

## Agenda

### **PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR TUESDAY, May 14, 2024 at 5:30 P.M. Hybrid Meeting**

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

*Beginning:* 5:00 p.m.

*Location:* (NDS Conference Room, 610 East Market Street, Charlottesville, VA 22902)

#### **II. Commission Regular Meeting**

*Beginning:* 5:30 p.m.

*Location:* (Council Chambers, 605 E. Main Street, Charlottesville, VA 22902 and 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)

1. Minutes – April 11, 2023 – Regular Meeting
2. Minutes – April 14, 2024 – Regular Meeting

#### **III. PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING**

*Beginning:* 6:00 p.m.

*Continuing:* until all public hearings are completed

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

1. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Funding  
- Draft Program Year 2024-25 Annual Action Plan for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Programs. The Planning Commission will be considering projects to be undertaken as part of the proposed PY2024 -25 Annual Action Plan for the CDBG and HOME programs. Staff from the Office of Community Solutions (OCS) and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) will be presenting funding recommendations for activities designed to address a wide range of community development goals, including economic and workforce development, public service projects that benefit low- and moderate-income citizens, improvements to public facilities and infrastructure, and fair and affordable housing. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has not yet informed the City of funding to be made available for these programs but based on program year 2023-24 funding, the City anticipates approximately \$410,000 in HUD funds for CDBG and approximately \$98,000 for HOME. A 30-day period for public comment will commence on May 1, 2024, and run through June 1, 2024. The draft Annual Action Plan is also scheduled to be presented at public hearings before City Council on Monday, May 20, 2024, and Monday, June 3, 2024. Members of the public can provide written comment on the proposed PY24-25 Annual Action Plan in writing to: CDBG/HOME Taskforce, City of Charlottesville City Hall, P.O. Box 911, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902. Report prepared by Anthony Warn at [warna@charlottesville.gov](mailto:warna@charlottesville.gov)

#### IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

*Beginning: following Joint meeting*

*Continuing: until all public hearings and action items are completed*

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

#### V. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE/ADJOURN

Tuesday May 28, 2024 – 5:00 PM	Work Session	
Tuesday June 11, 2024 – 5:00 PM	Pre-Meeting	
Tuesday June 11, 2024 – 5:30 PM	Regular Meeting	<u>Minutes</u> Entrance Corridor - VERVE

#### Anticipated Items on Future Agendas

Site Plan –240 Stribling Ave, 1613 Grove Street Extended, MACAA – Park Street, VERVE, 2005 JPA, Mount View PUD (preliminary)

**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](mailto:ada@charlottesville.gov). The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48 hour notice so that proper arrangements may be made.

Planning Commission premeeting and regular meetings are held in person and by 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](http://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](http://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  
4/1/2024 TO 4/30/2024**

- 1. Preliminary Site Plans**
- 2. Final Site Plans**
  - a. CRHA South First Street Phase 2 (900-1000 1<sup>st</sup> St. S) – April 29, 2024
- 3. Site Plan Amendments**
- 4. Subdivision**
  - a. 501 Cherry Ave BLA – April 24, 2024

## Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**April 11, 2023 – 5:30 P.M.**  
**Hybrid Meeting**

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

***Beginning:*** 5:00 PM

***Location:*** City Space

**Members Present:** Chairman Solla-Yates, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner D’Oronzio, Commissioner Russell, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Habbab

**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Missy Creasy, James Freas, Alex Ikefuna, Matt Alfele, Anthony Warn

Chair Solla-Yates called the meeting to order at 5:00pm. He noted the hearing for the CDBG/HOME budget and action plan. Draft motions will be available to assist during the meeting. It was outlined that the transportation presentation will focus on the items included in the packet materials. If there is interest in additional information, those topics can be collected, and staff can return at another time to provide additional information. Staff noted that there is no additional information on the zoning ordinance to be provided this evening. Reminders of this week’s events were provided, and Mr. Freas did provide an overview of the table of authority which is a new element of the code coming forward.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if there was any information on the trees on West Main Street wrapped with tape. No one in the room was aware and it was noted to check in with the City Arborist.

**II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Solla-Yates at 5:30 PM.**

***Beginning:*** 5:30 PM

***Location:*** City Space

**A. COMMISSIONER’S REPORT**

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I had a meeting with the Downtown Mall Committee last Thursday. We received an interesting presentation from Beth Meyer from the Architecture School at UVA about the history of the Mall, Lawrence Halprin’s vision for the Mall, and the 2008 plan to redo The Mall. Some radical changes were proposed. We kept our brick size. There were some changes to the tree grates that were problematic and a variety of other issues about café spaces being privatized and a lack of seating and other changes from the original vision in the Mall we see today. We will be discussing more about that and how to remedy those problems over the coming months. I was supposed to be at an MPO Tech meeting, which I missed. They discussed moving towards the 2050 long-range transportation plan and are starting to talk about smart scale round 6, which will be coming up next year. We scored poorly on our 5<sup>th</sup> Street application for a low benefit score. There is discussion of whether we can rework that project to do better. The low benefit is the benefit of the project according to a scoring criterion. With smart scale, you get all these points for the various benefits, and you divide by the cost. In the end, the cost was too high, or the benefit was too low. We need to increase those benefits, or we can put in local money and reduce that cost to get the overall score higher and get higher ranked in the future.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – The Parks and Recreation Board is busy. There were a couple of things that I want to bring to your attention. There was a presentation by Y Street. That is a youth engagement group that

is based at CHS. They have other affiliates throughout the state. They did a wonderful presentation called Share the Air. The objective is to be 100 percent tobacco and vape free in all outdoor spaces, all parks, and all public spaces. There are several localities that have joined their campaign. It will be voluntary wherever they do this by any location that does this. You must mandate that all public parks be tobacco and vape free. We talked about the budget submission. Commissioner Habbab, we were unsuccessful in getting the invasive species line item added. It is not going to make it this year. We are short at least 12 FTEs. We are working to fill those. It has been quite the effort. We are getting ready to open the pools in the future. We are short on lifeguards. We have a mitigation plan. It looks like we are going to outsource or contract out the support for the Onesty pool. We will directly staff Washington Park and Smith Pool with our own people. The LUPEC group met. There were 4 different conversations. The first was managed by UVA. It was talking about transportation in and around Fontaine. The traffic in that area will continue to grow as we continue to build out that area. It will be intensified by the onboarding of the biotech building that is on the way. UVA has undertaken an analysis that assesses what a full build out would look like by 2025. It is going to be busy out there. They walked us through an in-depth analysis of their data. There was a back and forth between UVAs data and VDOTs data. We are working through that. I would ask you to look at that presentation. It is detailed, in-depth, and enlightening. Another conversation was managed by the county. This was walking us through their Comp Plan update. The tagline for their effort is called AC-44. It is a vision for 2044. The goals, themes, objectives, and public feedback will be familiar to you guys when you look at the presentation. Another presentation was about what the county is doing with their ordinance. They are modernizing their zoning ordinance. They are doing that in conjunction with AC-44. The last time it was updated was 1980. There have been 200 amendments to their ordinance since 1980. The modernization process is a full-scale rewrite. The things that they are doing will remind you of the things that Mr. Freas is attempting to do with our rewrite; to make it more readable, to make it user friendly, and to make it more streamlined. The last thing in that meeting was Mr. Freas. He did a wonderful job of updating the members of what we are doing. The people in the county have agreed to do more collaboration as we work through our Comp Plans.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I attended the BAR meeting last month. The only thing of interest was a proposed hotel at 843 West Main Street. It has a 15- to 20-foot setback to try and create a nice outdoor plaza in front. I will be interested to see how that works with our future zoning code. There is going to be a lot of discussion about how the back works. It is currently following the regulations for bulk plane. It is sitting high above West Haven. There is some community feedback about how it can be less. That will be interesting to follow. That was a preliminary discussion. At the BPAC meeting, there was a presentation from our transportation planner. I did meet with 2 representatives of Livable Cville to listen to some of their concerns.

**Commissioner D’Oronzio** – There were a few meetings at the end of March. The CAHF Committee went through several sessions in late March finishing off the HOFS (Housing Operations Funding Suggestions). It went to Council with some adjustments to be made there. We have just finished the decision on the CAHF itself. We had \$1.8 million in requests for \$835,000. The CDBG Task Force met. We worked through the numbers and allotments there. You are going to see that shortly. The HAC had its inaugural meeting. In that meeting, Joy Johnson was elected chair. She tasked a sub-committee to review Module One quickly in advance of the work session to be held on the 29<sup>th</sup>. We have not adopted new bylaws in the HAC. The sub-committees don’t have the power to say that this is the product of the HAC. Until the HAC says, ‘this is our final product,’ it is not the final product. It has been circulated and provided to staff. I am not a member of that sub-committee. I did read it. Essentially, it is privilege, affordable housing, high multiple of density for making things predominantly affordable, 3,4 times bonus, and moved height another 50 percent. There is privilege in most zones. Privilege is of affordable housing.

**Commissioner Habbab** – The Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee met March 15<sup>th</sup>. We looked at the long-range transportation plan for 2050. We got a review of it. We reviewed the website for that. Instead of climate action and equity being standalone chapters, they are interwoven into all the other sections. We received an update on the Rivanna River Pedestrian Bridge. Because of the design that was chosen, it is now in the county instead of being the county and city. The TJPDC applied for a grant to complete the engineering for the bridge, which we hope will reduce the contingency and make it more feasible for the next round of smart-scale applications. We got an update from Safe Streets For All. We were awarded about \$850,000. We will probably hear about that later in the evening. That will go to complete the comprehensive safety action plan for this region. The goal is to prevent roadway deaths and serious injury. The Tree Commission met April 4<sup>th</sup>. We looked at the Downtown Mall trees that were cut down. I believe 2 benches have been created and are being tested from the lumber of those trees. We still need to figure out what to do with the tree stumps. We also received a presentation by Mr. Freas on Module Two. The codes and practices subcommittee of the Tree Commission is going to be reviewing that and submitting its comments. We discussed best practices to measure existing trees for the tree removal permit. There might be other ways that would be better to do that that people were suggesting. We discussed fines from the tree removal permit or people violating that could pay into a tree fund. We learned Module Three is going to have some flexibility in the setbacks and language like that to save some trees that would apply to Module One. The city did its first controlled burn.

**Commissioner Russell** – I missed the April 6<sup>th</sup> TJPDC meeting. I am looking through the agenda packet. It looks like there was a report on the Charlottesville Albemarle MPO unified planning work program presentation. It is both a summary of some of the big projects that have been ongoing like smart-scale, bike-ped, regional transit planning, and a look ahead at the next fiscal year. There is information online.

