MINUTES
WORK SESSION - CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND
ALBEMARLE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSIONS
Tuesday, October 25, 2016

Location: Water Street (407 East Water Street)

County of Albemarle Members Present: Chairman Tim Keller, Commissioners Mac Lafferty (arrived at 5:19 p.m.), Pam Riley, Daphne Spain, Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair and Bill Palmer, UVA representative. Absent were Commissioners Bruce Dotson and Jennie More.

Call to Order: Chairman Keller called the meeting to order at 5:12 p.m.

City of Charlottesville Members Present: Kurt Keesecker, Chair; Commissioners Jody Lahendro; Genevieve Keller (arrived at 5:16 p.m.) and Corey Clayborne (arrived at 5:34 p.m.) Absent were Taneia Dowell, John Santoski and Lisa Green.

Missy Creasy, Planning Manager, noted that the City of Charlottesville Planning Commission had not established a quorum with only two Commissioners present, Kurt Keesecker and Jody Lahendro.

Other Albemarle County officials present was: Bill Fritz, Chief of Special Projects for Albemarle County; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Boards; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of CDD/Director of Planning and John Blair, Deputy County Attorney.

Other City of Charlottesville officials present was: Missy Creasy, Planning Manager.

Other Matters from the Public:

Mr. Keller invited matters from the public on topics other than Woolen Mills.

Peter Thompson, 40 year resident of our community in both the city and county and Executive Director of the Senior Center on Pepsi Center, spoke on the vision for healthy aging at the Senior Center's future center to be built in Belvedere. He said he would like to share information as well as leave some information. Mr. Thompson explained they are seeking capital investments from the City and County as well as public private partnership opportunities to assist with the funding needs. Mr. Thompson offered to come and talk to any group to explain the future Senior Center vision, proposal and how it will provide many benefits to the aging community.

Call to Order: Chair Kurt Keesecker called the City of Charlottesville Planning Commission meeting at 5:16 p.m. upon the arrival of Commissioner Genevieve Keller.

AGENDA

ZMA-201600016 Woolen Mills

Commissioner Tim Keller introduced Bill Fritz, Chief of Special Projects in Albemarle County who will provide an overview of the proposal for ZMA-2016-16 Woolen Mills. Mr. Keller said the major reason for the work session and its format was so all commissioners, both county and city, will be able to speak to Mr. Fritz and the developer who is also present to answer questions about the concerns involving ZMA-2016-16 Woolen Mills due to its close proximity to the city. Mr. Keller noted that public comment will be taken

with a three-minute time limit and then the issue would be brought back before the two commissions for discussion and comment on the questions.

Commissioner Lafferty arrived at 5:19 p.m.

Bill Fritz, Chief of Special Projects with the County of Albemarle, gave a brief overview of the project, ZMA-2016-16 Woolen Mills in a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Fritz explained when the application came in Missy Creasy and myself with other staff met and held a discussion and decided to hold this joint work session given the property's close proximity to the city/county line. He pointed out the existing parcel was outlined in purple; the orange shows the existing structures; you can see the Rivanna River and Moore's Creek; the gold line and gold buildings are the county; the white area to the north is the city and you can see there is more city property on the side of Franklin.

This particular map shows the location of the floodplain, which is based on the last mapping done by the county. The applicant has prepared a detailed study. This study, which was done by the applicant, is actually lower than was previously calculated; however, the buildings are still within the floodplain even the revised floodplain. The applicant proposes to construct flood proofing, essentially a floodwall. This activity will require a special use permit and the information that is needed to review the application has not yet been received. All staff has now is the detailed study that more accurately calculates the level of the floodplain. It was a major study and goes all the way down to the county boundary.

This map shows the location of the steep slopes. Albemarle County has a steep slopes overlay district, and in that district we have two types of steep slopes; first being the preserved slopes as shown in green, and then managed slopes as shown in orange. In Albemarle County the orange, managed slopes, can be disturbed provided that design standards are met. The preserved slopes cannot be disturbed; and, the applicant's proposal would include disturbance of the preserved slopes for parking and potentially for new construction. So there will need to be a rezoning request to amend those slopes to either remove them as steep slopes or to change the designation from preserved to managed; that application has not yet been filed.

Next is the comprehensive plan map. This property was discussed in detail during the adoption of the comprehensive plan. The layout and uses proposed are consistent with the information reviewed during the comprehension plan amendment. The property is shown for community mixed use and parks and green systems. The applicant is proposing 100 units within the area of the community mixed use; that density works out to approximately 22 units per acre based on the area of this property that is designated for community mixed use. That density of 22 units per acre is within the permitted 34 units per acres based on all of the work. The applicant is also working with the county to provide trails and access to the south side of Moore's Creek and that is shown in the comprehensive plan. Based on our initial review, it appears to be consistent with the content within the comprehensive plan.

