity to live within the urban core, closer to employment and amenities. In addition, the Housing Needs Assessment cites the need for smaller units to accommodate the large number of small households in the City. It states, "The distribution of households by size suggests a particular need for small units to accommodate the two-thirds of city households with only one or two persons... Smaller units are an effective means of providing shelter at lower rents" (page 58). By comparison, the by-right duplexes that are currently under construction consist of 1,536 square feet per unit, versus 500-700 square feet per unit within the proposed fiveplexes.

The two multifamily buildings are not intended to be new luxury housing, but rather, simple construction that can accommodate the lower end of market rate rents.

## Streets that Work Plan

The Streets that Work Plan labels Nassau Street as "Local." Local streets are found throughout the City, and provide immediate access to all types of land uses. There is no specific typology associated with "local" streets. Nassau Street is fairly wide (45') with sidewalk along the entirety of the portion of Nassau Street on the opposite side of the street from the Property. In addition, new sidewalk has been or will be installed along the Property's side of the street with each of the newly constructed dwellings listed earlier in this narrative. The Applicant intends to install sidewalk along the Property's street frontage, connecting the newly constructed sidewalk adjacent to it on either side, creating a fairly consistent sidewalk network on either side of Nassau Street.

In addition, due to the width of Nassau Street, the roadway can accommodate on-street parking, and there is currently ample on-street parking that can be utilized. The proposed development will likely not substantially add to on-street parking due to the amount of parking provided internal to the site, and on-street parking availability.

## Bike Ped Master Plan

The City's 2015 Bike Ped Master Plan calls for Nassau Street to be a "Shared Roadway." Shared Roadways are roadways where a vehicular travel lane is designated as a shared space for people to both drive and bike. This designation is demonstrated to all users through on-road pavement markings, known as "sharrows" or street signage indicating that people bicycling may use the full lane. Nassau Street does not provide any separation between people driving and bicycling. The location of parking internal to the site will allow for less competition for onstreet parking, and more room for the envisioned shared roadway.

In addition, by increasing density in close proximity to public and private facilities, amenities, and greenspace, the result is a reduction in traffic from those who would otherwise be forced to find housing in surrounding Counties and commute to the City. The goals of the Bike-Ped Master Plan, such as, functional shared roadways and increased pedestrian and bicycle transportation is more likely to come to fruition as housing demand is satisfied within the City, rather than through housing in surrounding Counties. Our current restrictive zoning forces people into cars when they may otherwise be on foot or on bicycles.
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## Potential Adverse Impacts and Mitigation

## Massing

The proposed 5 -unit buildings are similar in size and scale to the by-right duplexes currently under construction (as well as those on the approved site plan for the Property). Also, enclosed with this application is a massing rendering that shows how the proposed five-plexes compare to the buildings on the adjacent properties.

The proposed buildings are only very slightly wider, but they have a very similar footprint when compared to the by-right duplexes.

## Floodplain

The floodplain is set at the elevation stated in Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) \#16-03-1207P, effective February 16, 2017, which is between 324 and 326.2 feet. On the enclosed Conceptual Site Plan, the elevation line for 324 feet is highlighted in blue. The floodplain elevation line of 324 feet is clearly outside of the building footprints, as well as the proposed recreational area.

The Applicant has considered the effects of climate change and the increased intensity of storms. Flooding is a result of (1) Rainfall and (2) Land Cover. Land Cover is how rainfall is distributed once it hits the ground. To the rear of the subject Property, adjacent to Moore's Creek, is a riparian buffer, which is Albemarle County property. This Albemarle County property is subject to a proffer statement (ZMA-2017-00007), which states, "An undisbursed riparian buffer area ("riparian buffer") managed in accordance with Albemarle County stream buffer protection regulations (County Code Section 17-600, et. seq.) will be established and maintained for perpetuity... The riparian buffer will extend to 100 from the top of the bank of Moore's Creek or to the limits of the floodway, whichever is greater." Enclosed is the related proffer statement.

The above riparian buffer will reduce the impact of higher rainfall by protecting surrounding properties from potential erosion and higher velocity water often seen in flooding. So, by preserving natural Land Cover, we can safeguard the area from some of the consequences commonly associated with the higher frequency and intensity of storms. Similarly, Albemarle County has increased stream buffers and related regulations such that the Land Cover of Albemarle County mitigates the impact of flooding within Charlottesville.

## Traffic

By-right, 6 units can be constructed (or three duplexes). Pursuant to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10 th Edition, 6 units within three duplexes would be considered Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise). Using the "Average Rate" rather than the "Fitted Curve," 6 units within the Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) category would produce approximately 7 vehicular trips per day per unit, or 42 vehicular trips per day in total. The proposed rezoning is also considered Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise), and would therefore produce approximately 7 vehicular trips per day per unit, or 70 vehicular trips per day in total. Compared to by-right development, the proposed rezoning would produce approximately 28 additional vehicular trips per day.

Such additional vehicular trips per day is not significant when compared to the daily traffic on Nassau Street. This single development would cause substantive traffic impacts, especially when considering the potential for non-vehicular trips that can result from locating more people in an area with several amenities within walking and biking distance.

## Conclusion

Our request is to build similar buildings to the by-right dwellings, but by rezoning the Property, we can allow for more families to live within the same buildable footprints. In addition, the proposed rezoning also allows for further diversity of housing types and sizes in this neighborhood, matching the varied preferences of prospective residents, as well as existing conditions. The rezoning also provides the opportunity for simple construction to accommodate lower end market rate rents.

## Enclosed

## Conceptual Site Plan

By-right Approved Site Plan
Massing Rendering
Proposed Proffer Statement
$\qquad$
Amendment $\qquad$

## PROFFER STATEMENT

Rezoning: 0 Nassau Street
Tax Map Parcels: 610079000 (portion of), 610079700 , and 610079600

Owner: Franklin Street Land Trust III, Justin M. Shimp, Trustee<br>912 East High Street<br>Charlottesville, VA 22902

Date of Proffer Signature:
Subject properties to be rezoned from R-2 to R-3

Franklin Street Land Trust III is the owner (the "Owner") of Tax Map Parcels 610079000, 610079700 , and 610079600 (collectively, the "Property"), located in the City of Charlottesville, Virginia. The Property is the subject of rezoning application $\qquad$ to allow for the development of a project known as "0 Nassau Street" (the "Project").

Pursuant to Division 4 of the City of Charlottesville Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 34 of the City of Charlottesville Code), the Owner hereby voluntarily proffers the conditions listed below which shall be applied to the Property if it is rezoned to the requested zoning district, R-3. These conditions are proffered as part of the requested rezoning and the Owner acknowledges that the conditions are reasonable. Each signatory below signing on behalf of the Owner covenant and warrant that it is authorized signatory of the Owner for this Proffer Statement.

1. DESIGN: The design, height, density, and other substantive characteristics of the Project shall remain essentially the same, in all material aspects, as described within the application materials submitted to the City on July 16, 2021, including, but not limited to, the Conceptual Site Plan, dated July 10, 2021, prepared by Shimp Engineering, P.C. Except that the characteristics of the Project may subsequently be modified to comply with City zoning regulations not modified by this application, any other material change of the Project as represented within the application materials shall require a modification of this rezoning application.
2. HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES: any buildings and structures located on the Property shall not exceed thirty-five (35) feet in height. (Height is to be measured in accordance with City Code Section 34-1110 in effect as of the date this ordinance, which specifies that height, when applied to a building or structure, shall refer to the
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vertical distance measured perpendicularly from grade to the highest point on such building or structure.)

## 3. LAND USES

a. Permitted Uses: the Property may be used only for the following. Any uses other than those listed below shall be prohibited:
i. Residential and related uses.

1. By-right: single-family detached, single-family attached, townhome, two-family, accessory buildings, structures and uses; multifamily dwellings; residential treatment facility (1-8 residents);
2. With a provision use permit: home occupations.
ii. Other uses.
3. By-right: utility lines;
4. By special use permit: utility facilities.

The undersigned Owner hereby proffers that the use and development of the Property shall be in conformance with the proffers and conditions herein above. This document shall supersede all other agreements, proffers, or conditions that may be found to be in conflict. The Owner agrees that all proffers shall be binding to the Property, which means the proffers shall be transferred to all future property successors of the land.
[Signature Page Immediately Follows]
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WITNESS the following duly authorized signatures and seals:

## OWNER:

Franklin Street Land Trust III

By: $\qquad$
Justin M. Shimp, Trustee

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA CITY/COUNTY OF $\qquad$ , to wit:

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 20 by Justin M. Shimp, Trustee of Franklin Street Land Trust III, on its behalf.

My Commission expires: $\qquad$

## OWNER/DEVELOPER

Franklin Street Land Trust III
912 E High St, Charlottesville, VA, 22902

## TMP(S)

610079000 (Portion of)
610079600, \& 610079700

## USE

EXISTING: Vacant
PROPOSED: 2 Buildings; 5 units each

## ZONING

EXISTING: R2
PROPOSED: R3

## CRITICAL SLOPES

There are no critical slopes existing on the site.
SOURCE OF BOUNDARY \& TOPOGRAPHY
Boundary from compiled plats for subject parcel and GIS for adjoiners. Two (2) foot contour interval opography from Roger W. Ray and Associates (2/9/2016)

## FLOODZONE

Project is subject to floodplain revision study \#16-031207 P effective February 7, 2017. Buildings will be elevated above the floodplain level.