## **B. UNIVERSITY REPORT**

**Commissioner Palmer** – I don't have a lot to report. We have several construction projects happening around UVA that you might have seen. The Alderman Library seems to be moving along very well. That is one we don't talk about too much because it doesn't impact traffic. It should be done towards the end of 2023. The Contemplative Commons should be done at around the same time. That is the one on Emmet Street, which includes the pedestrian bridge across the street there, which would be a nice addition to Grounds. The Data Science Building is moving along. They are putting a lot of brick on the building. That is going to be a new school for UVA. That will be a new home for that school. That should also be done towards the end of 2023/early 2024. A few projects are starting to come together.

## **C. CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – With Karen Firehock at Albemarle County, we put together a talk about climate action planning in the region as part of a larger University of Virginia event. It was recorded and I will share the recording when it comes out. It was productive. It is good for us to be talking about regional climate action planning. Hopefully, it will lead to good things in the future.

## **D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS**

**Ms. Creasy** – I read in the paper this morning about funding for the invasive species. I did clarify with the budget office that Council did put that back in the budget. We have 2 open houses coming up. We have an open house tomorrow evening at Carver from 4 to 7 PM. If you can attend, that would be wonderful. We also have an open house on Saturday in this room from 10 to 12:30. There is a lot of activity on Saturday going on downtown. We are hopeful that some of those events will also encourage people to come and visit us. We

have those opportunities. There are some other opportunities that are occurring with our consultants in town during the next couple of days that they are here. We will be focused on Module Two during that event. I anticipate that we will get comments and feedback on lots of aspects it. They are drop-in with stations or different explanations of what is involved with Module Two. Module Two is out for review. It is available on the website. The next part will be forthcoming. We have a work session scheduled for April 25<sup>th</sup>. We are planning a review of Module Two.

**James Freas, NDS Director** – I am encouraging commissioners to come to one of the open houses. We are going to be reassessing our overall schedule and try to provide that to you, the public, and Council our assessment of where we think this thing is going to land at this point given where we are now and what additional work needs to happen.

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

**Brian Emory** – Speaking about Module Two, Division 4.11 (Outdoor Lighting), is ‘outside of my lane.’ There are good model lighting ordinances available that we can adapt for our locality, lighting codes known to have worked well for decades. There are detailed lighting recommendations from The Illuminating Engineering Society to provide a further guide. There is local expertise and interests from architects, lighting designers, environmentalists, and others to write a new ordinance that serves our community well. Artificial light at night is an issue, especially for its longer-term impact on our environment and our health. It can be ameliorated by good lighting. The draft lighting ordinance in its simplicity turns back the clock to the 1970s. It is a step backwards from the existing lighting code. It is professionally and legislatively naïve. It has no basis in the national standards that VDOT follows. The basic principle is simple. Use the right amount of light only where needed and only when needed. Lighting effects health. Lighting creates serious environmental issues. LED technology has made light cheap to produce and spectrally disastrous. There are good lighting ordinances available that we can use as a guide. This section needs a thoughtful, professional redo.

**Genevieve Keller** – I am a former member of this body. I appreciate and respect the time and talent you bring to your deliberations. I hope that you will take my comment in the spirit in which it is given tonight. That is to be helpful and share my thoughts about the recent dialogue around the table. At your last joint work session, I was distracted, disgusted, and concerned that a commissioner made a comment about a hypothetical armed situation regarding the distance of a setback. The comment included a reference to a Maserati driven by a lingerie model. There was another comment that referred to a male body part as a descriptive term. This semester I am working with some extraordinary young women, who I believe must be reawakening some of my dormant 1970s brand of feminism as they critique writings by men from earlier eras. I am heartened by their concern about the way that women’s attitudes work, and roles have been underrepresented, ignored, or dismissed in environmental and planning literature. At a recent meeting, two other colleagues, both formally associated with the city, also found the commissioner comments offensive. As a person who spent the first half of my career as a community planning consultant, I was accustomed to being the only woman in the room. I have experienced much worse, both verbally and physically, than what happened in City Space two weeks ago. However, this was not acceptable. It is not acceptable among public officials in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The comment made me more aware that at that meeting, there were 9 men and 1 woman around the table. As the most important land use decision is being made here over the next months, the major advisory opinion will come from 6 men and 1 woman. It will ultimately be decided by 4 men and 1 woman. These are decisions that will affect women in many ways. They will affect the most vulnerable women of all profiles: young single parents usually women, single women living alone, and aging women on fixed incomes. Many women who own their residence, it is their only or major asset. If they are older, they were probably underemployed, underpaid, and spent some time out of the workforce. Women today spend

more time in their homes and their neighborhoods because they are nest makers, caregivers, and are still exploited, stereotyped, and demeaned.

**Ellen Contini-Morava** (225 Montebello Circle) – I would like to say something about the proposal to build an 8-story building at 1709 Jefferson Park Avenue. This is another example of how developers are scrambling to use the current Special Use Permit process to add height and density to their projects that go beyond what current zoning would allow by right without having to include any affordable units. They would have to do that if the proposals for inclusionary zoning are implemented just like the 5- to 7-story high rise at 2005 JPA you approved last year. SUPs for extra height, extra density, reduced on-site parking, reduced on-site setbacks, and no affordable units. City planners have been promoting the idea that more density will bring more affordable housing. The inclusionary zoning analysis hosted by the Cville Plans Together last summer mentions extra height, density, and reduced on-site parking as bonuses that are meant to encourage developers to include some affordable housing. Filling up the neighborhood with high-rises comes with a cost, adding to the current parking and traffic congestion, loss of tree canopy, and loss of a sense of community for residents in our neighborhood. Why award bonuses to developers without the gain of affordable units that are supposed to be the justification for them?

**Jennifer King** (221 Montebello Circle) – I would like to echo the previous comments. She eloquently presented the point. There is no need for me to re-present. I wanted to make sure that it was on the record that there was another resident in the JPA neighborhood that shared that perspective.

## **F. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes – October 21, 2021 – Special Meeting

**Commissioner Russell – Approve the Consent Agenda – Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg – Motion passes 7-0.**

Mayor Snook called Council to Order for the one public hearing.

## **III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL**

*Beginning:* 6:00 PM

*Continuing:* Until all public hearings are complete

*Format:* (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing, (iv) Discussion and Motion

1. **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Funding - DRAFT FY23-24 ACTION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE DRAFT 2023-2027 CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR THE THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT HOME CONSORTIUM - 5th Year Action Plan, FY23-24:** The Planning Commission and City Council will be considering projects to be undertaken as part of the federal fiscal year 2023-2024 Annual Action Plan for the city's CDBG and HOME programs. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has informed the City that funding for these two programs is currently estimated at approximately \$410,468 for CDBG and approximately \$98,161 for HOME, although these numbers may change with the final HUD allocation. CDBG funds will be used in the City to address economic development activities, housing activities, and public service projects that benefit low- and moderate-income citizens. HOME funds will be used to support the housing needs of low- and moderate-income citizens through homeownership opportunities. Report prepared by Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst.



## i. Staff Report

**Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst** – I would like to bring your attention to the resolution in favor of the current 1-year annual action plan for the city CDBG and Home Plans. There are currently two plans under development. One plan is the 5-year consolidated plan. Tonight, we are going to be discussing the first-year action plan for that, which guides the programs that are currently being evaluated and are the subject of the funding recommendations we are eventually going to put before Council for approval. We have the 2 plans. We have worked with the staff at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission in developing the larger 5-year consolidated plan, of which the actual annual plan is part of it. We are evaluating applications for funding for the 2 federal programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In the memo, there are the 2 estimated allocations we have received initial notification from HUD. We will be receiving \$410,468 for the Community Development Block Grant Program and a large allocation of \$785,286 for the HOME Program. The city will receive a share of approximately \$98,161 for programs of our choosing. That touches on the larger home consortium, of which TJPDC is the program coordinator. The work of the CDBG and HOME Task Force is guided by several documents the city has set out for its comprehensive planning. We can talk the specific priorities set forth by City Council last September. There are 2 set asides in the city guidance for \$89,896.51. One is for economic development, which we have included in the funding recommendations that you are going to be looking at later. Another set aside is for the public facilities improvements. The Task Force did not believe that we received applications were directly relevant to that. We have held that as a set aside for programs that are currently being researched right now. The Task Force will reconvene and discuss how we want to use that money to best maximize the impact for the residents of Charlottesville. We will be coming before you again and eventually to Council for recommendation on that.

The Task Force meets annually. It is composed of members from a variety of different stakeholder groups. Their work is to evaluate the application for funding from community based non-profit organizations that are related to the key goals of the programs. Each application is reviewed by staff for completeness, thoroughness, and appropriateness to the established goals that we have. The Task Force members read each of the applications thoroughly and score them on a scale of 1 to 4 on each of 13 evaluation criteria.

In terms of the requests for funding, they were broken down into 4 major categories, CDBG Community Services, CDBG Economic Development, and CDBG Housing Related. The 4<sup>th</sup> category was directly related to our share of the HOME allocation. We received 7 applications. Most of them were for CDBG funding. There was 1 applicant for the HOME funding, which made that deliberation process relatively easy. Two things emerged quickly in our discussions. It was agreed upon by all members of the Task Force that all the applications received speak to very important community goals. If we had the capacity and the power to do so, we would fund all of them at 100 percent. The asks in each category exceeded the amount of money available to us. We met several times. We had an in-depth discussion about each of the applications and how we could best maximize the impact of this very limited funding. This slide outlines what the applications were asking for in each of the different areas.

It was decided by the Task Force. All members agreed to fund several of these programs. We have utilized all the money available to us. With the Charlottesville Critical Rehab Program from AHIP, the members could speak to the important work that they were doing. With the Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents, members could speak to their work. With the Community Investment Collaborative, we are interested to look through their program. It was decided to fund them. the Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville & Albemarle were funded. The recommendation is before you. A lot of discussion was made towards the coordinated entry into homelessness systems of care; the Haven at First and Market Streets. One of the things that was important about the work that they were doing is that they have various intake

coordinators, who bring people into their programs. They have a hotline. The hotline is currently not funded to be available 100 percent of the time. This funding would help them expand the hours that is available and the number of people that they can help bring into the coordinated system of care for people with unstable housing.

Under the HOME Funding Program, Piedmont Housing Alliance has a program for permanent and long-term home ownership opportunities. They received Charlottesville's full share as a recommendation. In almost all cases, they were less than what the ask was for. The larger HOME program involves the City of Charlottesville and 5 surrounding counties.

The reason why we are here today is because we are currently developing the 5-Year Plan and the 1-Year Action Plan. The Commission will look at it tonight and recommend changes or revisions and move this on to a final recommendation by City Council. If it is accepted and approved, it is submitted to HUD. The deadline for submission of the 5-year and 1-year plans to HUD is May 15<sup>th</sup>. If we are able to submit locally approved plans, then we continue to remain eligible for the next 5 years of our funding through these 2 programs as an entitlement community.