Break Down of Uses

- Residential – 76,742 sf (existing building) (That could be the 100 units.)
- Restaurant – 15,211 sf (existing building)
- Live Work (Staff has asked for information.)
    - Residential - 9,287 sf(existing building)
    - Non Residential – 9,287 sf(existing building)
- Nonresidential 7,232 sf (existing building)
- Light Industrial– 40,000 sf (The new building proposed could be used for a variety of uses. That could be a two-story building with a 20,000 sf footprint.)

Mr. Fritz reviewed the proposal pointing out the location of the proposed uses. He pointed out the one access that would not be a vehicular connection, but used for a trail connection or an emergency access

only for emergency vehicles. He pointed out the location of the proposed new building and uses with access going out to Broadway. The residential is mostly in the existing multi-story office. The office area is in the saw tooth building. The restaurant occupies two floors the upper area and the basement. The new building is on the left. All of the renovations to the existing buildings are to follow the Department of Historic Resources guidelines in order to preserve the historic value of the building while still permitting modern use of the structures. In fact, there are no structures proposed to be removed from the property at this time.

Summary of Applications Needed

- Rezoning from LI, Light Industry to C1, Commercial has been made.
- Rezoning of the Steep Slopes Overlay District is required in order to allow disturbance of the preserved slopes. Parking and the new industrial building are shown in areas of preserved slopes. That permit has not been filed.
- Special Use Permit for residential use in the C1, Commercial District is needed. That permit has not been filed.
- Special Use Permit to allow activity in the floodplain. Staff needs more information on that, which has not been received. This activity will include the construction of a floodwall and other flood proofing measures to allow residential use of the existing structures.
- Variation request to reduce required parking staff believes would be needed. More information that is detailed has been provided in the staff report on the parking. As far as the parking goes, staff has been talking with the applicant about some alternatives to how that can be calculated so the variation may not be as great as it may looks like. As an example, if staff goes back to the restaurant there is a large area of 15,000 sf and that is a huge traffic generator. Well the basement is not going to be restaurant but storage and there is an outdoor dining area. Some of the questions that will need to be asked will be whether the outdoor and indoor dining area would be used at the same time; and, if it is not going to be used at the same time we should not double count that. Therefore, staff may need to do some modifications on the parking calculations. Staff is looking at that and the definition of live/work to see whether we should modify the parking calculations there, and so that is very much an ongoing endeavor.

Summary of Main Issues

- Provision of Parking
- Access to East Market Street. (In this particular property, a small parking area accesses East Market Street of about 30 spaces. That is an issue for many of the residents in the area.)
- Public Safety access to the site. (Those discussions are ongoing with fire/rescue who he believes are close to coming up with a solution.)
- Traffic Study (The applicant has prepared the scoping document after a meeting with the City Transportation and the Virginia Department of Transportation to determine the scope of the traffic impact study. Therefore, that work is now ongoing to do the study.)
- Accuracy of floodplain information
- Maintaining historic value of the site. (The applicant is willing to preserve it and utilize the Department of Historic Resources standards.)
- Trail access. (That is sort of a broad thing including the Rivanna Trail, off-site trails and access to the property by use of other means.)
- Changes in character of district due to new residents

Mr. Fritz noted that is a quick summery of where we are. He explained that we have received an application and have started the review and identified the things that need to be studied, but we do not have the answers for you on how we are going to solve all these types of things. He said we know they are there and are been working on them. Mr. Fritz said he would be happy to try to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Ms. Firehock said we talked about the need to change the preserved slopes to managed slopes in order to allow development to occur on them. She said that is always the tricky one because she always wondered what would be the rational to declare something as something else. She asked is it that perhaps they were man-altered slopes and therefore were not supposed to be natural.

Mr. Fritz replied some of these preserved slopes are manufactured slopes, but the question there is that is just one of the criteria for determining whether a slope should be managed or preserved. The other is have they taken on natural characteristics; are they part of a larger system or they associated with water features and so we would want to look at that. In short, what we would be doing is going back and looking at a more detailed study of these slopes to determine whether they should be preserved or managed using the very specific criteria that the ordinance has.

Ms. Spain said she had a question about the retaining wall for the floodplain - is there any evidence from other projects like this as to how effective the walls are.

Mr. Fritz replied we have not done that information yet, but there is good information. He pointed out there are other places he knows of that where they have used floodwalls like this incorporated into buildings that have been successful such as the City of Richmond and City of South Boston. To protect older historic buildings South Boston were taking some tobacco warehouses and flood proofed them. Therefore, it can be done, but we do not know the details for how it is going to be done in this particular case so he cannot answer that question and it is an issue for us to be worried about.