## WATER AND SANITARY SERVICES

Provided by Charlottesville Dept of Utilities


## CONTENTS

1. Cover Page

2 Conceptual Site Plan

## CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

TMP(s) Portion of 61-79, 61-796 \& 61-797

DATE OF SUBMISSION - JULY 10, 2021
project: 21.012
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## Affordable Dwelling Unit Ordinance Worksheet

Step 1: Total Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of Site
A. Total size of development site: $\quad 0.52$ acres
B. Total square footage of site: $\quad \frac{0.52}{(\# \text { of acres })} \quad \mathrm{x} \quad 43,560.00 \quad 22,450.82 \mathrm{square} \mathrm{feet}(\mathrm{sf})$
C. 1.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR): $\quad 22,450.82$ (total sf of site)
D. Gross Floor Area (GFA) of $\underline{\mathbf{A L L}}$ buildings/uses: $\quad 6,720.00 \mathrm{sf}$
E. Total site FAR: $\frac{6,720.00}{(t o t a l ~ G F A ~} \quad \div \frac{22,450.82}{(1.0 F A R)} \quad=\quad 0.30$
F. Is E greater than or equal to 1.0 FAR? NO: Your proposed development does not trigger the ADU ordinance.

YES: Proceed to Step 2 or Step 3.

## Step 2: Number of ADUs Required

G. GFA in excess of 1.0 FAR:

| 6,720.00 | - | 22,450.82 | = | -15,730.82 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (D: total site GFA) |  | (B: total SF of site) |  |  |
| -15,730.82 | x | 0.05 | = | -786.54 |

I. Equivalent density based on Units Per Acre:
i. Dwelling Units per Acre (DUA)
approved by SUP: $\begin{array}{r} \\ \text { ii. SF needed for ADUs: } \\ \begin{array}{c}\text { (H: Total GFA of } \\ A D U s)\end{array}\end{array}$
iii. Total number of ADUs required: $\begin{array}{cc}\frac{-0.0180565}{\text { (ii: ADU acreage) }} & \mathrm{x}\end{array} \quad \begin{gathered}0.00 \\ \text { (i: DUA approved) }\end{gathered} \quad=\quad 0.00$

## Step 3: Cash-in-Lieu Payment

J. Cash-in-Lieu Amount Residential:
$6,720.00$
K. Cash-in-Lieu Amount Mixed-Use:

*GFA of non-occupied space shall include: (i) basements, elevator shafts and stairwells at each story, (ii) spaces used or occupied for mechanical equipment and having a structural head room of six (6) feet six (6) inches or more, (iii) penthouses, (iv) attic space, whether or not a floor has been laid, having a structural head room of six (6) feet six (6) inches or more, (v) interior balconies, and (vi) mezzanines. GFA shall not include outside balconies that do not exceed a projection of six (6) feet beyond the exterior walls of the building; parking structures below or above grade; or and roof top mechanical structures.

## Step 4: Minimum Term of Affordability

L. Residential Project
i. Households earning up to $80 \%$ AMI:

| Unit Type | Eff. | 1BR | 2BR | 3BR | 4BR | 5BR | 6BR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Rent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HUD Fair Market Rents | \$752.00 | \$1,027.00 | \$1,179.00 | \$1,478.00 | \$1,772.00 | \$2,037.00 | \$2,303.00 |
| HUD Utility Allowance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difference per Month | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Annual Cost of ADU | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |

$$
\begin{array}{rc}
\text { Total Annual Cost of ADUs: } & 0.00 \text { (Sum of Annual Cost of ADU) } \\
\text { Minimum Term of Affordability*: } & \text { \#DIV/0! } \quad \text { (Cash-in-lieu payment / Total annual cost of ADUs) } \\
& \text { *If answer is less than } \mathbf{5} \text {, then minimum term of affordability will be } 5 \text { years. }
\end{array}
$$

M. Mixed-Use Project
i. Households earning up to $80 \%$ AMI:

| Unit Type | Eff. | 1BR | 2BR | 3BR | 4BR | 5BR | 6BR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Units |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Rent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HUD Fair Market Rents | \$752.00 | \$1,027.00 | \$1,179.00 | \$1,478.00 | \$1,772.00 | \$2,037.00 | \$2,303.00 |
| HUD Utility Allowance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Difference per Month | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Annual Cost of ADU | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |

Total Annual Cost of ADUs: Minimum Term of Affordability: *If answer is less than $\mathbf{5}$, then minimum term of affordability will be 5 years.

# CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE <br> DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT 

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING <br> APPLICATION FOR A CRITICAL SLOPE WAIVER <br> APPLICATION NUMBER: P21-0109 <br> DATE OF MEETING: November 9, 2021

Project Planner: Dannan O'Connell, AICP
Date of Staff Report: October 29, 2020

Applicant: Greater Charlottesville Habitat for Humanity
Applicant's Representative(s): Line and Grade Engineering
Current Property Owner: Greater Charlottesville Habitat for Humanity

## Application Information

Property Street Address: 0 Coleman Court, 0 Coleman Court
Tax Map \& Parcel/Tax Status: 490112000 and 490112200 (real estate taxes paid current - Sec. 34-12)
Total Project Area (Limits of Disturbance): 0.13 acres
Total Area of Critical Slopes on Parcels: 0.52 acres | 60.6\%
Area of Proposed Critical Slope Disturbance: 0.03 acres | $3.7 \%$ of total site area | $6.1 \%$ of total critical slopes area
Comprehensive Plan (General Land Use Plan): Low Density Residential
Current Zoning Classification: R-2
Overlay District: None

## Applicant's Request (Summary)

Greater Charlottesville Habitat for Humanity wishes to develop the above-referenced lots with one by-right single-family attached (duplex) residential structure. A boundary line adjustment (P21-0109) was submitted on March 24, 2021 to accommodate this development, and was approved by the City on October 29, 2021. The proposed improvements associated with the boundary line adjustment will impact critical slopes on-site as defined by Section 34-1120(b)(2). Per Section 34-1120(b) a request for a critical slope waiver must be heard by the Planning Commission.

The property is located at the northeast corner of Coleman Court and Coleman Street, and is currently undeveloped. It was previously divided into six lots but has since been consolidated into two lots with the approval of the boundary line adjustment. The properties have a combined 29 feet of frontage on the existing public street corner.

Greater Charlottesville Habitat for Humanity is requesting a waiver from Section 34-1120(b) of the City Code (Critical Slope Ordinance) to allow for by-right construction of one single-family attached structure with two residential units along with supporting infrastructure. The proposed duplex will be located on both lots, with the common property line dividing both residential units. Improvements specific to areas where critical slopes would be impacted should the waiver be approved are shown on the Critical Slope Exhibit (Attachment B) and include portions of lots 1 and 2, sanitary sewer and waterline placement, and a new private access driveway for both units.

Existing critical slopes areas located on this Property include 0.52 acres or $61 \%$ 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 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".

## Vicinity Map



## Critical Slopes per the Zoning Ordinance



## Standard of Review

Per Sec. 34-1120(6)(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.
If the recommendation is for City Council to grant the requested waiver, the Planning Commission may also make recommendations as to the following: 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.

## Project Review and Analysis

Each applicant for a critical slopes waiver is required to articulate a justification for the waiver, 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). The applicant has provided information in the attached critical slopes waiver narrative (Attachment A) for Application Finding \#1.

## Staff Analysis 34-1120(b)(d)(i) Application Finding \#1:

Planning Staff: The General Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan calls for the subject properties to be Low Density Residential land use with a DUA under fifteen. The proposed development will have a DUA of approximately two. The proposed duplex will be developed by-right in line with the established R-2 zoning for both parcels.

The proposed building footprint will be almost entirely outside the critical slope areas. Impacts to the critical slopes comes primarily from the new access easement needed to connect the building site to the street, sanitary sewer and waterline placement, and associated grading on both lots. Two trees will be removed to accommodate this development; however, the applicant indicates that stormwater runoff and erosion will not be significantly affected by the
development. Alternative site layouts are unlikely to reduce impacts to critical slope areas, as the buildable area for both parcels is almost surrounded by critical slopes, particularly the area nearest to the existing public street corner. The site layout of the currently proposed development is significantly scaled down from a previous proposal which included three duplexes on six existing lots.

## Staff Analysis 34-1120(b)(d)(ii) Application Finding \#2:

Engineering Staff: Engineering recommends the approval of the critical slope waiver under Finding 2 , since the presence of critical slopes along the public ROW frontage does effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use of the site for any development purpose. However, in accordance with City Code Section Sec. 34-1120 (6)(d): "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.", City Engineering has included several recommended conditions (listed in the following section) to ensure no detrimental effects to public health and conformance with sound engineering practices.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider the following when making a recommendation to City Council:

## Purpose and Intent of the Critical Slope Provisions

The purpose and intent of the critical slope provisions in Section 34-1120(b)(1) are to protect topographic features whose disturbance may cause negative impacts including:

Stormwater and erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties. The current configuration of the development limits the impact to critical slopes to the extent that it can be developed by-right as two lots. Critical slopes will be disturbed uphill of an existing stream and City storm sewer located north of the property.

Loss of tree canopy and topographic features that contribute to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community. The property is currently in an undeveloped, natural/overgrown state. Disturbance of ground cover on the property is minimized outside of the limits of disturbance for the duplex construction. An existing sidewalk and railing will necessarily have to be modified/removed to accommodate the new access driveway and utility connections for the development.