**Commissioner Habbab** – The only question that I had was the condition on the resolution. Why are we adding that?

**Mr. Warn** – The way HUD funding occurs is that they give an initial estimate of funding for the 2 programs. That funding can change at any point based on HUD's decision either with warning or without warning both before and after the official funding agreement is completed. Sometimes, there are several conditions. There is always a condition that if HUD does come in at some point with the final official allocation and they revise the number down, all the funding recommendations would be adjusted.

**Commissioner Russell** – I should disclose that I am on the board of AHIP. I don't think that I have a personal interest as defined by city code.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I noted that Habitat wasn't funded because they would probably be applying to other programs like HOFS. Do we know if they applied to HOFS?

**Commissioner D'Oronzio** – Yes, they did. Yes, they were funded.

**Mr. Warn** – That was probably the longest discussion that the Task Force members had. If we had the capacity, we would fund everything. The decision revolved around the fact that, in terms of the numbers of people that could be impacted and that they were likely to get funding in other ways, we could allocate our resources for the maximum effect.

## **ii. Public Hearing**

No Public Comments

## **iii. Commission Discussion and Motion**

**Commissioner Mitchell** – This is very good work. I appreciate how you netted out so much information.

**Motion – Chairman Solla-Yates** – I make a motion to recommend approval of the FY23/24 annual action plan for the City of Charlottesville as recommended by the current CDBG HOME Task Force and as outlined in the Planning Commission packet for April 11, 2023 with the following conditions:

- **The city adjusts for actual CDBG entitlement amounts as received from HUD in which funding allocations will be increased/reduced at the same prorated percentage actual entitlement to be estimated and no agency will increase more than their initial funding request.**

**Second by Commissioner Habbab. Motion passes 7-0.**

### **Discussion following Motion**

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I have some critiques on the process. One would be that it would be helpful to have the applications posted on the internet or linked to them. Another critique is that the rubric feels like it is judging the wording of the grant or of the application/grant writing rather than the end thing. Provides a clear description and clearly explains how it will address one or more Council priorities. It should be clearly addresses or strongly addresses Council priorities or adequately addresses Council priorities rather than how it explained it. I think this is the same rubric we have been using for years. With the minutes, I wasn't sure who some of the initials were.

**It was decided to have another public comment period for items not on the agenda. The public comments were added to the Matters From The Public above.**

## **IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS**

*Continuing:* until all action items are concluded

1. Preliminary Discussion – 1709 JPA

### **Staff Report**

**Mat Alfele, City Planner** – You are having a preliminary discussion and receiving a presentation from Mitchell Matthews Architects (representing the owner, Neighborhood Investments, LLC) who is in the early stages of pursuing the redevelopment of 1709 Jefferson Park Avenue. The site is currently occupied by a four (4) story apartment building with a total of eight (8) units and approximately fifteen (15) surface parking spaces (eight (8) off Montebello Circle and seven (7) off JPA, and was constructed in 1972. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing building with an eight (8) story (approximately seventy (70) feet) residential building that would have twenty-seven (27) units and twenty-three (23) parking spaces (nineteen (19) structured spaces off JPA and four (4) surface spaces off Montebello Circle). To accommodate the development as proposed the applicant will need to pursue a Special Use Permit and a Critical Slope Waiver. Prior to moving forward with these applications, the developer and their team is looking for feedback from the Planning Commission on the proposed project. Within your packet, there are 4 different topics that the Planning Commission might want to consider after the presentation. We have not received any application. There is nothing that has been reviewed by staff. This is very early in the application process.

**Commissioner Russell** – Normally, your staff reports analyze the proposal to the Future Land Use Map. I didn't see that.

**Mr. Alfele** – We don't have an application to review. What they are asking is that before they even apply, they wanted to come before this body. We will review it once we have an application.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – What is this currently zoned?

**Mr. Alfele** – Currently, this is R-3. It will be CX-5 if the proposed ordinance goes through.

**Commissioner Habbab** – We still have the FAR. Do they have to provide some affordable units or cash in lieu? What would that be? If we were looking at the draft zoning, how many affordable units would they have to provide?

**Mr. Alfele** – There is not enough information to do the 1-FAR calculation at this point. It would be 10 percent over any 10 units above or under the draft inclusionary zoning.

**Councilor Payne** – Is it to the point where we haven't seen any information about whether they plan to match the draft inclusionary zoning ordinance requirements?

**Mr. Alfele** – In their presentation, they can speak to that more. They are talking about in their preliminary plan trying to hit some of that inclusionary zoning. I think they would still have to use the 1-FAR. They might be able to provide that during their presentation.

### **Applicant Presentation/Commission Questions/Commission Feedback**

**Kevin Riddle, Applicant** – I will go through the materials that we submitted to you.

#### **Next Slide**

This summarizes the request for the Special Use Permit. By right, it is an R-3 zone. It is less than a third of an acre. By right, we can have 7 dwellings on the property. Division Seven of the zoning ordinance allows for up to 87 DUA, which is what we are seeking (27 apartments). Accompanying this, you can request additional height of up to 101 feet. What we are requesting is about 70 feet above the average grade. The yard dimensions required by right would significantly limit a new building footprint to less than 40 percent of the total land area. The existing building is non-conforming. You couldn't build it now by right. We request yard reductions to support more housing and more apartments on the parcel. Because of the size and the grades on the parcel, the capacity to park cars here is limited. We are requesting a reduction of about 40 percent over where the current zoning requires. We think this is probably appropriate. This street is not so unlike West Main Street and The Corner. There are a lot of services nearby, markets, University of Virginia. There are already a lot of people walking here. Incidents of car use is relatively lower here than it is in other city neighborhoods.

#### **Next Slide**

This shows some census data. Most of the people who live in the neighborhood are very young. They are graduate and undergraduate students, renters. They are walking and biking a lot.

#### **Next Slide**

Here we are looking at the site outlined in white dashes along Jefferson Park Avenue. It is on the west side. It is about 300 yards south of The Grounds. There is a bus stop a couple of doors down. Within 500 feet of the property are several multi-family buildings that are greater than 40 feet in height. You have 106 Stadium Road, the South Range Apartments associated with the Oakhurst Inn, and The Jefferson Commons Apartment building that is almost across the street at 1620 JPA. Further down on this aerial, we have a recent project at 1725 JPA.

#### **Next Slide**

Here we see a map that is color coded with the current zoning. This property is R-3. It is intended for potential multi-family use. The existing building on site sits far away. It is over 50 feet from Jefferson Park Avenue. Like many of its neighbors to the south, the deep yard here is surrendered to surface parking with

little regard to street scape or pedestrian comfort and safety. Plantings and paths are sparse. Asphalt and severe exposure are common. Several recent buildings on the corridor suggest a potentially better alternative, one with smaller yards but with walkways, entries connected to the public way, and planting beds in place of parked cars. Among these are the apartment buildings at 1620 JPA. That has a front yard of about 25 feet. 1725 JPA has about a 20-foot front yard. Directly north of the property is 1707 JPA. It was built about 15 years ago. It also has about a 20-foot front yard. The front facades of the apartments at 1600 JPA are right on the property boundary in places. The front yard in this property is somewhat negligible ranging somewhere from 2 to 8 feet in size. At 1707 and 1725 JPA, side yards are less than what is required by right. They are under 10 feet wide. With the property built about 15 years ago and the property built several years ago, we think they provide a useful bookend to this property and this neighborhood. If you imagine their front yards extending along the other parcels, we think that makes it better sense, an improved trend here to create a better street wall and use more of this land to provide more housing. If we look at the circle, there are currently 2 3.5-story buildings on Montebello Circle. It has a few buildings with some height to them. There is one at 210 and 300 Montebello Circle.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is a map color coded with the city's proposed new zoning classifications. CX-5 is what is currently intended for this property and its immediate neighbors. Note that the new zoning as currently drafted would allow an owner to build on more of their property. It would impose no limit to density and potentially no minimums to on-site parking spaces. One correction on this slide. Before Module Two of the zoning rewrite the draft was published, we just had a placeholder that included current zoning requirements for parking. We understand that potentially could be significantly reduced if not eliminated.

#### **Next Slide**

This slide emphasizes some areas of denser construction or housing in the city. The ones in the dark orange were built by 2011. The ones in the darker purple were built since 2011. While we have had one recent project at JPA come along at 1725 and the one at 2005, there is so much along this current stretch that is older. It is a place that has potential promise for significantly denser housing. We think our proposal would align with that vision.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is Streets That Work. The current zoning draft agrees with a lot of this, even though this is an older document. We see here that JPA is intended to be mixed-use. That is also true of West Main Street and The Corner. There is the same access to commercial services to UVA. There is a lot of walking. It is a wide, bustling avenue. It is a place where parking reductions would make sense.

#### **Next Slide**

We have zoomed in on the site. This is a survey. Montebello Circle is at the top. Jefferson Park Avenue is down below. We have colored this with light pink. This matches what is on the city's GIS map indicating critical slopes on the property. The site is unusually steep. As you go from Montebello to Jefferson Park Avenue, you drop 54 feet. There are a few locations that are not coded as critical. I think those are not naturally occurring flat areas. Those were produced when this earlier apartment building was constructed. This is true of a lot of properties along this stretch of JPA. There are at least 8 or 9 south of this property. If you look at the GIS map, you will notice that they are laced with critical slopes. These would be significantly hindered if some waiver was not allowed. We are seeking a waiver in this case.

#### **Next Slide**

Here are some drawings that help you see what would be allowed under different standards. We contrast first what is on the left here. We have a plan above that survey shrunk down. Below, we have a cross section cut

through the site and looking north towards UVA. The sections below go with the plans above. On the left, you see the by right use. Where you see a right rectangle, that is the area somebody could build without seeking any special uses or exceptions. On the right is a different vision for the property. This aligns with what we have in Module One of the zoning rewrite. You can see that side yards can potentially be built. There is a build-to range at front yards. This is a double frontage site. Montebello Circle and JPA are front yards. You can see that that range is rather narrow. With bonuses, you can build 100 feet tall with the zoning rewrite. We have this here to indicate the vision going forward for the city. It is not that we would be depending on what is currently in the Comp Plan and zoning drafts to have a viable project here. What is allowed with a special use permit process can also be achieved. We show that in the middle here. We are proposing a 70-foot-tall building from the average grade. We are proposing 5-foot minimums along the side. You will see in subsequent plans that most of the building would not get that close to the side yards. At JPA, we are proposing 18 feet. At Montebello, we are proposing a 25-foot front yard.