Ms. Spain asked are there specs similar to the wall structure similar to the 100-year flood.

Mr. Fritz replied yes, what will need to be done is the applicant will need to give us information based on the new FEMA floodplain map and so we will need to know very detailed where that floodplain level is and then the actual design of the floodwall. We also know there are probably pipes that have run from the building to drain to Moore's Creek and those will have to be identified in how they are going to be flood proofed so the water when it rises does not come back into the building. So yes, we know these things, the applicant is aware of these things, and a floodwall can be built, but we do not know the details yet.

Mr. Keller pointed out there was a follow-up to that most of the commissioners have not had a chance to see what Mr. Roy presented in the Woolen Mills meeting last week about how that.

Mr. Fritz agreed and pointed out Mr. Roy had some information or actual artist drawings that show how the building could be sealed in.

Mr. Keller noted as opposed to building a higher retaining wall.

Mr. Fritz pointed out it was not a floodwall like Scottsville; it is actually incorporated into the building.

Mr. Keesecker asked on East Market Street where it enters the site how would that be used, will that be left open as an entry to the site.

Mr. Fritz replied yes, the applicant is proposing to leave that open to access that smaller parking area of roughly 30 parking spaces depending how you striped it. The applicant at the community meeting held in the Woolen Mills neighborhood heard that and is aware of that concern and we have had some preliminary discussions about how that can be done. However, the property is so under parked that eliminating that parking is probably not possible in being able to meet any standards so what he is looking at is trying to

find a way to minimize the impacts. He pointed out the neighbors made some good suggestions there and we are trying to figure out how to answer that.

Mr. Keesecker asked with the proximity to the restaurant if that was going to be just parking for the restaurant, and Mr. Fritz replied that one of the things that we talked about was not to have that be parking for the restaurant, but actually having designated parking for the residents and businesses that are down there.

Genevieve Keller questioned the impacts from the parking and traffic to the city, particularly the non-vehicular aspects, and encouraged the city's alternate means of transportation for walking and biking.

Mr. Fritz replied that he was aware that might be part of the solution now, but he does not know and it will be part of the evaluation they will have to do. He noted there have been discussions with the city and county recreation and trails people with the applicant; but they do not have any answers right now. He noted they are discussing incentives for driving down the parking demand.

Genevieve Keller pointed out that she hoped the city and county are dealing with this together as one community, which she wanted to get into the record, and hopes the county will always act in the best interest of the citizens most impacted.

Mr. Fritz pointed out he would provide information to city staff as it comes in to Missy Creasy to provide an opportunity for the city to provide comments.

Ms. Spain asked if there had been any conversation about sharing parking with the church, and Mr. Fritz replied that there was no conversation about that and did not know how that would work since coming down East Market Street is just tough since mixing cars, pedestrians and bicycles is an interesting dynamic due to the narrowness of the street.

Ms. Spain noted it was a long walk to the church to the restaurant, but suggested there could be benefits to the church with revenue such as time-sharing.

Mr. Fritz pointed out the county is open to those kinds of creative solutions and the county does have a shared parking policy that could potentially be part of it.

Genevieve Keller pointed out we now have enabled valet parking so that might be something.

Bill Palmer said he was looking at Broadway more as a possibility for either on-street parking or utilizing some of those larger sites for off-site parking, and asked if that had been looked at.

Mr. Fritz replied that had been looked at there for parking since some of those businesses will be closed and they are going to have surplus parking. There is more opportunity for pedestrian access down Broadway Street; there is no sidewalk but he believes Broadway is big enough for on-street parking on each side. However, it the parking may just be on one side. However, that was another creative parking solution. Mr. Fritz noted the primary focus right now is to get better information on what the actual uses are so we can figure out what the real parking demand is and with that traffic, study that will help define what numbers, we are actually looking at here. Right now we just know it is an issue, but do not know its size.

Mr. Tim Keller said he had one more that came up in the meeting with the Woolen Mills community and that was a statement about children and school and some sort of collaboration between the city and county historically for that sort of landlocked group of children. He noted that staff had brought up fire/rescue. He asked do we have agreements for the city to service X, Y, Z.

Mr. Fritz replied yes, and that the Fire Marshall has been the one actually working on this about how do we protect these residents, but they have not gotten to schools yet due to time. However, they expect based on the unit type that the population of students in this will be exceptionally low because it is single bedroom, but it is on my list to coordinate with the county to see how they are going to deal with that.

Mr. Tim Keller invited the applicant, Mr. Brian Roy with Woolen Mills LLC, to address the C Commission.