## Recommended Conditions

City Engineering has the following recommended conditions to ensure no detrimental effects to public health and conformance with sound engineering practices:

1) The limits of disturbance (LOD) shall be staked in the field by a Professional Surveyor as a preliminary step, prior to installation of perimeter controls.
2) "Super Silt Fence" (chain linked backing) shall be installed along the entire LOD where there is not existing or proposed impervious surfaces.
3) Construction access from the front/public ROW to the rear is provided only by $3^{\prime}$ between the LOD and building on the north side of the project and 4.5' (with a 20\% grade) on the south side. There is a minimum of 4.5' of area in the back. The LOD should be expanded to provide for typical construction methods or notes provided describing limitations on modern construction equipment in this area.

## Suggested Motions

1. "I move to recommend approval of the critical slope waiver for Tax Map and Parcel 490112000 and 490112200 , as requested, with the conditions recommended by City staff, 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 denial of the steep slope waiver for Tax Map and Parcel 490112000 and 490112200. "

## Attachments

A. Application
B. Narrative
C. Critical Slope Exhibit

## Attachment A

WAIVER REQUEST FORM
Please Return To: City of Charlottesville
Department of Neighborhood Development Services
PO Box 911, City Hall
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
Telephone (434) 970-3182
Fax (434) 970-3359
For a Critical Slopes Waiver Request, please include one of the following application fees: $\mathbf{\$ 7 5}$ 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; $\$ 250$ for all other project types.

| Project Name/Description Coleman Duplex BLA | Parcel Number 490112200 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address/Location Intersection of Coleman Street and Coleman Court |  |
| Owner Name Greater C'Ville Habitat for Humanity |  |

Applicant Address: 113 4th St NE Ste 100 Charlottesville, VA 22902
Phone (H) $4342620169_{(W)}^{(W)}$
(F)

Email: dhyer@line-grade.com
Waiver Requested (review Zoning Ordinance for items required with waiver submissions):


Description of Waiver Requested: Waiver for disturbance of $1,383 \mathrm{sf}$ critical slopes on site in order to provide access to the site.
Reason for Waiver Request: The parcel area immediately surrounding the road is entirely comprised of critical slopes Though a building pad exists on site outside of the slopes, there is no way to get to it without disturbing critical slopes.


Property Owner Signature (if not applicant)

August 3, 2021
Date
July 26, 2021
Date
Date Received: $\qquad$
Planning Commission $\qquad$ City Council $\qquad$

Comments:
Director of NDS
$\qquad$

C I VIL ENGINEERING

## CRITICAL SLOPES WAIVER REQUEST SUPPLEMENT

| Applicant: | Greater C'ville Habitat for Humanity <br> Contact: Andrew Vinisky <br> avinisky@cvillehabitat.org |
| :--- | :--- |
| Project Description: | Coleman Duplex BLA <br> One duplex proposed on 0.855 acres. BLA application to <br> consolidate six parcels into two. |
| Ex. Conditions: | Vacant land |
| Total Site Area: | $\mathbf{3 7 , 2 5 7}$ sf ( $\mathbf{0 . 8 6}$ acres) |
| Zoning: | R-2 |
| Percentage of Site Area Made |  |
| up of Critical Slopes: | $\mathbf{2 2 , 5 7 1}$ sf / 37,257 sf = 60.58\% |
| Critical Slope Disturbance: $\mathbf{1 , 3 8 3} \mathbf{s f}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{6 . 1 3 \%}$ of critical slope area, $\mathbf{3 . 7 1 \%}$ of total site area |  |

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.

The shape of this property (which is comprised of several parcels, but will be referred to as the property) is unusual. It is located on the corner of Coleman Street and Coleman Court, with only 29 linear feet of the property fronting on the road. The entire frontage of this property is located in critical slopes, meaning the only way to develop the site is to disturb the slopes. It is worth noting that these slopes are a result of the construction of the road and not naturally occurring. It is also worth noting that this critical slope waiver is required because of the proposed Boundary Line Adjustment - however, no additional lots are being created. Six existing lots are being consolidated into two. The previous plans for this site included the development of 3 duplexes, and now only 1 is proposed.


CIVIL ENGINEERING

The disturbed critical slopes area will be filled in order to build a driveway. The slopes resulting from the driveway construction will be at a 3:1 grade where possible and will be matted and seeded immediately following construction to reduce erosion.

## 2. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties.

The area of critical slopes disturbance is minimized to the extent possible to develop this site. Silt fence will be installed around the construction site perimeter, and blanket matting will be installed on slopes to reduce erosion-related impacts on adjacent properties. The drainage patterns on site are not being altered, stormwater from the site flows to existing downstream channels and will not impact adjacent properties.
3. Stormwater and erosion-related impacts to environmentally sensitive areas such as streams and wetlands.

The proposed construction is approximately 150 ft uphill of the existing stream located just north of the property, where an existing City storm sewer currently outlets. Approximately half of the construction area will flow to that stream, and the other half will flow to an existing channel south of the property. The limited impervious area added ( 2,205 sf total) and the small construction area ( $5,802 \mathrm{sf}$ ) will have minimal stormwater and erosion-related impacts - especially when looked at in relation to the stormwater passing through the site from the City storm sewer drainage area. The silt fence and slope matting, as previously mentioned, will prevent erosion.
4. Increased stormwater velocity due to loss of vegetation.

Two trees will be removed for the construction of this project. The rest of the vegetation in the area is overgrown weeds. The stormwater velocity is not expected to increase, since the existing steep slopes are not to be made any steeper, and the vegetation that will be lost due to regrading of the slopes will be replanted with low maintenance ground cover.
5. Decreased groundwater recharge due to changes in site hydrology.

The development will not have a discernable impact on the site hydrology within the critical slopes areas, and therefore groundwater recharge will not be decreased. The travel time of a water droplet across the critical slopes area in the existing and proposed conditions will remain the same, as a relatively small area of slopes are being filled for a driveway. In both pre and post development, there is very little groundwater recharge happening across such steep slopes.

CIVIL ENGINEERING
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.

This site is currently a hazard to the pedestrians using the sidewalk, and a pedestrian handrail is in place to keep anyone from accidentally stepping off the sidewalk and tumbling 10 ft down a steep hill. The proposed condition will be of substantially higher visual quality as the former City ROW on this parcel has not been maintained for decades. The disturbance of land on the site is as minimal as possible, and 0.72 acres of the site will remain untouched.

Please list all attachments that should be viewed as support to the above explanations.
-Coleman Duplex Utility Plan Exhibit

CIVIL ENGINEERING

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
1 ainl CHEs
Applicant

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

## Engineer's Comments/Recommendations:



# CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE <br> DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES <br> STAFF MEMO 

JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING UPDATE MEMO ON REZONING APPLICATION ZM20-00002 \& CRITICAL SLOPE APPLICATION P20-0079
DATE OF MEETING: November 9, 2021

Project Planner: Matt Alfele, AICP
Date of Staff Memo: October 25, 2021

Applicant: Southern Development
Applicant's Representative(s): Charlie Armstrong
Current Property Owner: Belmont Station, LLC

## Application Information

Property Street Address: 240 Stribling Avenue
Tax Map \& Parcel: 18A025000 (real estate taxes paid current - Sec. 34-12)
Total Square Footage/ Acreage Site: 12.07 acres (525,769 square feet)
Comprehensive Plan (General Land Use Plan): Low Density Residential
Current Zoning Classification: Multiple Zoned Lot: R-1S (Residential Single Family Small Lot) and R-2 (Residential Two-family)
Overlay District: None
Completeness: The application generally contains all of the information required by Zoning Ordinance (Z.O.) Sec. 34-41 and (Z.O.) Sec. 34-490.
Other Approvals Required: Critical slopes waiver (P20-0079)

## Applicant's Request and update Summary

On September 14, 2021 Planning Commission held a Public Hearing for the requested rezoning application. The application was seeking to rezone the Subject Property from R-1S (Single Family Small Lot) and R-2 (Residential Two-family) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) with a development plan and proffers. The applicant was also seeking a recommendation on a Critical Slope Waiver at that meeting. Both applications are needed for the proposed development. The proposed development and proffers included the following key features and elements:

- A density of not more than fifteen (15) Dwelling Units per Acre (DUA).
- Twenty (20) rows of townhouses, in the general or approximate locations depicted within the PUD Development Plan.
- Three (3) multifamily buildings designated as condominiums, in the general or approximate locations depicted within the PUD Development Plan.
- Two (2) single-family attached dwelling units, in the general or approximate locations depicted within the PUD Development Plan.
- A use matrix that allows residential and related uses such as single-family attached (SFA), rowhouse/townhouses (TH), single-family detached (SFD), twofamily (TF), and multifamily (MFD), family day home, and residential treatment facilities up to 8 residents; non-residential uses such as house of worship, ball fields, and swimming pools. The use matrix prohibits such uses as, nursing homes, animal shelters, libraries, and gas stations.
- The proposed PUD Use Matrix allows MFD, SFA, SFD, TH and TF by-right. Parking garages, surface parking lots under and above 20 spaces, and temporary parking facilities are allowed as ancillary uses.
- Fifteen percent (15\%) of all dwelling units constructed within the area of the Subject Property shall be Affordable Dwelling Units.
- Two (2) central greens (Open Spaces A and B), in the general or approximate locations depicted within the PUD Development Plan.
- Preservation of existing wooded area (Open Space C) between the development and Moores Creek.
- Total Open Space of 4.760 acres ( $41.9 \%$ of the total site), in the general or approximate locations depicted with the PUD Development Plan.
- Shared Use Path constructed to City Standard Detail TR-1. City detail states the minimum width will be ten (10) feet and constructed of a non-erodible surface approved by the City Engineer. Crush-and-run/stone dust may be substituted as an acceptable surface type per approval of the City Engineer.
- Four (4) new City standard roads, in the general or approximate locations depicted within the PUD Development Plan.
- A public road connection to Morgan Court.
- Six (6) private roads built to City standards for rear loading of townhouses.
- The City’s Subdivision Ordinance §29-161 requires every residential lot to have frontage on either a public street, or a private street within a townhouse development; City Council cannot, by approving a PUD Plan, amend the City's street standards). Based on the general layout shown within the PUD Plan, the private street would meet the requirements of section 34-390 of the zoning ordinance. The townhouse private-streetaccess requirements are not "dimensional requirements" (see section 34500) that can be altered by approval of a PUD Plan.
- On-street parking generally located as depicted within the PUD Development Plan. Including parking on the western side of Road A and C.
- Structured parking for the three (3) multifamily buildings to be provided within each building.
- Dwelling units within the development will have porches and balconies.
- Zero (0) minimum setbacks for structures within the development and five (5) foot setbacks for structures adjacent to properties outside the development.
- Having a minimum setback of zero (0) does not exclude the developer from providing street trees. Only areas with a maximum of zero (0) or ten (10) feet are exempt from this requirement.
- Maximum building height of fifty-five (55) feet except for lots 1-7. These lots have a maximum height of three (3) stories.
- Subtle variations of massing, wall openings, and colors will be used on the dwelling units to reduce repletion.
- Widening of Stribling Avenue along the north side of the property adjacent to Road A.
- A preliminary landscape plan with screening on the edge of the property and general location of street trees.
- Note: City Council cannot waive the street tree standards by approving the PUD Plan. Number and location of street trees required by section $34-870$ will be reviewed during final site plan approval. Preliminary review of the plan indicate there could be possible conflicts with utilities. Section 34-870(1)(a) is not applicable to this development.
- Sheltered five (5) foot sidewalks along both sides of all public roads and one side of all private roads.
- The project is being proposed as a twenty (20) phase development. The developer will need to enter into a development agreement with the City prior to approval of a final site plan.

During the Public Hearing the Planning Commission heard from sixteen (16) members of the public. Most speakers raised concerns about the safety of Stribling Avenue and how additional dwelling units on the Subject Property would be detrimental to public safety. A few speakers were in favor of the development and would like to see more affordable dwelling units in the City and felt this development would provide that. If Stribling Avenue was improved and had sheltered sidewalks, most residents in the area would be in favor, or less opposed to the development.

During Planning Commission's discussion density, affordable housing, street trees, and the proposed sidewalks on Stribling were all discussion points. Most Commissioners liked the development and the affordable units it would provide, but did not feel the proposed agreement between the developer and the City was detailed enough. The Planning Commission and City Council did not have enough information to know if the City would have to cover any gaps in funding for the improvements to Stribling Avenue. There was disagreement between what the developer felt it would cost and what the City Engineer believed the estimate should be. To address this issue and some of Planning Commissions/Staff concerns, the applicant requested and was granted a deferral.

Notwithstanding the changes noted below, the applications before you tonight are the same as what was presented to Planning Commission on September 14, 2021.

## Critical Slope Waiver Application P20-0079

No Changes

## Rezoning Application ZM20-00002

The applicant made the following two (2) changes to the PUD Development Plan:

1. Update the setback requirements on page 4:

The original plan stated:
Minimum Building setbacks:
Front: $0^{\prime}$
Side: $0^{\prime}$
Rear: $0^{\prime}$
Adjacent to outside properties: 5'
The new setbacks are:
Front: $0^{\prime}$
Side: $0^{\prime}$
Rear: $0^{\prime}$
Adjacent to outside properties: 5'
Maximum front setback: 10’
(Stribling Ave, Frontage Excluded)
2. Updates to Phasing and Open Space Requirements on page 5:

No information provided in the original plan
New information on page 5:
A minimum of 1.00 acre of Open Space shall be dedicated in Phase 1. At least 20\% total Open Space area shall be provided with each phase thereafter.

## Vicinity Map



Context Map 1


## Context Map 2-Zoning Classification



KEY - Orange: R-2, Yellow: R-1S, Light Yellow: R-1, Green: PUD

Context Map 3- General Land Use Plan, 2013 Comprehensive Plan


KEY: Yellow: Low Density Residential

## Staff Recommendations

In addition to the updates to the development plan outlined above, the applicant provided a response letter (Attachment A) to staff recommendations for denial as outlined in the September 14, 2021 Staff Report. Below are staff's responses to that letter:

1. Reason 1 concerned the inadequacy of Stribling Avenue but noted that the applicant may be pursuing avenues to provide improvements to Stribling. The applicant now has a draft agreement with the City for those improvements that would be approved by Council simultaneously with or prior to this ZMA. We hope this resolves this concern.

## Staff Response:

The level of infrastructure (Stribling Avenue as a public ROW) improvements needed is one of staff's biggest concerns as it relates to any conditional rezoning of the Subject Property. Staff is aware the applicant is continuing to work with the City to meet the perceived needs as they are understood at this time. Even with an agreement in place between the applicant and the City to provide sidewalks and improvements to Stribling Avenue, staff would still be concerned with the implementation of such an agreement and the timing needed to achieve the improvements as it relates to the development of the Subject Property. Any planning process undertaken for Stribling Avenue would need the input of the surrounding community and that engagement may alter what is currently being proposed between the applicant and the City.
2. Reason 2 revolves around Morgan Court and the concern that it is not yet a City street. This is acknowledged, but our research indicates that the ROW has been dedicated to public use by the Huntley developer. We expect that the City also holds a bond posted by that developer to assure construction of the platted streets. If it becomes necessary, the City could call that bond. I doubt that would be necessary, but those are assurances the City has from the Huntley developer.

## Staff Response:

Although ROW has been dedicated, the City has not accepted the dedication nor accepted the roads into the City's street network. Although it is correct the public improvements (roads, sidewalks, and utilities) for the Huntley PUD are bonded, the bonds were posted almost fifteen (15) years ago. Staff is concerned the current bonds being held would not be sufficient to cover completing the outstanding work needed to insure all public infrastructure meets current standards.
3. Reason 3 describes potential for utility conflicts. We have revised the required setbacks on Sheet 4, Land Use Plan, of the PUD. We hope this resolves this concern.

## Staff Response:

This update does alleviate staff's concern with utility conflicts that may come to light during site plan review. By providing a 10' maximum for front setbacks, the development plan would be allowed to exclude streetscape trees per Sec. 34-870: (a) Streetscape trees shall be planted along all existing or proposed public streets; however, the following areas are exempt from the requirement of streetscape trees:
(1) Areas subject to a zero (0) building setback requirement, or
(2) Areas where the maximum permitted building setback is fewer than ten (10) feet.
It should be noted that while the applicant now has a path forward for addressing utility conflicts, this path will result in fewer street trees within the development.
4. Reason 4 notes that staff is concerned that in many cases the private roads are neither alleys nor provide [vehicle] connectivity. This is an intentional and important design element in the PUD. To have marketable homes, vehicle access and parking are a necessity. But beyond that market-driven necessity, we have intentionally deemphasized those vehicular travelways and instead focused on the pedestrian mews on the opposite side of the buildings. We do not know the basis for staff's concern about the roadway design and are not sure if this additional information helps resolve it, but the roads do meet City SADM standards, and we hope this additional information demonstrates the intentionality and purpose of the layout.

## Staff Response:

Staff still believes the private road do not function as rear loading alleys nor provide connectivity, but are shared driveways for the sole purpose of parking. The City defines alley per Sec. 29-182(f) as Alleys with a width of not less than twelve (12) feet may be provided in the rear or side of any commercial, industrial, or residential lots; however, no dead-end alleys shall be permitted. However, when the alley is the principal means of emergency access or access for service vehicles, they shall be no less than twenty (20) feet in width; and Sec. 29-3 Alley means a form of vehicular travel way providing access to the rear or side lot line of abutting properties that front along streets. Unless dedicated to and accepted by the city, an alley is privately owned and maintained, is intended to be used primarily by the owners and occupants of the abutting properties and persons and vehicles providing services to those properties (including emergency vehicles) and is not intended for through traffic. Staff believes the "shared driveways"
provided for in the development plan are appropriate and permitted per City code, but they do not further the City's comprehensive goal of connectivity we are looking for in PUDs and/or conditional rezoning.
5. The $5^{\text {th }}$ and final concern is regarding making sure that the open space within each phase meets the minimum requirement of at least $15 \%$ of the gross land area. With this submittal, Sheet 5 of the PUD Plan and Sheet 11 on the Supplemental Plan, Phasing and Open Space Plan, were updated to indicate minimum Phase 1 Open Space to be dedicated as well as calling out $25 \%$ minimum dedication total. We expect our total open space to be closer to $40 \%$ of the gross land area and are confident that minimum required dedications can be met by dedicating all or a large portion of the open spaces proposed on the south and west sides of the site with the first phase of development.