### **Next Slide**

Here are a couple of floor plans for reference to give you some impression of how the building is working with each of its streets. On the left is the entry level off Jefferson Park Avenue. You can see where most of the parking will be. It is under the building. It will be largely concealed from view. What you see in the lighter brown as opposed to the dark black is where we are considering having planting beds so we can have better street trees where there are none now. In addition to the entry into the parking area, which we would like to keep as narrow as possible, we have an entry court here and a lobby for the tenants. On the left, we are hoping that we can find space to largely conceal trash bins. The grades here might assist us so that we could submerge those and have them behind site walls or retaining walls. On the right is the floor plan about 4 levels up. You could enter the building here from Montebello up at the top of the site. We have reduced the surface parking by half of what is there now. We are keeping 4 spaces up here. To improve the streetscape, we are proposing some planting so that we have a couple of medium-sized trees and understory planting on the right side. We have a covered entry and a walk that leads from a sidewalk that we would be introducing with a small seating wall over here. Most of the building will be 12 feet from the property boundary. It is just up here close to JPA where we are proposing an entry volume that comes up 2 stories. That gets closer to the street and to the north boundary. We believe this is going to have beneficial effects on the massing of the building. We can step back the front façade and the corner facades as we go up to the full height of the building on the Avenue.

### **Next Slide**

We are cutting through about halfway through the site and the building. We are looking towards UVA. We have extended the section out to show you buildings that are on the other side of the street, to give you some impression of what kind of room there is beyond the property. With JPA, we have an unusually wide right-of-way. It is over 80 feet. The outcome here would be, with our proposed front yard, we are still over 120 feet from the façade of the 1620 JPA apartment building across the street. There is also a smaller stone house that is south of Valley Road here. That is also about 120 feet away from the proposed building. As we go to Montebello, we have a narrower street. While the street is narrow, you have different conditions on either side of it. On the project side, many buildings are within 25 feet of the right-of-way. Sidewalks are missing. Entry points are often below the street grade. On the west side, it is different. The buildings sit higher above the circle, usually at least 12 feet above the elevation of Montebello. They are also typically about 50 feet away from their property boundary. There is a nice stone wall that consistently runs with a sidewalk there that helps to further define the edge there and perch these properties. There are also a lot of plantings on that side. There are a lot of buffers in place on that side of the street.

### **Next Slides**

The following slides will give you some photographs looking at the site from different angles. Here you begin to appreciate the grades and existing conditions. You can see a tall retaining wall here on the neighboring property that extends to the southeast corner of our property and wraps around. You are left with this unyielding apron of aging concrete that is very steep with no walks. You can eventually reach a little stair that is tucked around over here. There is no legible or inviting connection from the street up to the building as it currently is. Trash cans are often out. There are 2 curb cuts even though it is a 90-foot-wide frontage.

This is another view. We are near where Valley Road intersects JPA. Behind us is the 1620 apartment building. To the right is the apartment building at 1707 JPA. You can see that the building is 4 stories tall. Because of its location on the site up from JPA, it is over 20 feet before you get to the terrace on which this building is constructed.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is a glimpse of a residential project possible with the requested special use permit. This creates street frontage that is aligned more closely with 1707 JPA and further to itself at 1725 JPA. It allows room for at least 2 large trees and understory plantings, new walks, seat walls, and a concealed trash enclosure. All this would replace the deteriorating and daunting slab of parking that currently is occupying the entire front yard.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is the same proposal with some alternative exterior materials.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is another option for exterior cladding. We are showing these alternatives, not so much to discuss them specifically here tonight or look for preferences for many of you. It is more to demonstrate that we have been trying to consider multiple options and work through this design. It is important to test a variety of materials. At this point, we want to keep a range of colors and textures in play as availability and cost of materials are bound to vary. We haven't had the chance to narrow down our choices with material samples. If the project was to move forward, during the entrance review process, we would start zeroing on these.

#### **Next Slide**

This is the site directly across the street. We currently have a building there with 8 apartments.

#### **Next Slide**

This is a masonry building to replace it with 27 apartments. Over to the right, you get a glimpse of the tree and the entry lobby. We imagine right now that it would have storefront. It would be visible to the street and from the street into the lobby. Up above, we have located a study lounge there. This would be a heavily glazed space with common use and a lot of visibility to the street.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is the elevation with ribbed and corrugated metal siding and a white gray masonry base.

#### **Next Slide**

This is the aluminum cladding that is mimicking wood. What we are showing in the balconies is to hopefully have operable mesh curtains that could be hung there to create screening and privacy and to be opened or closed depending on the time of day. We think that this is a nice way that the façade could be enlivened. Up here is a canopy at the top level where we step back. This is a semi-open canopy. We are imagining it having a fine framing and closely spaced metal pipers up there that would allow sunlight to rake through. With the

change in materials, we think that it will help that upper story along with the step-back to recede somewhat and not be as prominent.

#### **Next Slide**

We have swung around. We are up to the Montebello Circle. We see the existing conditions at the other front yard. It is tough over here. There is a lot of parking almost completely in the front yard, a meager bridge that comes over there. There are no sidewalks on the east side of Montebello Circle.

#### **Next Slide**

Here it is from another vantage point. You can see the conditions that are typical here. On the west side, you start to see a little bit of what is going on. You have this continuous sidewalk, a sidewall, and the yards that begin to slope up. The houses are about 50 feet away and are perched up. You also have parallel parking on this side.

#### **Next Slides**

Here is our vision for this side. Here is the wood version and the gray and silver version. Here is the last look in brick and metal. Although we retain half the existing surface parking, this combination of pavers, planting beds, and concrete scoured and textured would significantly improve the streetscape. We propose a sidewalk and a seat wall along about half the yard. An entry walk leads to a covered entry point. The planting beds would be sufficient to support at least 3 medium-sized trees and a lot of understory planting. The 4<sup>th</sup> story steps back rather significantly about 14 feet from the facades below it. There is also a change in material. At the building's corners, we have located living rooms and balconies to better orient common space and increase visibility to the public realm to give the tenants a nice view.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – With the 3 affordable units, what is your thinking about that? How are you planning to build those in?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is a question we are just beginning to think about. One of the challenges with a project like this is that it is going to be geared so much to student housing. I don't know if you have had any discussions or have any insights about the potential there might be to have an affordable provision that would be geared toward young people, who might be attending UVA that are coming from modest or low-income families. If there is a potential to have an affordability provision for a project like this one that is level to have this kind of demographic. There is going to be an obligation to affordable housing. We will be working that out if the project moves along. We know those discussions are going to involve the City Council.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – We care deeply about these students at UVA that maybe in need of some additional subsidies. We care about providing affordable housing for the permanent residents of Charlottesville. That is something that we will have to work through. With the tree canopy, it looks like we are going to lose some trees.

**Mr. Riddle** – I think that we might lose one tree of any size that is on the north of the property, close to the boundary with 1707.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – In your survey, there are 2 4-inch crepe myrtles on the south side. There is a 12-inch unknown tree. It is over the property line. Would that be affected by your grading?

**Mr. Riddle** – That one might be affected.



**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – There is that 30-inch deciduous. It is further away but up a little bit. Would that be affected?

**Mr. Riddle** – I am seeing the 20-inch mulberry. I don't think that 30-inch deciduous is close enough that it would be affected. The one up top at the northwest corner. That 20-inch mulberry should be fine. We are going to be potentially having to use retaining walls and grading significantly will be closer to JPA and about halfway up the site. As we get closer to Montebello, we are not proposing to change the grades there very much. All those trees should be fine. That 12-inch tree is far enough down the site that I would suspect its root system would be damaged. That one would be lost. We have the potential here for maybe 3 large new street trees on JPA and 3 medium-sized trees at Montebello. Because of those locations, their location will make them work harder to serve the public realm than some of the trees that are further up and buried within the sites.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – It would be helpful if you would present a proposal that allows us to break even or at least maybe net up a little in the canopy. With the critical slopes, pay attention to that you are walking through that and what that is going to do to the greenery. Make sure that you can 'walk' us through what you are going to do to mitigate any loss of greenery in the critical slopes. There is no waterway at the base of these slopes.

**Mr. Riddle** – There is a waterway that is close by on the other side of JPA. It is within 200 feet. That is the thing along with the excess of 25 percent that triggers the critical slope.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – It is going to be important when you present that you have a good and strong mitigation plan. Things like nutrient credits, while intriguing, don't help us locally. Any mitigation you can do on site would be of great value.

**Mr. Riddle** – When making these kinds of proposals, it sounds like you would like to see an outline or intentions even though I assume that with the site plan review, a lot more of the details are going to be 'hammered out.'

**Commissioner Mitchell** – That is certainly what Mr. Freas is trying to point us to. I would still like to be comfortable that there is a good strong mitigation plan to protect the waterways and at least net zero on the tree canopy.

**Commissioner Habbab** – Like Commissioner Mitchell, I like the trees on the street. It is better than what is currently there, more if you can fit them all around the site to break even. The current site is unfriendly with a lot of pavement. This is a good approach that nestles that grade change from JPA to Montebello. It does a better job representing itself on Montebello than the current structure. I appreciate the eyes on the street approach. My concerns are the rent and considering the existing units. They are in this building that is not very nice. It is going to be a higher end rent potentially and trying to preserve some of that affordability, whether for students or if it finds its way into our larger Charlottesville affordable housing funding. Another concern was how much space there was between this building and the building next door. There are units there with windows facing the site.

**Mr. Riddle** – That building is 10 feet off its side yard. It is a somewhat narrow space. We realize that for code purposes that when we are so close to the property boundary, there are going to be limitations on openings. They might have to be protected if we go above that. We feel that if we have at least 15 feet between this façade and the other one, it is not necessarily going to be too close for comfort. I think that right now, we would have over 20 feet based on this proposal and what is there now.

**Commissioner Habbab** – Along that same location, more plantings and/or a way for the public to navigate between the upper gathering space and the lower gathering space. Material-wise, brick on the JPA side would be my preference. I had questions about the material on the balcony.

**Mr. Riddle** – Where we have exterior drapery, that would be a metal mesh curtain. It would be durable but also potentially operable. It is a potential addition. Some of us think it could be nice because it would allow for potentially more privacy for tenants. It would create the potential for a different kind of shifting façade depending on how people are using those.

**Commissioner Russell** – I was hoping that you could help me understand how I am reading the height, the floors, and the stories, and looking at the proposed future zoning. You are proposing an 8-story building at 70 feet. In this future rezoning, that is proposed to be a CX-5, which is a maximum of 5 floors, height of 72 feet. What am I missing in that?