Brian Roy, contract purchaser, said he appreciates everyone coming out for such a small simple redevelopment proposal. He had been involved with the property for almost two years now and was amazed the first time he walked through the building - the interior and exterior is gorgeous and really lends itself to a tremendous opportunity going forward. This is a watercolor rendering of what this property in theory could look like with a new industrial building with the parking on the high side of the property off Broadway. To be honest when you do an architectural it is generally made to make the property more attractive. However, he thinks if you have seen the site and the pictures of it, which he held up, he thinks it actually does not do it justice. He thinks the building is gorgeous as it is. He thinks it has been preserved quite well over the past 100 years and the history of the site goes back to pre-civil war. Obviously, these buildings date more to the early 1900's, but thinks they may have seen some fires that burnt down the original factories and such they built this to be very lasting and to be very attractive from an industrial perspective. The main problem and issue on the property was the 100-year floodplain, which was adjusted in 1980, reflected that the floodplain was about 3' above the finished first floor that really did not allow for any kind of development.

Mr. Roy pointed out the first challenge was to see if the data going back over history that the floodplain could be lowered. Therefore, with the existing owner we endeavored to see if the floodplain could be lowered and at the end of the day, we did not know how much it could be lowered. Certainly, it needed to be below the first floor and then it needed to give us a little cushion obviously, if it allowed for it. The floodplain was about 3' above the first floor. The data which took almost 1 ½ to 2 years to get through; the study continued per FEMA standards continued to grow and grow throughout the county so the floodplain was able to be lowered not only 3' but by an additional 2' that still meant the building itself was in the floodplain but was in the basement section. While the basement section was not useable so it allowed for the potential could you do a floodwall along the base of the building along the base of Moore's Creek that would allow for a potential occupancy in the building. Therefore, that is what we have contemplated here and he would give just a preliminary rendering of what it could look like. These arches are the original structure and the thought would be this floodwall would be filling in these arches.

Mr. Roy said the focus of this entire property is to preserve the buildings historically, and to preserve buildings historically it has to meet a very strict standard and that is done by the Department of Historic Resources for the state and then on the federal level through the National Park Service. So both of those standards that have to be meet are significant. When you change an historical building, whether that is the site or the exterior of the building, it comes under some significant scrutiny. Therefore, to solve for that issue the thought is if we were to enclose the arches with a different concrete or color and really almost make them look invisible in a way if that is possible that would be preferred for an historical structure. He suggested may be set off that retaining wall with a different concrete or color maybe setoff that floodwall 6" from the arches which is show here where it allows for the opportunity so not cold floodwalls to tell the history of the site. This is a site goes back to the early 1800's. The original Charlottesville factory was 1847. The uses in this building was for the civil war military uniforms through the 1800's and its best years was in the War World II period they were producing the uniforms for the majority of the military. Obviously, in the 1950's the need for wool uniforms slowed down a little and the business eventually went bankrupt in the early 1960's.

Mr. Roy said he thinks there is an opportunity and a challenge with getting the building out of the floodplain and this is the best way to deal with it to have the most minimum impact on the historical nature of the building but also solve for the functionality if there is a 100-year flood. Obviously, in going back to the 1969/1970 timeframe there was 100-year floods. It is a need and it does allow potentially for an area that could be used more as pedestrian access because it does have a little pinch point right at the top of the building where it makes any vehicular traffic very unlikely so it would be maybe more for just fire and rescue. He thinks Bill Fritz did a good job of summarizing the challenges of the site. He noted that he does want to preserve this historically and to meet the overall comprehensive plan, which allows for about 50% of the property to be residential and 50% to be non-residential. How that non-residential looks could evolve over time.

Mr. Roy said the floodplain that just came back from FEMA was just received two weeks ago and so it was a little premature for filing for the rezoning. Recognizing that there would be many questions/challenges and understanding it is a tight knit community, he wanted to be very sensitive to that. He said he sees that as you drive down Market Street it does not allow for a ton of increased traffic so to overcome that he has moved the main entrance to the site up off of Broadway which right now is really more of a gravel road and the main entrance to the four-story building going back. The main entrance to the four-story building would actually be on the third floor on the backside of the property so the parking would be somewhat hidden so you can focus your attention to this great natural resource and asset which is the Rivanna River and Moore's Creek as they join at the property site. That would allow for your main pedestrian access coming through the building whether it is residential, restaurant or office to come down through this site. He thinks that does allow for an elegant solution for what exists on Market Street, which is a challenge. He offered to answer any questions and appreciates your time and consideration.

Mr. Keller invited questions for Mr. Roy.