## Staff Response:

Staff is now satisfied the Phasing Plan will meet Sec. 34-505(2).

## Staff Recommendation for ZM20-00002 (Rezoning)

Staff finds the proposed development, as presented in the application materials, could contribute to some of the City's goals within the Comprehensive Plan under the Land Use, Housing, and Transportation sections. Staff finds that the proposed PUD offers a mix of housing types within a cohesive development with connectivity, open space, and access to Moores Creek that is not currently available and meets some of the goals of the PUD ordinance. Staff also finds that long-term affordability is a priority within the development as outlined in the draft proffer statement. Staff is concerned about other aspects and recommends denial for the following reasons:

1. Due to the lack pedestrian/bicycle infrastructure and road width of Stribling Avenue, a development of this size could have an adverse impact on both the improved and unimproved sections of the road. The applicant may be pursing different avenues to provide improvements to Stribling, but the PUD plan being proposed only offers to widen the north side of Stribling Avenue adjacent to the primary street entry.
2. Staff is concerned with the proposed connection to Morgan Court. Although connectivity and two main points of ingress and egress are needed for a development of this size, Morgan Court is not currently accepted into the City street network. Due to width constraints, lack of sidewalks, and unknown quality of construction, staff cannot say with certainty that Morgan Court will ever be accepted. This creates issues as it relates to the development having two (2) points of access on a publically maintained street.
3. Staff is concerned the proposed private roads do not function as alleys nor provide connectivity and instead act as communal driveways. Private road " J " offers some connectivity with the connection to Open Space " $B$ ".

## Staff Recommendation for P20-0079 (Critical Slope Waiver)

Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider the following when making a recommendation to City Council:

## Purpose and Intent of the Critical Slope Provisions

The purpose and intent of the critical slope provisions in Section 34-1120(b)(1) are to protect topographic features whose disturbance may cause negative impacts including:

Location of public improvements. The current configuration of the development limits the impact to critical slopes when it comes to building location, but does impact critical slopes when it comes to public improvements such as roads and trails.

Loss of tree canopy and wildlife habitat that contribute to the natural beauty and visual quality of the community. If the corresponding rezoning application is approved by City Council, a majority of the trees on site will be lost during development. The only forested area to be preserved will be to the south and west of the property. At this stage it is not possible to compare the proposed development to a by-right one, even a by-right development would most likely require a Critical Slope Waiver.

## Suggested Motions

## Rezoning

1. I move to recommend that City Council should approve ZM20-00002, on the basis that the streets proposed within the PUD Development are laid out in a manner substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan, and approval of the proposed PUD Development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and will serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice.
OR,
2. I move to recommend that City Council should deny approval of ZM20-00002.

## Critical Slope

1. I move to recommend approval of the critical slope waiver for Tax Map and Parcel 18A025000, as requested, with no reservations or 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 for Tax Map and Parcel 18A025000, as requested, with 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)
Recommended Conditions:

1. Site Plans (VESCP Plans) should include, at a minimum, 4 stages/phases of ESC controls, the first shall be "Initial/Preliminary Controls" and outfall construction, and the second shall include the establishment of sediment traps and conveyances. The sequence shall dictate that no disturbance of the slopes can occur, other than to facilitate trap/conveyance construction, until after the establishment of the trap, conveyances and permanent outfall (until Stage/Phase III).
2. "Super Silt Fence" (chain linked backing) shall be installed where perimeter silt fence is specified.
3. Any disturbance occurring outside of conveyances to the trap, in either sequence or space, planned or unforeseen, shall be immediately stabilized with sod (for pervious areas, utilities should have other "same day stabilization".
4. The proposed trail shall be a non-erodible surface (asphalt/concrete or similar) and provisions shall be made in the stormwater management plan to ensure runoff from the trail is conveyed in a non-erosive manner, and concentrated flows shall not be discharged above slopes, or flow along the toe of slopes, on or offsite the property.
5. Trees removed from areas of critical slope(s) shall be replaced within those areas, at a three-to-one ratio ("Habitat Replacement Trees").
6. The Habitat Replacement Trees shall be locally native tree species appropriate for the site conditions.
7. No tree(s) planted in any area(s) that contain buildings, parking lots, sidewalks, or other built improvements shall be counted as any Habitat Replacement Tree(s).
8. The specific number and species of Habitat Replacement Trees will be determined by the applicant and the City based on available space and site conditions, and the size, location and species of all Habitat Replacement

Trees shall be specified within the landscaping plan required by Sections $\S \S 34-861$ et seq. of the Charlottesville City Code, as amended.
3. I move to recommend denial of the steep slope waiver for Tax Map and Parcel 18A025000.

## Attachments

A. Applicant Response Letter dated October 12, 2021
B. Updated PUD Development Plan dated April 28, 2020 and revised June 11, 2021
C. Updated PUD Supplemental Packet dated April 28, 2020 and revised June 11, 2021
D. Photo of Trees along Stribling Avenue

Link to the staff reports and attachments from the September 14, 2021 Public Hearing. Reports start on page 6.
https://civicclerk.blob.core.windows.net/stream/CHARLOTTESVILLEVA/92935418-1829-4086-
8688-896256d9cb7f.pdf?sv=2015-12-
11\&sr=b\&sig=s6R6Y5SNzG4O171uTtjx23zDvPLRIgVcY4OHI7EZw0c\%3D\&st=2021-10-
26T16\%3A29\%3A45Z\&se=2022-10-26T16\%3A34\%3A45Z\&sp=r\&rscc=no-
cache\&rsct=application\%2Fpdf
or
https://www.charlottesville.gov/1077/Agendas-Minutes

October 12, 2021

Matt Alfele, AICP<br>City Planner<br>City of Charlottesville<br>Department of Neighborhood Development Services<br>City Hall - 610 East Market Street<br>P.O. Box 911<br>Charlottesville, VA 22902

Re: 240 Stribling PUD
Dear Matt,

Enclosed is a revision of the 240 Stribling PUD that incorporates feedback we heard from the Planning Commission and responds to the remaining concerns staff detailed in the staff report. On page 23 of the August $30^{\text {th }}$ staff report in the "Staff Recommendation" section, staff recommended denial for 5 reasons.

Reason 1 concerned the inadequacy of Stribling Avenue but noted that the applicant may be pursuing avenues to provide improvements to Stribling. The applicant now has a draft agreement with the City for those improvements that would be approved by Council simultaneously with or prior to this ZMA. We hope this resolves this concern.

Reason 2 revolves around Morgan Court and the concern that it is not yet a City street. This is acknowledged, but our research indicates that the ROW has been dedicated to public use by the Huntley developer. We expect that the City also holds a bond posted by that developer to assure construction of the platted streets. If it becomes necessary, the City could call that bond. I doubt that would be necessary, but those are assurances the City has from the Huntley developer.

Reason 3 describes potential for utility conflicts. We have revised the required setbacks on Sheet 4, Land Use Plan, of the PUD. We hope this resolves this concern.

Reason 4 notes that staff is concerned that in many cases the private roads are neither alleys nor provide [vehicle] connectivity. This is an intentional and important design element in the PUD. To have marketable homes, vehicle access and parking are a necessity. But beyond that marketdriven necessity, we have intentionally deemphasized those vehicular travelways and instead focused on the pedestrian mews on the opposite side of the buildings. We do not know the basis for staff's concern about the roadway design and are not sure if this additional information helps
resolve it, but the roads do meet City SADM standards, and we hope this additional information demonstrates the intentionality and purpose of the layout.

The $5^{\text {th }}$ and final concern is regarding making sure that the open space within each phase meets the minimum requirement of at least $15 \%$ of the gross land area. With this submittal, Sheet 5 of the PUD Plan and Sheet 11 on the Supplemental Plan, Phasing and Open Space Plan, were updated to indicate minimum Phase 1 Open Space to be dedicated as well as calling out 25\% minimum dedication total. We expect our total open space to be closer to $40 \%$ of the gross land area and are confident that minimum required dedications can be met by dedicating all or a large portion of the open spaces proposed on the south and west sides of the site with the first phase of development.

In addition to addressing staff's five concerns above, we also updated Sheet 12, Landscape Plan, to delineate the tree preservation areas more clearly, and we added "Wildflower and Meadow Grass Mix" hatching and callouts for establishing a wildflower/pollinator habitat on the southern portions of the site.

One thing that we have not been able to address is the desire expressed in the last planning Commission Meeting to make further attempts to save some of the beech trees along Stribling Avenue. Though we agree these are nice trees, it is the opinion of our engineer that not only is it not feasible to save these trees, it is not advisable. Enclosed is a photo of the trees showing their proximity to the road. A new sidewalk would destroy the root system, even if a large planting strip is established. The roots of the trees are likely already causing issues under the pavement because they are too close to the road, and they are less than 10 ' from existing water mains. Beech trees are not listed as a "good street tree" in the City's Master Tree List guidelines and they are not recommended near roads or sidewalks.

We hope the above revisions resolve most or all of staff's previous reasons for recommending denial of the plan.