**Mr. Riddle** – I don't think you are getting anything wrong. That is true about CX-5. I think at a bonus level, you can have 100 feet and 7 stories. We are seeking a special use permit based on the current zoning. With the current zoning, there is not a limitation on stories. There is only a limitation on height at 101 feet. Potentially, you can consider up to 101 feet in height from the average grade. We are proposing about 70 feet from the average grade. The reading of the stories of the building can be a little tricky. It is a property that has 2 front yards. It is equally valid to say 'yes' it is an 8-story building on JPA, but on Montebello it is a 4-story building because the grade inevitably creates that change as you go from one side to the other. On that section, it is rough at this point. Normally, it is something we would have to calculate specifically to make sure we got it right. Ultimately, if this proposal was to be built, it could be the roof is 72 feet from the average grade or 68 feet. We think it is going to be about 70 feet based on what we have drawn here. At JPA, we have a couple of step-backs. They are modest but not insignificant. There is the entry volume I mentioned at the base of the building at JPA. We stepped back about 7 feet to the floors above. With the top story, we step back about another 5 feet and change materials. On the Montebello side, we go up 3 stories and step back about 14 feet and change materials. On the Montebello side, it is creating an impression not unlike a 3.5-story building if this had a pitched roof. There are already a couple of buildings with that height on Montebello. We don't think this is getting out of neighborhood scale for Montebello.

**Commissioner Russell** – We don't know if you are asking for more than what is in the bonus scenario in CX-5 world because we don't quite know where that height is going to come in. It would be more than 7 stories. I have concerns over the absence of affordability.

**Mr. Riddle** – We don't mean to suggest that we weren't planning on there being that obligation. It is just not something we have yet had a chance to really consider and include in the presentation. That is not to say it is an afterthought. We started by trying to figure out what is the potential for a building here to provide more housing in general. An affordability obligation would come along.

**Commissioner Russell** – My concern is pertinent to our public comment. It is the thing that we talked about. Density for density's sake is what we want to avoid and the impact on our community that it be linked to this thing that we all want, which is affordability.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I am going to be paying a lot of attention to how you deal with the streetscape. What you currently propose has me a little worried. It is two-thirds parking garage and trash cans and one-third lobby. I know you are on a constrained site. There is not a whole lot you can do. Whatever you can do when you develop this for an SUP would be appreciated. As far as the massing and the height, I realize you are not quite meeting what we are trying to get with the new code. It is JPA. This does show what happens

when you have a steep slope. One of the reasons I personally feel height is appropriate on JPA on this side is because the impact uphill to the neighborhood there is far less than downhill. Basically, the impact is on the students. That is where the height is going to be. I don't necessarily think that is a problem. I am supportive of the massing that you are trying to show.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Where did we land on affordable units? I thought that I remembered in the presentation or packet that you were going to do the existing 34-12 5 percent of floor area over one FAR.

**Mr. Riddle** – In the early parts of the presentation in the narrative, there was maybe some language there that we had put into the booklet. We have been reevaluating that in light of what we see as the vision based on the Comp Plan and the zoning drafts. If there is something there that looks like it is talking about affordability as it was written in the zoning, we realize there is still more discussion and debate around that.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I agree with everybody. We have had vague discussions about a student affordability program. It seems like we have mostly landed on the idea of enforcing that would be a nightmare. Something like this seems why you have an in-lieu payment. Otherwise, you have stuck people with a bunch of kids and units designed for roommates. Why are you here now?

**Mr. Riddle** – It is the owner's feeling that it still feels a little uncertain. He would like to move at some pace to get this underway. Maybe you can tell us more. We were thinking that between really 'hammering it out' and there potentially being some legal challenges, would the zoning be in place a year from now, two years from now? We are not meaning to 'jump the gun.' I understand why you are asking that. We have had the same discussion. Are these requests going to be effectively obsolete? We figured that we would go forward now because there are provisions with a special use permit that can allow this building. We think it is close to what is outlined in the new zoning draft.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – With the special use permit, you can do basically the same as the new zoning. Commissioner Schwarz made some comments on Module One about how this, with the ridge around JPA, makes sense to spread CX-8 more. This is a site that makes that clear. I do want to talk about the couple ways that it seems that you are not super-compliant with the new zoning. One is the front setback where we are going to institute this build-to line up to 10 feet. What is the logic behind setting it back more?

**Mr. Riddle** – There are a couple of things that work there. We were thinking first for the sake of planning street trees. We are not aware that the city has enough ground at the sidewalk with the parallel parking that is common there to plant trees of any significance. We thought it would make for a better entry experience, to have a little plaza out there, a place to take a load off where you are not necessarily inside the building. It felt like a more comfortable distance considering the building. It does have some height to it. It is coming closer to JPA than the existing building. It also seems to make sense for it to be somewhat close in its yard depth to what is on the neighboring property at 1707. It feels like a comfortable yard for a building that is more than 3 stories tall. That is where we landed on that.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – With the green-scape requirements, you would be required to have a planting strip. The sidewalk would zigzag around it.

**Mr. Riddle** – You have an outdoor space requirement that would have to get carved out. It could maybe happen at Montebello. It could maybe happen at a part of JPA. If you are saying that you are intrigued by the possibility of some of the building maybe getting closer to the street. I don't know if that is something we are going to be able to weigh. It would be interesting to know if that had any appeal.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I wouldn't want to lose all the street trees. The right-of-way is constrained there. I agree with Commissioner Schwarz's comment about the front and how it is a gaping maw of a parking garage. I think there is an exemption in the code to the build-to requirement or the active space requirement if you need it for access. It doesn't work with the layout. If you could move the entrance to a side, that would feel good. The treatment of your second floor looks like the garage is extending upward.

**Mr. Riddle** – We did look at that. That is a very good observation. We thought the same thing. It would be better if we could have more lobby, more building that is there close to the street. Putting the drive on one side would help with that. If you look at the floor plan, it ends up taking a lot of spaces away. We already are at a small number here. I don't think the owner is going to have in his program a building with no parking. This seemed like it was a decent compromise. We could have planting on either side of the drive. We could look to a material that is better than asphalt to get there, maybe some nice paving maybe aligned with the sidewalk. Look at the property that exists to the north. It has the same kind of entry right in the middle. You can see, what those sycamore trees have helped to do, in just 15 years since it was built. It is lost in shadow for much of the day. That is something to consider.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – That helps across the street, but not if you are on the sidewalk right there.

**Mr. Riddle** – If you walk by and check it out, it doesn't 'grab' you as you walk by it. I don't believe that they have a garage door there. You can see right into the parking level. It would be nice if there was a way to make that drive less prominent there without losing 20 percent of the spaces down there. At that point, there is so much excavating that the owner is doing and a relatively small amount of parking. It might start to get a little perverse. We have talked about that entry/drive in the office. We are extending the reading of the opening up and the masonry thinking that the vertical proportions have a certain appeal. We could revisit that or reconsider it. It would maybe help to diminish that parking entry.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – You are on the right track with how to make the driveway more pleasant to pedestrians. I wonder if you could do something. In some places, you see a level sidewalk rather than a curb cut. That way you don't have this cross slope that pedestrians must walk. That would be great.

**Commissioner Palmer** – A couple of things come to mind. It seems that we have gone from questions to comments. A lot of what I had thought about has been covered with Commissioner Mitchell's comments about the critical slope. They make a lot of sense in terms of stormwater. The site is probably not holding back any stormwater at this point. It is good that we have these discussions to have a strategy in understanding how you are going to improve that. You don't have it all figured out. That is important. We talked about that with 2005 JPA. I had a misunderstanding of the height from JPA. It is a 95-foot building from the sidewalk because of the zoning code and how it is applied. When you talked about it being a 50-foot drop from top to bottom, I was thinking 70 feet. Why is it 40 feet off Montebello Circle? What Commissioner Habbab and Commissioner Schwarz said about the streetscape makes a lot of sense. When thinking about students, the safety coming out of that side of the building is very important. When cars are coming out of that garage, it is important that it be visible and easy for a pedestrian to get a warning that a car is coming. I also want to make sure there is room for the street trees. Future things that the city might want to do to bring it up to more of the type B proposed Streets That Work streetscape would be a good thing to look at. Make sure your landscape plan is matching that. On the Montebello side, that is a neighborhood. It is weird. How often do you have 2 primary frontages? Setting it back makes sense there, especially for the neighbors. It seems that would be appreciated and providing a good formal entry and streetscape there. One thing that came to mind talking about affordability. I know we all snicker a little when we think about affordability for students or think that it is misplaced in some ways. Having lived on JPA in the past as a student, the choice to live there had a lot to do with price. Here we have 8 units that will not any longer be

affordable to a student. I am assuming these would probably be a little bit more expensive. However we end up dealing with the affordability, it is good to recognize conceptually that there are affordable student units that will be going away with this and not coming back necessarily. It is well-located for students. I look forward to continuing to see the evolution of the project.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – I am excited about this site. I think that we can do better than current conditions. I am excited to see some permeability. Some trees would be a good thing. Because there are 2 front doors to this property, that creates an opportunity. You could do vehicular circulation on one side and not the other side. Have one curb cut on one side and the other side has a high-quality pedestrian frontage. Personally, I would like to see that on JPA. I understand there are major costs and amenity tradeoffs. There are benefits too. It is something to think about. In terms of design, I love verticality and design. We will have concerns from the public about height. That is verticality. Please consider that in the design. I am happy to see modern materials. I am happy to see ideas of shifting and adjusting to the needs of occupants. That seems reasonable to me. Affordability is a concern.

**Councilor Payne** – Do you have any specifics on what you are thinking in terms of affordability?

**Mr. Riddle** – Not right now.

**Councilor Payne** – To make such heavy reference to the Future Land Use Map, Comprehensive Plan, and zoning, and to not match the draft inclusionary zoning program is not appropriate or acceptable for this or any projects. I would agree with the comments of Commissioner Mitchell. It is an interesting calculus to think through with 8 affordable units being permanently destroyed for 27 new units at a luxury price point. It changes if there is an affordability requirement.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – We still have some formal questions to consider. Those being concerns related to the proposed density, concerns about height and massing, reasonable conditions to consider, and SUP and critical slope waivers. Any additional comments on those items?

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – On critical slopes, I feel this is an interesting case where we often think of critical slopes as heavily wooded slopes that are undisturbed things. What we want out of it is protection of waterways and protection of natural features. There are no natural features on this site except for the 2 crepe myrtles and the neighboring tree that might be taken out. There is a waterway nearby. It strikes me that you could pave over some flat sites near this, buy nutrient credits, and never get a waiver. It isn't accomplishing that goal of waterway protection. With the slope, you need to worry about erosion stuff. It sounds like the state requirements cover. I am assuming that you will have a good erosion plan. It would be great to have as much treatment as you can fit. I will be interested in whatever stream buffer stuff we come up with once we are done with this zoning code.

**Commissioner Russell** – I have a question about our inclusionary zoning. If we say that it is going to be hard to track student affordability, it sounds like we are requiring the inclusionary zoning no matter what. We are going to have to figure that out. Clearly, it is bringing up a thing we need to investigate.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I am assuming there is going to be a lot of rock you are going to get rid of.