Ms. Riley noted at the neighborhood meeting you talked a little more about the projected residential uses that they would be rental and asked if he could give a little more description.

Mr. Roy replied that one of the items to preserve a building historically is that it cannot be altered for a significant amount of time or about a five year period. So once the plans are presented to the National Park Service and the DHR they are essentially locked in; so they would be all rentals. The four-story building has tremendous window and ceiling heights that would allow for true loft apartments that really do not exist. On the first through the third floor the ceiling height is about 14' and on the fourth floor it is about 19'. Therefore, he thinks you want to play up and take advantage of those natural characteristics. Therefore, it would lend itself to probably narrow units so everyone could have the availability of these windows and it would lend itself to very open studio type apartments. Certainly the demographic that would be most attractive to this area would be younger professionals that want that natural setting that want to live in this historic building that has these unique characteristics. Therefore, he did not think there would be two-bedroom or three-bedroom apartments, but all one-bedroom apartments or studio type apartments. He would hope that would make it more attractive for everyone that is living there.

Mr. Lahendo asked if the two one-story warehouse buildings with the monitors does the floodwall come up to those and are they within the floodplain.

Mr. Roy said if he meant the saw tooth buildings, the answer was yes. He noted the saw tooth buildings have a more significant basement wall and currently does have some windows. The basement area of the entire building is only 10' to 15' deep so losing that in terms of usable space is not a huge issue. Therefore, what he envisions here is incorporating the existing walls and almost putting a floodwall inside and bracing that so the visual impact is minimal. Then there is a small piece about 15' between the two saw tooth buildings that would need to be filled in and so you would extend it all the way and then the floodplain

starts to decrease as the building ends so the area beyond the second saw tooth is not needed for any kind of significant wall beyond that.

Mr. Lafferty noted as an observation the North Carolina flooding was classified as a 1,000-year flood and that was a near miss of the land. He pointed out we are having more of those these days.

Mr. Keesecker said obviously, Mr. Roy, your site is positioned between an area that has jobs kind of employers on Broadway and a natural resource that we all recognized is probably underutilized in our community as a whole and then the historical neighborhood of Woolen Mills particularly. He asked do you see your site as a link between those three distinct areas or destinations beyond those areas.

Mr. Roy replied yes that he wants to be sensitive to the neighborhood and he would prefer a higher percentage of residential in these buildings to take advantage of the character. He thinks the neighbor on Broadway are more industrial buildings and then you have the Service Authority so allowing for another building to serve somewhat as a buffer would then allow for true transitions. He pointed out this is primarily more residential and you get into a little more commercial and office space in here so this would truly be a commercial generator that would fit from this point going up towards Broadway where there are other businesses involved. He said so it could certainly be a destination; the idea is that it would be a nice place to have live/work and that access to the river and again turning the back yard more of the focus of the entire site.

Mr. Keesecker asked if the limit on the number of units a question of the underlying zoning or the comprehensive plan for the 100.

Mr. Roy replied that the comprehensive plan allows specifically for 55% of the property to be residential and the balance to be non-residential; that could be restaurant, office or light industrial.

Mr. Fritz said he thinks the question is about the density and he has taken the position that the comprehensive plan says that it can be used for residential and says 34 units per acre is the number. He pointed out that he has taken not the entire 10.8 acres of the property, but only that portion of the property shown as community service, and divided the 100 units by that, and it works out to 22% to 24% which is well below the 34 units. He pointed out for the entire property it works out to 10 units per acre, but that is not the way it is calculated.

Mr. Keesecker said he was curious about the comparison or the job density with the proposed addition and the new building with Broadway and if more jobs would be on this site than Broadway or less.

Mr. Roy replied that a lot of that depends on who the ultimate business in that goes in here and what would be attractive obviously what would be more sensitive to the area would be something like a brewery production centers that meets the light industrial code but people might not view that as an industrial type user type uses. He said so something like that he does not know how many jobs that would create, but it is a bit enough building that would allow for something substantial.

Mr. Fritz replied that it was difficult for staff to answer that question because we are trying to factor in the work and whether that is a job or a residence and staff does not know how to express and do that yet.

Mr. Keesecker said the live/work is interesting and he was trying to get a sense of how many people are living here and driving away to jobs as opposed to staying.

Mr. Fritz noted that he did not know the number of live/work units, and Mr. Roy pointed out the work units are about 20 with the thought of using the saw tooth building to have separate living space and workspace for individuals that work out of their home to meet the zoning requirement of the 50/50 split.