Sincerely,


Charlie Armstrong

## PUD DEVELOPMENT PLAN
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## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Objectives (Charlottesville Ordinance Sect. 34-490)

1 To encourage developments of equal or higher quality than otherwise required by the strict application of zoning district regulations than would otherwise govern;

2
To encourage innovative arrangements of buildings and open spaces to provide efficient, attractive flexible and environmentally sensitive design;

3 To promote a variety of housing types, or, within a development containing only a single housing type, to promote inclusion of houses of various sizes;

4 To encourage the clustering of single-family dwellings for more efficient use of land and preservation of open space,

5 fied projects

6 To ensure that a development will be harmonious with the existing uses and character of adjacent property, and/or consistent with patterns of development noted with respect to such adjacent property;

To ensure preservation of cultural features, scenic assets and natura features such as trees, streams and topography:

8 To provide for coordination of architectural styles internally within the development as well as in relation to adjacent properties along the perimeter of the development

9 To provide for coordinated linkages among internal buildings and uses, and external connections, at a scale appropriate to the development and adjacent neighborhoods;

10 To facilitate access to the development by public transit services or other single-vehicle-alternative services, including, without limitation public pedestrian systems.

This proposal includes more housing than would be allowed by right. It provides a mix of dwellings-- including affordable units-that encourage a heterogeneous community.

The street layouts and building densities adopt an urban strategy without erasing the site's existing sylvan character. In addition to preserving swaths of wooded land along creeks and ravines, this neighborhood proposes an interconnected band of smaller common spaces. These cascade from roughly the middle of the site down to the floodplain. They provide a recreational corridor that-- except for occasional alley crossings-- is free of traffic. They are terraced and allow a degree of partition: at the bottom green, kids can throw a football; at the green to its north, residents sit and talk; while at the top, families can set up a canopy and have a bar-b-que. Yet even with the separation provided by elevation level and alleyways, the greens are grouped ogether to enhance views. Shortly after entering the neighborhood on Carrsgrove Drive, a visual corridor opens all the way through the entire property down to the bottom land. The greens insinuate themselves in what would otherwise be a repetitious rank and file of townhomes. They contribute to a rich environment of outdoor space-- creating larger vistas and common ground that expand on the private porches and gardens of the smaller mews spaces,

Three housing types are proposed: duplexes, townhouses and apartments/condos.

The dwellings assume a compact arrangement. Apartment buildings are arrayed along the west half of the site, where they are not readily seen from Stribling Avenue. Townhomes are situated in areas closest to the existing PUD at Huntley, as well as the existing SFD, duplex and townhomes on Stribling Ave. By and large, the buildings are concentrated in the middle of the site, avoiding and preserving critical slopes, flood plains and stream buffers.

The dense weaving of shared green spaces, pathways and streets encourages connection and visibility among the residents. The abundance of porches and balconies provides subtle, comfortable transitions between private space and public.
athe for the stite townhomes $21 / 2$ to 3 stories tall line Stribling Avenue. They are not out of scale or character with their surroundings. While parale sume a mews arrangement. Typically their front facades face one another across landscaped gardens, while at the rear, alleys provide vehicle access,

Mature hardwood trees, especially along the western slopes and floodplain, remain. The footpath that currently exists along the west and south boundary is retained. While grading will be necessary, the essential lay of the land remains intact. The floodplain is preserved. As much as possible, the boundary vegetation is preserved.

The architecture is characterized by certain forms and materials consistent across the development, and familiar within the surrounding neighborhood. Subtle variations of massing, wall openings and colors reduce repetition, inviting heterogeneity while maintaining coherence.

Sidewalks follow both sides of the main streets within the site. Paths and entries into buildings connect directly to these sidewalks. Canopies, front doors and front porches give clear visible indications of entry points to all buildings and domiciles.

Proposed widening of Stribling Avenue along the north side of the property adjacent to the primary street entry allows better access by public transit ehicles than would be the case without this development. Improvements to Stribling also provide safer conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and wheel chair-users, allowing more space and greater visibility. Sidewalks and planting buffers within the site further enhance safety and ease of movement.

## NARRATIVE PER 34-517(2)

PAGE 3 OF 17
240 STRIBLING AVENUE - APRIL 28, 2020
REVISED: JUNE 11, 2021






## ROADS E, F, G, H, I, J

PRIVATE STREET
NOTE: STREETS E-J MEET ACCESS DESIGN STANDARDS FOR TOWNHOMES PER CITY ZONING ORDINANCE SEC. 34-390.


ROADS A, AND C
LOCAL STREET - PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY


ROAD B
LOCAL STREET - PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY



ROAD D (SOUTH OF ROAD A)
LOCAL STREET - PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY




## LANDSCAPE PLAN



## LANDSCAPE PLAN




## Attachment B (11/9/21)

| Use Types |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PUD | Existing Zoning- R -15 (for reference) | Existing zoning- R -2 (for reference) |
| RESIDENTIAL AND REATED USES |  |  |  |
| Accessory papatment, interral | P | P | P |
| Accessory apartment, external | P | P | P |
| Accessory building, structures and uses | в | B | в |
| Adult assisted living |  |  |  |
| Greater than 8 residents |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Adult day care |  |  |  |
| Amateur radio antennas, to a height of 75 ft . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Homestay | в | B | B |
| BQ B |  |  |  |
| Inn |  |  |  |
| Boarding: fraternity and sororoty house |  |  |  |
| Boarding house (rooming house) |  |  |  |
| Convent/monasterv | $s$ | s | $s$ |
| Criminal iustice facility |  |  |  |
| Dwellings: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Single-family attached | B |  | B |
| Single-family detached | B | в | в |
| Rowhouse/Townhouse | в |  |  |
| Two.family | в |  | в |
| Family day home |  |  |  |
| 1-5 children | B | B | B |
| $6-12$ children | s | s | s |
|  | P | P | P |
| Night watchman's dwelling unit, accessory to industrial use |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Nursing homes |  |  |  |
| Occupanc, residential |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 4 unrelated persons | в | B | B |
| Residential density (developments) |  |  |  |
| - $22 \times 43$ SUA |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 44-64 \text { DUA } \\ \hline 65-87 D U A \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 65-87DUA |  |  |  |
| 88-200DUA |  |  |  |
| 1-8residents | B | B | B |
|  |  |  |  |
| Shelter care facility |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| NON-REIIENTIAL: GENERAL and MISC. COMMERCIAL |  |  |  |
| Access to adjacent multifamily, commercial, industrial or mixed-use development or us |  |  |  |
| Accessory buildings, structures and uses |  |  |  |
| Amusement center |  |  |  |
| Amusement enterprises (circuses, cartivals, etc.) |  |  |  |
| Amusement park (putt-putt golf; skateboardparks, etc.) |  |  |  |
| Animal boarding/grooming/kennels: |  |  |  |
| With outside runs or pens |  |  |  |
| Without outside runs or pens |  |  |  |
| Animal shelter |  |  |  |
| GFA up to 10,000 SF |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Use Types |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PUD | Existing zoning- $\mathrm{R}-15$ (forreference) | Existing Zoning- $R$-2 (for reference) |
| Artstudio, GFA 4,000 SF orless |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Assembly (indor) |  |  |  |
| Arena, stadium (enclosed) |  |  |  |
| Auditoriums, theaters |  |  |  |
| Houses of worship |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Amphitheater |  |  |  |
| Stadium (open) |  |  |  |
| Temporary (outdoor church sevices, etc.) | T | T | T |
| Assembly plant, handcraft |  |  |  |
| Assembly plant |  |  |  |
| Automobile uses: |  |  |  |
| Gas station |  |  |  |
| Parts and equipment sales |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Repaliservicing business |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Tire sales and recapping |  |  |  |
| Baker, wholesale |  |  |  |
| GFA 4,000 SF or less |  |  |  |
| GFA up to 00,000 SF |  |  |  |
| Banks/ financial institutions |  |  |  |
| Bowling alleys |  |  |  |
| Carwash |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Cemetry |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Health Clinic (no GFA limit) |  |  |  |
| Health clinic (up to 10,000 SF, GFA) |  |  |  |
| Health clinic ( (up to $4,000 \mathrm{SF}, \mathrm{GFa}$ ) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Veterinary (with outside pens/runs) Veterinary (without outside pens/runs) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Cluss, private | $s$ | s | s |
| Communications facilities and towers: |  |  |  |
| towers established prior to 02/20/01 Attached facilities utilizing utility poles or other |  |  |  |
| Attached facilities utilizing utility poles or other electric transmission facilities as the attachment structure |  |  |  |
| Attached facilities not visible from any adjacent |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Attached facilities visible from an adjacent |  |  |  |
| Alternative tower support structures |  |  |  |
| Alternative tower suppor structures |  |  |  |
| Guyed tower support structures |  |  |  |
| Latice tower support structures |  |  |  |
| Self-supporting towers support structures |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Daycare facility Drycleaning establishments |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Educational facilities (non-residential) |  |  |  |
| Elementary | 5 | s | 5 |
| High schools | s | s | s |
| Colleges and universities | s | s | s |
| Artistic yp to 4,000 SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| Artistic up to 10,000 SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| Vocationa, , up to 4,00 Oosf, GFA |  |  |  |