**Mr. Riddle** – We haven't done any Geotech borings yet. There could be some bad surprises. We don't know.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – That might be something you could offer as part of the SUP as conditions you put on yourselves to not blast for a whole year.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – What is this building made of? Is it stick over concrete podium?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is what we are assuming now. It might be getting tall enough that we would go to a metal framing. That is something else we will be working out, especially if there is a masonry façade going up that tall. We probably would have to go to a metal framing in this case.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Can you do 6 stories of wood?

**Mr. Riddle** – You can do 5 stories over the podium. Masonry often has some limitations as to how high you can go before you need more reinforcing than a stick frame will provide.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – There is a media post called Praise of Dumb Boxes. The concern is that if you chop up a building too many times, you lose building, you increase cost, and you lose habitable space. I see a lot of modulation and a lot of step-backs in this proposal. Can you speak to those tradeoffs?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is a good point. A building that I am fond of is the old Norcross Station building that is parallel to the tracks. The building is interesting because it doesn't do any of those things that we often talk about; a modulated façade, stepping in & out, breaking up monotony. It is a terrific building. It is not as tall as this one. It is more of a long horizontal building of several stories. It relies on a simple brick façade and some nice, old, and steel windows. It is great like that without a lot of fussing. In this case, as we were designing the building, we had a building that came up at about as tall as it is with a bit of a step back at the top but not at the base. When we started to look at introducing the entry volume that we have at the first 2 stories, that encloses the entry to the parking and the lobby. It felt at home on the project. It gave it this forebuilding that introduces the architecture to JPA. It looked proportionally better to us.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – R-3 is limited at 87 DUA, which is the 27 units. Would you be splitting this up into more units if you didn't have that density restriction in the new code?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is something we might consider. As we have it designed now, without going up another story or several stories, it would be difficult for us to have more apartments than we are currently showing. We look at this a lot of ways with independent buildings, bridging between them, and courtyard space. We ended up coming back to here. It does provide more housing. It is a site that is confined enough that you can array all the tenants with views out. It is almost like it doesn't want a courtyard building unless it was a smaller scale project. We arrived at this seeming to work well with the owner's program and to provide something dense here at an appropriate height considering the corridor.

## 2. Presentation – Transportation Update

**Ben Chambers, Transportation Planner** – I am going to try to keep us focused to about 4 topics. We will try to stick to these 4 topics.

### Next Slide

What did I find when I came back? What state was our transportation planning in?

### Next Slide

I wanted to look at it from the academic sense. In the academic world of planning, they talk about the 3 Cs of planning to make sure you know it is good planning. It must be comprehensive, continuous, and collaborative. In terms of comprehensive, we have had some issues. A lot of our planning activities are happening in silos across the city. Some of it is happening in NDS. Some of it is happening in public works. Some of it is happening in CAT. Some of it is happening at TJPDC. Our Comprehensive Plan identifies a transportation master plan. It is several different plans. It is our Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan, Streets That Work plan, a bunch of smaller area plans. They are spread all over the place. That leads us to an issue with the continuity of it. A lot of those plans are older. We have our 2015 Bike Ped Master Plan and 2016 Streets That Work Plan. We have a bunch of small area plans that were completed prior to the pandemic. We are working with old plans. We are also working with old data from those plans. We have data that we are relying on that is pre-pandemic that is informing our projects. It probably isn't as relative as it was 5 years ago. We also have a continuity issue between the plans. They don't always agree with each other. Even plans done in the same year don't agree with each other. We must figure out how to put all those back on the same page and make sure we are headed in the same direction. Collaboration has been an issue, partly because of the silos, the different plans being planned separately, we have had challenges with effective engagement prior to the pandemic and because of the pandemic. It has become even more challenging. We are now trying to get 'our feet back under us,' and remember what it was we did before the pandemic that was working right. How are we tackling these 3 big issues that we are facing?

#### **Next Slide**

We are doing a lot of different things. We are doing a lot of work with CAT, the region, the schools. We are being comprehensive in our scope, being collaborative across departments, and we are trying to make everything continuous at the same time. It is a challenge. We could talk through all of these. It would probably take us several days.

#### **Next Slide**

We are going to stick to these three. This will be the safe streets and roads for all action plan, non-motorized infrastructure prioritization process, and dockless permit regulations revisit.

#### **Next Slide – Dockless Mobility Permit Program**

The scooters first came to town in 2019 as part of a pilot program, which resulted in us adopting regulations for a dockless mobility permit program. VEO is our scooter operator in town. They have had that permit since 2020, since it first became available. There were 2 other vendors that previously held the permit along with VEO. This permit is managed by the bike-ped coordinator. It is not currently managed by the bike-ped coordinator because we don't have one. We have an offer out to a candidate right now. Hopefully, we will have a bike-ped coordinator shortly. When I was hired, VEO came to the city and said that it had been a while since they had somebody to talk to. They wanted to talk about the regulations. I told them that we have had some issues from our end that we have heard from the public. The public had not been happy with how they had been performing.

#### **Next Slide**

This tells you how they have been performing over the past year and why it was important for us to talk with VEO. These are a lot of rides. We have about a quarter million rides a year at this point. A lot of the traffic is between UVA and Downtown, along West Main Street. We also see some areas along JPA, up at Preston and Grady. Most of the traffic is between UVA and Downtown. You can see from the graph at the top that it is seasonal. People like riding scooters when it is warm outside. It is also dependent on the student population. That is where a lot of our riders are coming from. It is students who don't have vehicles. You see a lot of students riding those scooters and e-bikes during the fall months and the spring months but not so much in the winter or in the summer.

### Next Slide

Here are the issues that we came to the table with. VEO's biggest concern was the fees. That is not surprising. They are a for-profit company. They are looking for more profit. I told them that was going to be a hard sell. We put this in place for a reason. We have these regulations and these fees for a reason. They said that the city was charging way more than anybody else. They were getting to the point where they couldn't make much of a profit. The other issue that they had fleet flexibility. Previously, the way that the dockless permit regulations were written, they are Byzantine on how many scooters they could put on the streets. It started with 350 scooters maximum. That doesn't include e-bikes. If you do e-bikes, you get 25 more scooters. It became this difficult thing for us to manage on our side to make sure that they were putting the right number of scooters out and that they were complying with the different potential elements that they could be adding to the fleet. It became annoying on their side because they wanted to put a certain mix that attracts their customers. If we are dictating those little nuances, it becomes hard for them to do business. It becomes annoying for us. Our biggest concern was parking. We had misplaced scooters throughout the city. It was causing safety concerns, ADA concerns. We were having issues with our sidewalks, bike lanes, and roads being blocked. This has been an ongoing thing that we were hearing from the public. We were also hearing from the public about safety concerns with how people were riding the scooters. We have some outreach that needs to happen to the users to make sure that they are correctly operating them. Equity is a concern. These trips are not cheap. There is a fee for unlocking the scooter and there is a permanent fee for riding the scooter. It adds up quickly. This may not be the best resource for a low-income resident as it is currently set up. We have outreach in our regulations that they are supposed to be doing to low-income residents, student populations, to promote safe usage, promote better parking, to educate users on how they are supposed to be operating these vehicles. Partly because of the way the pandemic has made things difficult with outreach, they have not been able to do it. They haven't been getting out there when they can. We are going to dive into each of these issues and how we resolve them.

### Next Slide

This is a high-level summary of how we are resolving each of these issues. With the high fees, we said that we would take away the per vehicle fee that we charge at the beginning of the year. We usually say pay for the number of vehicles you are going to put on the street on January 1<sup>st</sup>. They must come back later in the year. Instead of having the back and forth, remove the per vehicle fee. That seemed to be the easiest piece to cut so they could bring down their cost. For the fleet flexibility, we wanted to take out the Byzantine rules. Make it a higher max cap, but also include the e-bikes. A lot of their fleet is switching over to e-bikes instead of scooters. For parking, we are looking at piloting parking hubs along West Main Street and Downtown. We will be allowing VEO to have parking fees for misplaced vehicles. With safety, we are asking them to implement an education mode for first ride or first couple rides. With equity, they will be implementing a reduced-price access program for low-income residents. With outreach, they will be conducting two outreach events per quarter, typically aimed at low-income residents or student populations.

### Next Slide

For the reduced per-ride fee and removed per-vehicle fee, we are dropping the fees down to 4 or 5 percent of their revenues instead of 12 percent. That is more in line with what they are seeing in other markets. In other markets, they don't have a per vehicle fee. We are pulling that out. That will save us some time. We don't have to track down how many vehicles they are putting on the road all the time. It is a benefit for VEO. We are changing the higher max cap and not including any bonuses. This is to get back to the fleet flexibility issue. With the previous regulations, it was more onerous for us to keep track of. There were also some things written into it that had some loopholes that let them put as many e-bikes on our streets as they wanted to. We wanted to stave them off from doing that. They now have a cap of 700 vehicles total.



**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Why have a cap?

**Mr. Chambers** – They would put them everywhere.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – You would be able to find one.

**Mr. Chambers** – The public has come to us with the difficulty of finding a VEO scooter.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I think you are hearing from the public that isn't riding them. It is difficult to find them a lot of the time at least 5 blocks.

**Mr. Chambers** – The 700 will take us from 450 (now) to 700. That is a significant increase. This doesn't just apply to VEO. This applies to anybody who wants to put a scooter on our streets. If another company comes in, they can come in, apply for a permit, and compete with VEO on our streets. We would then have 1400 scooters.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – Can you talk about the revenue impact?

**Mr. Chambers** – It is minimal. Last year, the per-vehicle fee came in at about \$35,000. At the beginning of the year, there were some adjustments made after that. We don't have anything that is dedicated to it now. It is not a really big impact on us. It is more of a deterrent for them than it is a benefit for us.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Have we collected that at this point?

**Mr. Chambers** – Not for this year.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – The \$35,000 is revenue to the city?

**Mr. Chambers** – That is correct.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – How much is the per-ride total?

**Mr. Chambers** – The per-ride is currently 25 cents. The per-minute is reduced. It was about 85 last year. We don't have a dedicated use for it.