Mr. Lahendro noted he had mentioned DHR guidelines and asked if this would be a tax credit project with the state and federal, and Mr. Roy replied absolutely, he said they want to preserve the historical aspects but it can be more costly and so it was extremely important to the economic viability of the project. Mr. Roy pointed out that he had met with DHR and was asked a lot of things and the big ask was to solve the big issue of the floodplain Mr. Roy said DHR has weighed in and he had the part 1 of the application in with DHR so that is the first major step to be resolved. Mr. Roy noted on the site there were different opinions, but to preserve the building historically with DHR it can be at odds maybe with the ideal Fire/Rescue access and where you put the parking. In trying to get everyone in the same room and on the same page he things that DHR is most important on the internal structure and to balance all the needs is what he is trying to do now.

Ms. Firehock asked if said you have to do one bedroom to get tax credits, and Mr. Roy replied that the tax credits do not speak to anything in terms of size; the tax credits speak to kind of the existing structure.

Ms. Firehock asked if he had considered having a mix of unit types in there that would address different levels of affordability so someone would not have to leave just because they had a child. She was thinking about the people feeling like they were part of the community and be able to stay a long time.

Mr. Roy noted the focus on the interior walls and the windows stay. He said the thought with the layout was driven with two stairways and mixing the type of units was a strain in looking at the challenge of the schools/children; however, he can look at it with the economics since the number of units was not locked in.

Genevieve Keller asked concerning the live/work units if there would be a requirement to have a residence.

Mr. Roy replied there was a high demand for those type of units and it was a marketing issue, but the layout was for exterior access as opposed to interior so it allows for whether that is a business or a residential entry and so allows for that. However, how that is marketed it is something that does not exist, but how it is laid out with an interior loft space with one-half of the footprint on the floor does.

Genevieve Keller asked if there was any safeguard against flipping to entirely commercial.

Mr. Roy replied he thought in the program if it flips from residential to commercial it probably would be allowed, but if it flipped to entirely residential, it would not be allowed. He said what the Board of Supervisors agreed to approve was for kind of a 50/50 split allowing for some flexibility allowed and the main goal is to preserve it historically.

Mr. Fritz noted the question was if the residential number has to be maintained at a higher number or is it okay if they go away. He noted that Mr. Roy was correct that the comprehensive plan really has a cap saying no more than X number of units; it talks about there being a mix but it does not establish for what that mix would be. Therefore, if they were to lose 20 units he thinks they probably would be consistent with the comprehensive plan mixed-use component. He asked if the concern is to keep it a higher number of residential or does it matter that those 20 units would be converted over to purely commercial.

Genevieve Keller asked if it was rezoned could the saw tooth buildings become a single use either residential or some sort of industrial/commercial.

Mr. Fritz replied that it probably could not become residential because it was getting too close to that maximize 55% ceiling for residential use.

Genevieve Keller asked could it be retail.

Mr. Fritz replied yes, it could because the C-1 zoning district does allow, but the way the proffers have been submitted to date that would not be the case. He said it would allow for the full range of commercial right now for commercial, office and retail. He said the overnight lodging would not be allowed, but would require a special use permit.

Ms. Spain asked will the trail connect down to Riverview Park, and Mr. Roy replied yes, the trails ends at the entrance at Market Street and the thought would be to allow for a connection through the site possibly with a pedestrian bridge across Moore's Creek that connects the trail on the other side at the Service Authority. Mr. Roy said there would be a trail connection proposed.

Ms. Spain asked Mr. Roy if he had been involved with Rivanna Conservation Alliance and Rodney Savage because they have a kios up at Riverview Park.

Mr. Roy replied yes, he had spoken with her a fair amount and talked about how this site could be incorporated into what she does and even some office space that would allow her to be closer and have another site on the river where you could put kayaks in. He said that it was an attractive area for that type of business.

Ms. Firehock questioned the impervious surface since he had talked about the parking on site. She pointed out that Moore's Creek was an impaired stream and suggested consideration of using permeable pavement and other measures particularly for a parking lot, and Mr. Roy replied that he desires preserving the site.

Ms. Firehock said with a focus on fire/rescue and traffic coming in she would discourage the use of the Market Street entrance.

Mr. Roy replied that it was definitely being discouraged and 90% of the traffic was proposed to come in off Broadway.

Commissioner Clayborne suggested integrating mass transit in the area.

Mr. Roy said the parking is a big issue; however, he would use bike racks as incentives for not having cars and agreed the site is a challenge and will require creativity such as access to zip cars and other incentives.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the third floor comes out and does not stop.

Mr. Roy replied that it would remain a concrete structure/building with a small entry point with the primary entrance to the main building off the third floor. He pointed out on the other side of the building there is a bridge to nowhere and to keep with the historic nature of the site it has to stay.