## MATRIX OF USE TYPES

Attachment B (11/9/21)

| Use Types |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | puo | Existing Zoning-R-15 (for reference) | Existing Zoning- R -2 (for reference) |
| Electronic gaming café <br> Funeral home (without crematon) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| GFA up to 10,00 SF |  |  |  |
| Funeral homes (with cremator) |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { GFA } 4,000 \text { SF or less } \\ \hline \text { GFA up to } 10,000 \text { SF } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Golf course |  |  |  |
| Golf divivin range |  |  |  |
| Helipad |  |  |  |
| Hospital |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Laundromats |  |  |  |
| Libraies |  | B | B |
| Manufactured home sales |  |  |  |
| Microbrewery |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Movie theaters, ineplexes |  |  |  |
| Municipal/govermental offices, buildings, courts | $s$ | $s$ | $s$ |
| Museums: |  |  |  |
| Up to 4,000 SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| Up to 10,000 SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| Music halls |  |  |  |
| Offices |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Philanthropici institutions/agencies |  |  |  |
| Property management |  |  |  |
| Other offices (non-specified) |  |  |  |
| Outdoor storage, accessory |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Parking grage |  |  |  |
| Surface parking lot | A |  |  |
| Surface parking lot (more than 20 spaces) | A |  |  |
| Photography studio <br> Photographic processing; blueprinting |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Radio/television broadcast stations |  |  |  |
| Recreational facilites: |  |  |  |
| Indoor: health/sports clubs; tennis club; swimming club; yoga studios; dance studios, |  |  |  |
| Outdoor: Parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts, swimming pools, picnic shelters, etc. | в | в | в |
| Outdoor: Parks, playgrounds, ball fields and ball courts, swimming pools, picnic shelters, etc. (private) | в | s | s |
| Restaurants: |  |  |  |
| Dance hal/all l ight |  |  |  |
| Drive-through windows |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 24 hour |  |  |  |
| Taxi stand |  |  |  |
| Technology-based businesses |  |  |  |
| Transit facility |  |  |  |
| Utility facilities | $s$ | $s$ | 5 |
| Utility lines | B | B | B |
| NON-RESIDENTIAL USES R RTAAL |  |  |  |


| Use Types |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | puo | Existing zoning- $\mathrm{R}-15$ (forreference) | Existing Zoning- $R$-2 (for reference) |
| Consumer service businesses: |  |  |  |
| Up to 4,000 SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| Up to 10, 0 OLSF, GFA |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Greenhouses/urseries |  |  |  |
| Grocerv stores: |  |  |  |
| Convenience |  |  |  |
| $\frac{\text { Ceneral, up to } 10,000 \text { SF, } 6 \text { FA }}{\text { General }}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Home improvement center |  |  |  |
| Pharmacies: <br> $1-1,700$ SF, GFA |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1,701-4,000 SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| $4,001+$ SF, GFA |  |  |  |
| Shopping centers |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Temporary sales, outdoor (flea markets, craft fairs, promotional sales, etc.) |  |  |  |
| Other retail stores (non-specified): |  |  |  |
| Up to 4,000 SF, GFAUp to 20,000 SF GFA |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Up to 20,000 SF GFA |  |  |  |
| NON-RESIDENTAL INDUSTRIAL |  |  |  |
| Accessory buildings, structure sand uses |  |  |  |
| Assembly, industrial |  |  |  |
| Beverage or food processing, packaging and bottling plants |  |  |  |
| Brewerv and bottling facility |  |  |  |
| Compounding of cosmetics, toiletries, drugs and pharmaceutical products |  |  |  |
| Construction storage y ard |  |  |  |
| Contractor or tradesman shop (HAZMAT) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Greenhouse//ursery (wholesale) |  |
| Industrial equipment: sevice and repair |  |  |  |
| Janitorial service company |  |  |  |
| Kennels |  |  |  |
| Laborator, medical |  |  |  |
| <4,000 sq. ft. |  |  |  |
| Laborator, pharmaceutical |  |  |  |
| <4,00 sq. ft. |  |  |  |
| Landscape service company |  |  |  |
| Manufactured home sales |  |  |  |
| Manufacturing, light |  |  |  |
| Medical laboratories |  |  |  |
| Moving companies |  |  |  |
| Printing/publishing facility |  |  |  |
| Open storage ard |  |  |  |
| Outdoor storage, accessory to ind strial use |  |  |  |
| Research and testing laboratories |  |  |  |
| Selfstorage companies |  |  |  |
| Warehouses |  |  |  |
| Wholesale establishments |  |  |  |

$A=$ ANCILLARY USE
MFD = MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT
CR = COMMERCIAL/RESIDENTIAL
A/S = ANCILLARY OR SPECIAL USE PERMIT DUA $=$ DWELLING UNITS PER ACR

## MATRIX OF USE TYPES

TO THE HONORABLE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE:
The undersigned limited liability company is the owner of land "Owner") subject to the above-referenced rezoning petition ("Subject Property"). The Owner seeks to amend the current zoning of the Subject Property subject to certai voluntary development conditions set forth below. In connection with this rezoning application, the Owner seeks approval of a PUD as set forth within a Development Plan for a planned unit development to be known as the "trin pages, total, submitted with the Owner's Rezoning Application.

The Owner hereby proffers and agrees that if the Subject Property is rezoned as requested, the Subject Property will be eveloped in aeral accordance with , and the Owner will abide by, the apprad 240 Stribling ATD Development Plan, and that the Subject Property shall also be subject to the following conditions:

1. The Owner shall establish affordable housing within the Subject Property, as follows
a. For the purposes of this Proffer, the term "Affordable Dwelling Unit" means a dwelling unit reserved for occupancy by a household that pays no more than thirty percent ( $30 \%$ ) of its gross
income for housing costs, including utilities, provided that the annual gross income of the housenold/occupant is sixty percent ( $60 \%$ ) or less than of the Area Median Income (AMI) for the City of Charlottesville, as said AMI is established annually by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
b. Fifteen percent $(15 \%)$ of all dwelling units constructed within the area of the Subject Property shall be Affordable Dwelling Units "Required Affordable Dwelling Units"). The Required Affordable Dwelling Units shall be identified on a layout plan, by unit, prior to the issuance of any certificate
of occupancy for a residential unit within the PUD ("Initial Designation"). The Owner reserves the right, from time to time after the Initial Designation, and subject to approval by the City, to change the unit(s) reserved as Affordable Dwelling Units, and the City's approval shall not unreasonably be withheld so long as a proposed change does not reduce the number of Required Affordable with respect to any of the Required Affordable Dwelling Units.
i. Thirty percent ( $30 \%$ ) or more of the Required Affordable Dwelling Units shall be reserved for rental to low- and moderate-income households ("Rental Affordable Dwelling Units"). Each of the Rental Affordable Dwelling Units shall be reserved as such throughout a period of at least ten (10) years from the date on which the unit receives a certificate of
occupancy from the City's building official ("Rental Affordability Period"). All Rental Affordable Dwelling Units shall be administered in accordance with City regulations adopted pursuant to the provisions of City Code $34-12(\mathrm{~g})$ as such regulations are in effect on the date of Owner's signature, below. For the purposes of this section and section 1. biii below, if City regulations adopted pursuant to the provisions of City Code 34-12(g) are amended by the City after the date of Owner's signature, below, the Owner may elect
ii. Thirty percent ( $30 \%$ ) or more of the Required Affordable Dwelling Units shall be reserved for ownership by low- and moderate-income households ("For-Sale Affordable Dwelling Units"), throughout a period of thirty (30) years from the date on which the unit receives a certificate of occupancy from the City's building official. The For-Sale Affordable Units
shall be administered in accordance with City regulations adopted pursuant to the provisions of City Code $34-12(\mathrm{~g}$ ) as such rezulations are in effect on the date of Owner's signature, below. During construction the For-Sale Affordable Dwelling Units shall be
constructed incrementally, such that at least 5 Affordable Dwelling Units shall be either completed or under construction pursuant to a Citt-1ssued building permit, prior to
issuance of every 30 th Building Permit for non-affordable for-sale dwelling units.
iii. On or before July 1 of each calendar year the then current owner of each Required Affordable Dwelling Unit shall submit an Annual Report to the City, identiffing each
Required Affordable Dwelling Unit by address and location, and verify ing the Household Required Affordable Dwelling Unit by address and location, and verifying the Househol Income of the occupant of each Required Affordable Dwelling Unit
c. The land use obligations referenced in 1. .i.i, 1. .i.ii, and 1 .b.iii shall be set forth within one or more uritten declarations of covenants recorded within the land records of the Charlottesville Cincruit
Court, in a form approved by the Office of the City Attomey, so that the Owner's suceessors in Court, in a form approved by thbe eftice of the City Attomey, so that the Counder's successors in In the event of re-sale of any of the Required Affordable Dwelling Units that reduces the number of Required A Affordable Develling U Units below the thresholds set forth in this proffer, the declaration
of covenants shall provide a mechanism to ensure that en equivalent Affordable Dwelling Unit is created within the City of Charlottesville, either on or off of the Subject Property, that satisfies the requirements contained herein for the remainder of the Affordability Period.

WHEREFORE, the undersigned Owner stipulates and agree that the use and development of the Subject Property shall be in conformity with the conditions heremabove stated, and requests that the Subject Property be rezoned as requested, Respectfully submitted this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2021.