#### **Next Slide**

For parking, the first thing we are going to do is try to implement parking hubs on West Main and Downtown, usually around areas where there is going to be bike parking, so they are co-located. This is what UVA Grounds is doing. This will be an extension of that down West Main Street to Downtown. Once we have those installed, we are going to be looking at the Rugby-Grady area and JPA area as our next areas. This has been successful on UVA Grounds. There are still some complaints about mis-parked scooters on UVA Grounds. A lot of those are privately owned. We get a lot of the same complaints about scooters on the Downtown Mall. I can sympathize with that. The other thing that they will start doing that UVA doesn't have is that they are going to start charging fees for people who park incorrectly. Right now, when you end a ride on a VEO scooter, it asks you to take a picture of where you parked. That picture currently goes in the garbage. In the future, they will take complaints from residents about misplaced scooters. They will compare that to the picture that they received from the user to make sure it isn't somebody dragging the scooter to a bad place or tipped it over. If the picture matches what we found when we pick up the scooter, that user will be charged a fee. It will be a fee through their user fees built into the VEO app. It won't be a city

enforcement issue. This allows VEO to enforce some of the issues we have had issues with. It makes them responsible for it instead of us. The fees are going to be low. The first offense will be a warning. It will eventually top out to \$75 or a ban from the service.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Who keeps the fee money?

**Mr. Chambers** – They keep the fee money. They are administering the enforcement.

**Commissioner d’Oronzio** – Does that generate a moral hazard?

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – No. They should be looking for as many violations as they can.

**Mr. Chambers** – The next item is discouraging sloppy parking and if they are in education mode.

#### **Next Slide**

When you get on the scooter, it gives you some instructions the first time you get on about where you should park, how you should ride, and where you shouldn’t ride. Most people get on the scooter and hit ‘next’ multiple times so they can turn on the scooter. What this will do is take them through those screens and put the scooter into an education mode which mean you can only go 8 miles-per-hour. In other markets, what you see is that first-time users make up a vast majority of the crashes and a lot of the complaints. In other markets where they have tried this, slowing everyone down has flattened that line where the same number of crashes are happening with early users as with seasoned users. They are not being as risky. They are being forced not to be as risky. They will be implementing that. There is also a rider safety quiz. When they get through those screens, they will have to read those screens to answer the quiz. We are having them implement that with the new permit.

**Commissioner Habbab** – With the fines, we still get the 5 percent from the fines.

**Mr. Chambers** – They will be collecting the fines themselves and keeping the fines. We get revenue for each ride.

**Commissioner Habbab** – On the hubs, it says that if you don’t park at a hub, you get a fine. What if the hubs are full when you get to your destination?

**Mr. Chambers** – They are going to be a like an empty parking space or an empty area we have marked off. If it is completely full and you have parked close to it, they probably aren’t going to do anything about that. Their GPS isn’t accurate enough. If you are within 5 to 10 feet of a space where you are supposed to be, that wouldn’t be an issue.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – UVA has 2 kinds of hubs. Along McCormick, you can’t park anywhere except in a hub. In other places, there are just hubs because people gravitate to the corrals.

**Mr. Chambers** – They have them split into enforcement and encouragement.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – The hubs we are going to do across the city.

**Mr. Chambers** – The initial ones that we are looking at on West Main and Downtown will be enforcement.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Unless you have one on every corner, there are a lot of safe places you can correctly park a single scooter. You lose a lot of the point-to-point benefit of a scooter and the ability for the next user to be able to find it without walking. We need them to be correctly parked when they are outside of a corral. Forcing them into corrals if there are only 3 corrals around Downtown is harmful to users. You are discouraging use.

**Mr. Chambers** – We are looking at not just 3 spots Downtown, but for a wider distribution around the Downtown area. It is going to be more of a challenge along West Main because of where bike parking is currently located and the space constraints along the sidewalk. We might have to look at potential spots in the roadway where we can set up a corral. In that case, they might be smaller corrals that we do along the way. That is an ongoing discussion we are having with VEO on how we locate those and how they work.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – Thinking beyond the students, we have tourists and commuter workers. Are there ways we can address those needs with this service?

**Mr. Chambers** – The commuter works are going to be a more challenging one. A lot of those are people that are coming in from out of town. They are already in a car. Tourists are not the target of our outreach at this point. We can work with Economic Development Office to see how we might be able to promote this. I am sure that VEO would love to have that conversation.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Commuters could be a target if you are in Belmont. I am told that people drive in from Belmont. If you have one around, it could be doable to get Downtown.

**Mr. Chambers** – We might be able to make that expansion to neighborhoods like Belmont with our outreach as we are growing the fleet. Since most of the fleet is concentrated on West Main and UVA, we don't have that to go to Belmont. As the fleet expands and we can have more coverage throughout the city, we may have that opportunity to do more of that.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I was thinking of coverage. That is where I am skeptical of the cap. Maybe you want to have the cap in the areas where we have too many of them so that you allow them to spread out.

**Mr. Chambers** – That is something VEO is open to; talking about how they redistribute vehicles. In other markets, they must have this percentage of the fleet must be in certain areas of town. That could be something we get into. We are initially trying to do outreach to low-income communities as part of our equity drive. That could expand in the future.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I assume when they are doing that outreach, they are going to put them in the neighborhoods even if it is not mandated.

**Mr. Chambers** – Their initial efforts have been focused on Friendship Court and West Haven. I think they will be going out to Prospect in a couple of weeks.

#### **Next Slide**

We are implemented a reduced-price access program for low-income residents. Right now, when you get on a scooter, you must pay a dollar to unlock it. You must pay per-minute. It gets expensive. With this program, users would pay \$5 a month. They would get no unlock fee. Anytime they turn on a scooter, that dollar is immediately knocked off. They get one free ride for up to 30 minutes every day. One leg of the commute would be paid for and a discounted per-minute fee for any other ride. I believe the per-minute fee is 20 cents. It would go down to 10 or 15 cents. Individuals would qualify through any state or federal assistance

program. VEO is open to a local assistance program that we want to incorporate into this. They are willing to accept that if we recognize it. It has been used in other cities to great effect. In New York City, it is about 10 or 11 percent of users are part of this program. In Seattle, it is 40 percent. They have a large scooter program in Seattle. That is a lot of low-income residents with a new mode for riding.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – When you say an assistance program, what is that?

**Mr. Chambers** – They use SNAP and have evidence that they are using SNAP. They can qualify for the program. If they live in public housing, they can qualify for the program.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – How do children fit in?

**Mr. Chambers** – They don't fit in. They are not renting scooters. You must be 18 years old. They must do 2 outreach programs per quarter. Previously, they had requirements to do outreach. Nobody has been meeting them. Our previous vendors weren't meeting them. VEO hasn't been meeting them. In this year, they have done 4 outreach events. What they call outreach events are minor. We are looking to have them participate in Bike to Work Week coming up in May. Having them partner with some of our advocacy groups that are taking the lead on that. They have been promoting scooters, bikes, e-bikes, and pedestrians get to work all in one package. Our outreach will be focused on making sure everybody knows how to park and getting some education on parking hubs, they start getting installed. Telling people about education mode and how they can ride safely, where they can ride safely, where they shouldn't be riding, and educating people about the VEO access program.

#### **Next Slide**

We have adopted these new regulations. We have informed VEO that they need to apply for a new permit under the regulations. Their current permit under the 2019 regulations is extended through its 60 days. If they can get us an updated permit application before then, we will start with the new regulations. They are incentivized to put together that application more quickly because they get the reduced fees, and they get an enhanced profit. We are working with them to identify hub locations. We are working with Public Works to figure out how we can get those on the ground. We are working with them to set up coordination for outreach on Bike to Work Week. We expect that they will apply for a full year permit in December for 2024. While we were going through these regulations, we did find one tool buried in our existing regulations that should help us with the parking. It is going to take some coordination to figure out how we are going to pull that off. If there is a complaint made about a scooter's parking, if VEO doesn't get to that scooter within an hour and I get to it first, I can charge them \$100. There are a lot of complaints we have had coming through in the past couple years. We need to figure out how we are going to race VEO to that scooter.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I am still stuck on this requirement versus encourage thing when we have both options. Why not start with the encourage thing for Downtown and West Main, see how it works, give you some chances to race, and collect the \$100 and see if encouragement is enough before we take away a major feature of the scooters if you are a good citizen about it.

**Mr. Chambers** – We are not 'married' to sticking with enforcement versus the other. We can talk to VEO about if they have any data that supports whether we should go one way or the other. Right now, we are tending to lean towards the enforcement one because we are giving them the power of enforcement. They are already doing a similar thing along McCormick Road and UVA. We are talking about extending it down a similarly, heavily traveled corridor. That is the logic behind it. Whether it holds up to the data that they have and whether we should go the other direction, that is for us to decide.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – The corridors are the same. The distribution of scooters is different. It is dense at UVA and hard to find one around here. We are also giving them the power of finding them when they are in bad places. Those 2 things combined could be enough.

#### **Next Slide**

This is the Safe Streets and Roads for All Action Plan. As part of the bipartisan infrastructure law, there was a \$5 billion discretionary program set aside for safe streets and roads for all. It is \$1 billion every year for the next 5 years. To get that funding, we need to have an action plan in place. We partnered with the TJPDC. They are sponsors behind the grant to get this action plan. Communities all over the country submitted for this so that they could get action plans so they can access this funding over the next 5 years. It is not a surprise that everyone is talking about doing an action plan for safe streets. Our region was awarded over \$800,000. That is the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest amount in the entire state. Why we got that amount is that we worked on it as a region. We are working with TJPDC across Region 10. That includes all the rural communities to do our action plan together. When we are done, we can coordinate what the implementation steps will need to be.

#### **Next Slide**

What this is going to result in is a regional plan. Each of the chapters of that plan will focus on a specific community. Our chapter, as it has been previously scoped out, is going to have additional outreach and engagement compared to the other counties. That is because we have more modes, and we have more people interacting with those modes in a tight space. We are going to have more outreach and engagement within our city that is associated with this. You might get the sense that we have our own plan. Each county has its own plan. It is part of a bigger picture that will get melded into one plan. Currently, we are enrolled in an infrastructure boot camp for the implementation grants, walking us through what is going to be required for the next steps once we have this action plan in place. The safety needs, data, and funding availability that comes with this action plan and our implementation grants that we will apply for in the future are going to inform our near-term priorities.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – When do we start seeing projects done?

**Mr. Chambers** – Right now, we are scoping it with USCOT (the consultant that has been selected). We have a scoping meeting next Thursday. We should be kicking off probably late May. I am not sure when the outreach events will be happening. We will have a lot of them over the next year.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – What are the odds we are done by next fiscal year's funding cycle?

**Mr. Chambers** – I think that it is 2 years, especially given when we are starting. It is about 1-year process.

#### **Next Slide**

Our Comp Plan identifies several documents in the transportation master plan. That includes the Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan from 2016, the 2016 Streets That Work Plan, the ADA Transition Plan (2017 or 2018), CAT Transit Development Plan (2018), and several small area plans. When you see all these plans, you will realize some of these priorities don't align with each other. We are talking about a world pre-pandemic, about a community pre-pandemic. Some of those people have left Charlottesville. New people have come in. We are also not accounting in our priorities across these plans for staffing changes that have happened in the past 6 years. Staffing levels have also changed. These plans are optimistic about what they could get done in the next 5 to 10 years. We are sitting with these plans. We realized that these were all issues that needed to be solved.