Bill Palmer noted the closest bus stop is probably Riverside and Chesapeake Street at Riverview Park. He asked if his preference is do all of it at once or is there a phasing plan, and Mr. Roy replied with an historic structure it is usually all or none – the existing building would be done all at one – and the new building could take place sooner or later since it is not vital to the entire site.

Bill Palmer asked if the service for the restaurant or anything else would come off Broadway, and Mr. Roy replied that is a thought since this is developing and is certainly primary pedestrian, but could be used for

service vehicles coming in off Broadway. Mr. Roy said there is a set of doors here that you could get directly into.

Genevieve Keller asked to speak to the special use permit if he wanted some uses and if he planned to retain all by right uses or eliminate some with the C-1 Commercial.

Mr. Roy replied that he did not envision major revisions since it was more attractive for residential.

Ms. Genevieve Keller said she did not want any misunderstanding on what commercial means and asked the applicant, staff and the planning commission to take another look at the by right commercial matrix before making a final decision.

Ms. Riley asked if a brewery did not work out as he mentioned what other type of businesses did he envision, and Mr. Roy replied that those businesses with young demographics that liked historic aspects to keep open space was more attractive and maybe some would live in the site, too.

Ms. Spain noted on Attachment A on the last page it says see attached proffer form and they do not have it so she assumes that is because it does not apply because you are coming under review now since July 1.

Mr. Fritz replied they submitted the preliminary proffer form and attachment A was the information submitted as part of the application, and he had provided that and had that note in there but just did not include that. He pointed out it talked about providing the trail and the access is off Broadway. He asked if she wanted a copy.

Ms. Spain said that was okay she just wanted to make sure she was not missing something.

Mr. Keller noted that public comment would be taken after a five minute break with the idea it is to inform staff of any concerns and positives. Mr. Keller said that afterwards he would give the planning commissioners their last opportunity to comment to staff

Mr. Keller called the meeting back to order and asked for public comment. He noted under new business they would talk with staff about the next joint meeting and how to structure.

Ms. Firehock invited public comment.

Bill Emory, city resident, said Woolen Mills is on the National Register and he thought it was great the two planning commissions were working together today. He said he was hoping they would craft a recommendation today for the Board of Supervisors to waive dramatically the parking requirement. Today he was walking up and down Broadway looking at the metal buildings and the sea of asphalt and felt this site has more in common with Monticello visitor center since the sites appear under parked. There is a sense of cars in the parking lot with nobody there. He suggested the use of buses to this area again and potentially the use of zip cars. This site has such a great cultural tourism potential and he was sorry to hear that overnight lodging was by special use. He said this site has great tourist and cultural attraction potential and supported the proposal.

Travis Pietila, with the Southern Environmental Law Center, said he was glad to see both planning commissions talking through this project early in the process; it is clearly a very important site for both localities. Like many people here tonight we see this project as a great opportunity to preserve this historic property, to open the site up for the public and providing new physical connections to the Rivanna Trail. He said they also appreciate Brian Roy taking the time to meet with us and walk through the project when it was initially proposed a couple of years ago. He said one of the things they want to make sure gets

adequate discussion going forward is this project's relationship to Moore's Creek. This is one of our area's most impaired waterways, and it is impaired mainly due to urban runoff. This site is located right along the creek and includes significant preserved critical slopes as discussed earlier, which is a designation used by the county to identify those slopes that are particularly important to protect. We hope that these important environmental features can be avoided to the greatest possible extent particularly those located immediately adjacent to Moore's Creek which if disturbed would have the greatest impact on water quality. We recognize that the preserved slopes internal to the site may present a bigger challenge, but they also warrant careful consideration. As this proposal continues to evolve we hope the applicant and the county can work together to find creative ways to avoid and protect these resources. The opportunities identified by staff to get the most out of limited parking space available on site is a good start and liked the ideas such as shared parking and parking along Broadway.

Allison Ewing, 1900 Chesapeake Street, said she lives in Woolen Mills. They have talked about the pressures on the neighborhood of the increased traffic and she could add to that the potential pressures to the park. She lives adjacent to the park and the park is really at capacity in terms of the parking and use. She supports the project and loves the idea of the bridge and connection of the path. However, she did not think they are thinking through it and asked for consideration of the impacts from the increased traffic, parking and pressure on Riverside Park due to the increase in the neighborhood population and demographics of the neighborhood for the people that have lived there a long time. She said there was no mention of Franklin Street and was surprised the traffic was not discussed because the kids use that street. She emphasized that was a big concern because of the parking issue of the site at capacity and questioned the new building being constructed. She asked them to reconsider how to do improvements on site with the level of intensity of the use particularly due to the preserved slopes on site. In terms of the proffers if they do the development to look towards softening the impact on the neighborhood with Rivanna Water Service Authority discussion and some amenities such as sidewalks that could help the community.