Applicant
Belmont Station, LLC
$\underset{\text { Its }}{\mathrm{By}}$ $\qquad$

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION REQUESTED BY STAFF IN ADDITION TO PUD DEVELOPMENT PLAN CONTENTS

## SITE DATA:



$\frac{\mathrm{ZONMG}}{\mathrm{R} 1 \mathrm{NO} \mathrm{K}} \mathrm{R}$
Cowner CARRSROVE Proobertes, Ll
$\frac{\text { Developer }}{\text { SOUHTERN DEVELOPMENT }}$
$\frac{\text { DESGON }}{\text { TIMONS GRoup }}$
Sounceof bounadr surver:
SOURCE OF TOPOGRAPHY EXISTING TOPOGRAPHY PROVIDED BY TIMMONS GROUP MAY, 2017
THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED IN ZONE AE AND XAS SHOWN ON FEDERAL EMERGENCY
MANAGEMENT AGENCY FLOOD INSURANCE MAP NUMBER 5100302690 , DATED $24-2005$
MAXIUUM BULLDNG HEIGHT: $55^{5}$ : EXCEPT THAT FRR ANY PORTION OF A BULLDING LOCATED WITHIN 75 ' OF LOW DENSITY
 RESIDNITIL ZONNN DII
DISTRICT SHALL APPLY.
CURRENT USE:
PROPOSED USE
$\frac{\text { OPEN SPACE OUNERSHP: }}{\text { ALL OPENSPACE TOBE OUNED AND MAINTAINED BY A HOME OWNERS ASSOCIATION }}$
$\frac{\text { LIGHTNG: }}{\text { LIGHTING FIXTURES SHALL NOT EXCEED } 3000 \text { LUMENS. }}$
$\frac{\text { LAND USE SUMMMARY: }}{\text { TOTAL STE AREA: }}$
RNL LEDICARTOA:
TOWNHOUSELOTAREABLING AVE CONDOAAPARTMENT LOT AREA: PUBLIC RIGHT-TF-WAA AREA:
PRVVATE RIGH-OF-WAY ARA
PRVVATE RIGHT-OE-MA
OPEN SACE AREA:
TRAFFIC STUDY:


PM PEAK HOUR- -94 (59 ENTER, 35 EK
AVERAGE DALI TRPS $-1,244$ ADT

240 STRIBLING AVENUE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA


VICINITY MAP
SCALE: $1^{\prime \prime}=500^{\prime}$
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| MITCHELL |
| :--- |
| MATTHEWS |
| ARCHITECTS |

$.0 \%$
TIMMONS GROUP
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## FIRETRUCK AUTOTURN 3A
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## FIRETRUCK AUTOTURN 4A

SHEET 9
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## PEDESTRIAN ACCESS PLAN

 DETENTION IS BEING PROVIDED THOUGH 4 PROPOSED BIORETENTION FACILITIES, AS WELL AS A PROPOSED UNDERGROUND STORAGE FACILITY ON THE SOUTH END OF THE SITE,
CHANNEL PROTECTION: THE ENERGY BALANCE EQUATION HAS BEEN MEET FOR THE 1 -YEAR, 24 HOUR TORM PER 9VAC25-870-66(B)3, "NATURAL STORMWATER CONVEYANCE SYSTEMS." APPLICABLE APPROVALS FROM ACOE WILL BE OBTAINED TO OUTFALL TO THE STREAM.

LOOD PROTECTION: PER 9VAC25-870-66(C)3, STORMWATER SHALL E ANALYZED FOR FLOOD PROTECTION信PLIANCE TO THE POINT WHERE THE SYSTEM ENTERS A MAPPED FLOODPLAIN. ADEQUATE
ONVEYANCE OF THE 10-YEAR STORM IS DEMONSTRATED UP TO THE SITE OUTFALL.
EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL NARRATIVE
E\&SC MEASURES SHALL BE PROVIDED PER THE VIRGINIA EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL HANDBOOK IS CONTAINED ONSITE AND TO ENSURE PROTECTION OF ADJACENT STREAM. FINAL DESIGN WILL BE PROVIDED WITH PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN

DEQ Virginia Runoff Reduction Method New Development Compliance Spreadsheet - Version 3.0

| Site Summary | Project Title: 240 S Date: 43937 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Rainfall $=43$ inches |  |
| Site Land Cover Summary |  |
|  | A soils |
| Forest/Open (acres) | 0.00 |
| Managed Turf (acres) | 0.00 |
| Imperious Cover (acres) | 0.00 |
| Site Tv and Land Cover Nutrient Loads |  |
| Stite Rv | 0.58 |
| Treatment Volume ( $\mathrm{t}^{3}$ ) | 19,489 |
| TP Load ( $16 / \mathrm{yr}$ ) | 12.25 |
| TN Load (lb/v) | 87.6 |
| Total TP Load Reduction Required (lb/yr) | 8.46 |
| Site Compliance Summary |  |
| Total Runoff Volume Reduction ( $\left(t^{3}\right)$ | 8,745 |
| Total TP Load Reduction Achieved (lb/yr) | 6.17 |
| Total $T$ L Load Reduction Achieved (IL/ry) | 45.15 |
| Remaining Post Development TP Load ( $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{yr}$ ) | 6.07 |
| Remaining TP Load Reduction (lb/yr) Required | 2.29 |

## Drainage Area B Summary

Land Cover Summary

|  | A Soils | B Solis | C Soils | D Soils | Total | \% of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forest/(Open (acres) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Managed Truflaces) | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 29 |
| Impervious Cover (acres) | 0.00 | 0.55 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.55 | 71 |

BMP Selections

| Pratice | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Managed Turf } \\ \text { Credit Area } \\ \text { (acres) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Impervious Cover Credit Area (acres) | BMP Treatment volume ( $\left(t^{3}\right)$ | TP Load from Upstream Practices (lbs) | Untreated TP Load to Practice (lbs) | $\underset{\substack{\text { TP Removed } \\ \text { (bb/v) }}}{\text { and }}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { (bb/yr) }}}{\text { TP Remining }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Downstream } \\ & \text { Treatment to be } \\ & \text { Employed } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.22 | 0.55 | 2,056.40 | 0.00 | 1.29 | . 16 | 0.13 |  |


| Total Impervious Cover Treated (acres) | 0.55 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Turf Area Treated (acres) | 0.22 |
| Total TP Load Reduction Achieved in D.A (lb/yr) | 1.16 |
| Total TN Load Reduction Achieved in D.A. | 8.49 |

Drainage Area A Summary
Land Cover Summary

|  | A Soils | B Soils | C Soils | D Soils | Total | \% of Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Forest/Open (acres) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Managed Turf (fares) | 0.00 | 0.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.15 | 14 |
| Lmpervious Cover (acres) | 0.00 | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.90 | 86 |

smp selections

| Pratice | Managed Turf Credit Area (acres) | Impervious Area (acres) | BMP Treatment Volume ( $\mathrm{ft}^{3}$ ) | TP Load from Upstream Practices (Ibs) | Untreated TP Load to Practice (Ibs) | TP Removed (lb/yr) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TP Remaining } \\ & (\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{yr}) \end{aligned}$ | Downstream Treatment to be |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { 6.b. Bioretention } \# 2 \text { or Micro-Bioretention } \\ \text { \#2 ( Spec } \\ \text { 9 }}}{ }$ | 0.15 | 0.9 | 3,212.55 | 0.00 | 2.02 | 1.81 | 0.20 |  |


| Total Impervious Cover Treated (acres) | 0.90 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Total Turf Area Treated (acres) | 0.15 |
| Total TP Load Reduction Achieved in D.A. ( $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{yr}$ ) | 1.81 |
| Total TN Load Reduction Achieved in D.A. |  |


| Virginia Runoff Reacuition Meltod Worksheet |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drainage Area C Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Land Cover Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | A Soils | B Soils | csoils | ${ }^{\text {D Soils }}$ | Total | \% of Total |  |  |
| Forest/Open (acres) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| Managed Turf (acres) | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 11 |  |  |
| mpervious Cover (acres) | 0.00 | 1.60 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.60 | 89 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1.80 |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{\text {Emp Selections }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Practice | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Managed Turf } \\ \text { Credit Area } \\ \text { (acres) } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Impervious Cover Credit Area (acres) | BMP Treatment <br> volume ( $\left(\mathrm{t}^{3}\right)$ | TP Load from Upstream Practices (lbs) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Untreated TP Load } \\ \text { to Practice (lbs) } \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { TP Removed } \\(\mathrm{bb} / \mathrm{yr})}}{\text { then }}$ | TP Remaining $(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{yr})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Downstream } \\ \text { Treatment ob be } \\ \text { Employed } \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \left.\begin{array}{c} \text { 6.b. Bioretention } \# 2 \text { or Micro-Bioretention } \\ \text { \#2 } \\ \hline \end{array} \text { Spece } 49\right) \end{array}$ | 0.2 | 1.6 | 5,62.80 | 0.00 | 3.55 | 3.20 | 0.36 |  |
| Total Impervious Cover Treated (acres) 1.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Turf Area Treated (acres) | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total TP Load Reduction Achieved in D.A. (1b/yr) | 3.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total T TN Load Reduction Achieved in D.A. ( $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{yr} \mathrm{r}$ | 23.39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL NARRATIVE:
E\&SC MEASURES SHALL BE PROVIDED PER THE VIRGINIA EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL HANDBOOK (VESCH) TO ENSURE SEDIMENT LADEN RUNOFF IS CONTAINED ONSITE AND TO ENSURE PROTECTION OF ADJACENT STREAM. FINAL DESIGN WILL BE PROVIDED WITH PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN SUBMITTALS




Attachment C (11/9/21)


Attachment D (11/9/21)