Fred Wolf, resident of 1911 East Market Street, said he was a direct neighbor and architect. He said he appreciates tax credits and was in support of the project since it was fantastic. He encouraged the city and county to work together cooperatively and to be creative on the parking in how to make the site usable with a functional building with the residents to help the neighborhood, which was a critical part and would be a huge benefit in safety of the area. He strongly supported the project.

John Frazee, President of Woolen Mills Neighborhood Homeowners Association, asked to retain the name of the building. He said they were excited about the collaborative nature to allow us feedback since it was a critical opportunity for the city and county to work together. As part of the Woolen Mills Neighborhood, they were looking at this as a joint opportunity for understanding the pressures and the opportunity for greater access with working together on the parking concerns to be successful. He thanked the commission for the opportunity to speak.

Katherine Rocket, of 1800 Chesapeake Street, said as mentioned in the community meeting the main impact is to the neighborhood since her family is here and this is our home. She pointed out her grandfather was the night watchman and she wanted to see it happen, but thinking about the community she wondered what community you are talking about. She asked what is this going to do with the neighborhood access on East Market Street, the Riverside Park, Chesapeake, Franklin and Broadway. Regarding the parking for the kayak business, it bothers me in how access will be to the community trails. She suggested they look at the city data on Riverside Park and bus stops.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller asked to pull together with the two jurisdictions and invite further discussion.

Commissioner Clayborne said that bus stops should be part of the plan if the destination needs to be extended.

Mr. Tim Keller said there were two stages that needs to be talked about.

Ms. Firehock suggested it was the pedestrian nature and how people get there. There was a lot of asphalt and she said there would be less parking if more people walk to the site. A bonus apartment in the parking she would suppose if they get creative would reduce the amount of asphalt on site. She suggested adding a sense of community gathering space on site with a little park.

Mr. Keller added that private property parking could be solved in a defined gathering space.

Mr. Keesecker echoed Ms. Firehock in the connections focus and the analysis has to be spread out for the jobs and living with the neighborhood focus on the community. From the city's perspective, the question is how we siege the opportunity to look at planning to address traffic concerns, make better connections, and address bike/pedestrian. He asked what can the city do to spark conversations to get going and keep conversations with the county and Brian Roy going forward. He said he was excited for the potential.

Mr. Keller suggested to get the conversation going you need Bill Fritz, and Mr. Fritz agreed.

Mr. Lahendro said they need to take creative approaches to address the topography, natural resources and historical resources since it is an exciting project so everyone can wor4k hard to make it happen.

Ms. Genevieve Keller suggested exploring place making safeguards, explore trolley, encourage fund with city for the Rivanna, and be in touch with the delegate representing the historic designation.

Ms. Firehock suggested historic panels along the floodwalls due to the history of the site.

The Planning Commission took a five-minute break at 6:57 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 7:04 p.m.

Other Public Comment

Mr. Keller invited other public comment.

Bill Emory noted the Rivanna River Study came up with a series of recommendations and suggested they move the Rivanna River Study planning forward by encouraging the legislative budget to fund the project.

Mr. Keller pointed out the county representative, the new director; Andrew Gast-Bray is present.

There being no further public comment, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

New Business

Mr. Keller invited new business.

The City of Charlottesville and Albemarle County Planning Commission discussed and came to an agreement that the following issues be discussed at the next two joint meetings: the first addressing housing (city) and the Rivanna River (TJPDC) and the second addressing design – small area plans, entrance corridor design guidelines, and city/county "nodes"

In addition, the following suggestions and issues were discussed:

- Memorandums of understanding between the City and County regarding education, environment, and housing.
- Entrance Corridors Guidelines - how to coordinate to have similar city/county standards on shared corridors (Major through corridors - 250/29 and 5th Street uniform guidelines – including signage)
- Affordable Housing Study – (Ms. Spain requested a copy of the study.)
- Rivanna River Study – The Commissions discussed how to support and advocate moving forward to request future funding. (This was based on what the Commissions heard from Mr. Emory.)
- Preparing for comp plan on horizon.
- Work Plan – Focus on Small Area Plan with parallel Residential Impact Group

There being no further business, the meeting moved to adjournment.

Adjournment at 7:37 p.m. by: Tim Keller, Chair of the Albemarle County Planning Commission and Kurt Keesecker, Chair of the City of Charlottesville Planning Commission.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m. to the Tuesday, November 1, 2017 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Lane Auditorium, 241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

Andrew Gast-Bray, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Albemarle County Planning Commission)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 4-18-2017 SCT