#### **Next Slide**

We knew that we had to bring all these priorities together and figure out what to do with them. We applied for grant assistance through OIPI (state office of intermodal planning and investment) that is under the Secretary of Transportation. They were assisting the TJPDC on setting up their prioritization process. We brought in a consultant team that would develop a process, look at quantitative metrics for key needs under that process, which has output scores that we are reviewing through a qualitative analysis. All the analysis was performed on projects identified in the Bike-Ped Master Plan and in The Streets That Work Plan. There are some old projects that we are looking at but have been vetted by the community. We are now bringing those 2 plans together. To date, our consultant is done with the quantitative part of it. We have received all their work out of it. We are now looking through all these projects internally and making sure that they still make sense.

### **Next Slide**

This is an overview of the process. The left half is the quantitative assessment. The right half is our qualitative assessment. From the left you can see the Bike-Ped Master Plan and Streets That Work projects in that green bubble feeding into the quantitative assessment, which looks at suitability (bike score, walk score, schools and transit nearby, hilly area), demand (latent demand from zone to zone, actual travel, connectivity, slopes, cost), and safety (crash density and number of cars next to these bike and ped facilities). These get added into a final score that provides us a list to look at qualitatively. Qualitatively, we are looking at how this impacts equity. Are all these projects concentrated in parts of town where they may not be used or not meeting the demand of low-income residents? Are we spreading this around equitably throughout the city? We are looking at feasibility in terms of funding, physical, and near-term versus medium-term versus long-term. Are there projects that we can get done within the next 5 years using the funding that we know is available and they are easy enough feasibility-wise so we can get them on the ground? We have hundreds of projects listed. Are there 2 good projects that would be a great project if we paired them together? That qualitative assessment is happening right now. Once we get through that and collecting stakeholder input, we will have a prioritized list. The projects will be in tiers depending on feasibility, cost, and stakeholder input. We are going to come back to you with a list that looks more like that than a prioritized 1 through 60 list of projects. You will notice a little box off to the left that says sharrows. When we were looking through the bike facilities, a lot of the stuff that came up from 2015/2016 was shared lanes or sharrows. We didn't want to list these as project priorities. They are not really projects. What we are going to do with these is hand these over to Public Service so they can incorporate them into their paving schedule. We don't need to have more discussions about whether to put the paint of a bike picture on the ground. We will have bike facilities and sidewalks out of this plan. Those 2 things will be covered by these prioritizations.

### **Next Slide**

We are focused on sidewalks and bicycle facilities. We are working through the qualitative assessment. We will have a draft list of priorities to share. We will be engaging stakeholders to give feedback on what those draft priorities are. We will revise the list and take it to Council for adoption. Once we get Council to adopt it, it is not the end of the road. This is something we will have to look at annually. We will be doing this annually to make sure that we are pursuing projects that are going to continue being feasible. We will be documenting lessons learned about our prioritization process and how that is playing out. Down the line, we will have start from scratch and figure out what the inputs are for the projects that we want to prioritize. We are working off a list from 2015 and 2016. We will have to revisit that and do a better job with the prioritization in the future.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I understand that the administration has removed most of the bike/ped funding out of the CIP in the last 3 or 4 years because we don't need it because we have so much money accumulating and we can't spend it. At what point will you be ready for us to spend or fund things again?

**Mr. Chambers** – When you hear city officials complain less about staffing, you will know. That is currently the biggest holdup. It is a matter of getting the right people in the door.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – Something I have noted in recent debates over bicycle and pedestrian facilities is that at some level, there is a re-allocation of space from private motor vehicles to anything else. That rallies people with private motor vehicles to want to keep their space. The project dies. That seems like a bad formula. Is there any way, we can separate allocation for private motor vehicles from safe space for everything else?

**Mr. Chambers** – The constraint there is the right-of-way that we have available. That is a major issue in town because we have some old streets and old right-of-way property. Within a lot of those constrained areas, there is not a lot we can do to separate. There are areas in town where you have a lot of right-of-way and a large area. You could do something completely separated and protected there if you have the support from the public to do that. That is the other element of it. The public is going to weigh in on that private vehicle versus bike/ped trade-off.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – I expect that feedback will come. We don't hear from people who need safe space because they are not yet using it. It is difficult to balance.

**Mr. Chambers** – I have had some conversations with advocacy groups in town that are keeping an eye out for that. They want to have more users on the streets of the modes that they are trying to promote. Making sure that we have good facilities for people who ride a bike or walk down a busy street, but also providing facilities for kids is a big issue in our city. Kids need bike/ped facilities to get to school because we don't have as many school buses. There is a focus on making sure that those less-confident users and less-experienced users do have safe facilities.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 PM.

## PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

April 9, 2024 – 5:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting

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

***Beginning:*** 4:30 PM

***Location:*** NDS Conference Room

**Members Present:** Commissioner Solla-Yates, Chairman Mitchell, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Joy, Commissioner Roettger, Commissioner Stolzenberg

**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, April Wimberley

Commissioners gathered at 5pm and following motion was made:

**Pursuant to Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3712, I move that the City Planning Commission close this open meeting and convene a closed meeting for the following purposes:**

**1. Pursuant to Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3711(A) (8) for consultation with the City Attorney regarding legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice related to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA);**

**2. Pursuant to Code of Virginia Section 2.2-3711(A) (7) for consultation with the City Attorney pertaining to actual litigation, where consultation or briefing in open meeting would adversely affect the litigating posture of the Planning Commission, specifically, White v. Charlottesville.**

**Motion by:** Commissioner d’Oronzio

**Second by:** Commissioner Schwarz

**Ayes:** Commissioners d’Oronzio, Schwarz, Mitchell, Stolzenberg, Solla-Yates, Roettger

**Absent:** N/A

The closed meeting was held.

### CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING

**I move that this Planning Commission certify by a recorded vote that to the best of each Planning Commissioner’s knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.**

**Motion by:** Commissioner d’Oronzio

**Second by:** Commissioner Solla-Yates

**Ayes:** Commissioners d’Oronzio, Schwarz, Mitchell, Stolzenberg, Solla-Yates, Roettger

**Absent:** N/A

The Pre meeting ended at 5:30

### II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Mitchell at 5:35 PM

***Beginning:*** 5:30 PM



**Location:** City Hall Chambers

## **A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORT**

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – We had a LUPEC meeting in March. We had presentations from the statewide trails office, the Virginia Passenger Rail Authority, and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation. It was a general overview over what those bodies do. I also had a meeting of the MPO Technical Committee. That was dominated by a discussion of the Barracks Road project. The 2 options are roundabouts on either side of the underpass under 250 plus a roundabout at Georgetown Road or just sidewalks and limiting turns along the corridor. Since there isn't much room under the underpass, there wouldn't be room for a shared use path the whole way. It was the opinion of many members that there were still ways to make the roundabout design more pedestrian friendly, removing slip lanes, adding a mid-block crossing between Georgetown and the interchange. We conveyed that to VDOT. Following that meeting, the county specifically requested several changes, including removing the slip lanes at the roundabouts at the Rt. 250 interchange. The policy board gave approval to proceed with the pre-application for smart scale.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – There was nothing of significance from last month's BAR meeting. Next week, the BAR is having a preliminary discussion for a potential hotel use on the Artful Lodger site, which we had given an SUP as a residential project. It might be interesting to find out why that became a hotel versus residential.

**Commissioner Solla-Yates** – I spoke with Mr. Freas at the Fry Springs Neighborhood Association meeting about the new zoning.

**Commissioner d'Oronzio** – With the CDBG, due to the extraordinary behaviors of Congress, the money and the approval of the budget is so late that HUD can't tell us the dollar amounts. Those people, who know more, are saying that hopefully by May, which is when it is supposed to come before this body. I am moving forward with the Task Force providing recommendations based on money to be trumped by percentages if it changes the dollar amount in any significant way, except when we are complying with Council directives. HAC is continuing to meet regarding the land bank. We have had 2 extremely productive meetings regarding that. Some of that has garnered interest elsewhere and in other localities looking at us and what we might be doing. The TJPDC met. There was nothing in that meeting that would be of relevance to this body.

**Commissioner Roettger** – No Report

## **B. UNIVERSITY REPORT**

**Commissioner Joy** – No Report

## **C. CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Chairman Mitchell** – We are down one member. Commissioner Habbab resigned based on a principle that he holds very dear. I respect the principle upon which he resigned. I respect the fact that he stood by those principles in the way that he did. He has been a significant contributor to our group, especially as we developed the Comp Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. He will be missed. I am grateful for all the work that he put in with us. I am more grateful for the friendship that we developed the last couple of years. He leaves holes. One of the holes is committee assignments. There are a couple that I have not been able to figure out how to fill. The first is the Tree Commission. The Tree Commission meets every first Thursday at 5:00 PM in the Parks & Recreation Office. The other one is the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee. That meets the third Wednesday of every other month at 7:00 PM in the Water Street Conference Room. I am looking for people to step up.

**Commissioner Roettger** – I am happy to fill both of those positions.

**Chairman Mitchell** – Let's put Commissioner Roettger on the Tree Commission and the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee.

Parks & Recreation continue to get a lot of work done with not a lot of people. At the last meeting, we talked about a lot of things. The first thing was Jenkins Park. The precipitating event was a lot of dog waste in the park. Jenkins Park is just outside of West Haven. It is a passive park. The residents think that they are having a difficult time relaxing because the dog waste makes it uncomfortable and to some degree unsafe for the kids. The PowerPoint presentation that I sent you walks you through what we are doing to mitigate that issue. It also walks you through things that we want to do to fix up the park and make it an even nicer place for our city residents. The issue around dog waste in the parks has us thinking again. There is some thought about revisiting the ordinance as it relates to dogs and parks. We are thinking through that. As that evolves, I will get back to you guys. There is also talk about needing a couple of dog parks in the city. With the pools, we don't have enough people to cover the pools. We are worried that we may not be able to be open full-time during the coming season. The recruitment efforts are underway. The recruitment efforts are intense. We are hoping to get there. We are worried that we may not be able to have full-time staffing for the parks. We are in the middle of the Parks & Rec Master Plan engagement. Many of you might have received a survey in the mail. If you did get that survey in the mail, please fill it out and send back to us. There are going to be 3 or 4 shots in the next weeks. The first will be at Crow Rec. That is going to be on Sunday, April 21<sup>st</sup> from 3 PM to 5 PM. The next will be in Jenkins Park 3 PM to 5 PM Sunday, April 28<sup>th</sup>. The next one will be in Washington Park. That will be Saturday, May 4<sup>th</sup> 3 PM to 5 PM. The last one will be Saturday, May 11<sup>th</sup> 3 PM to 5 PM. That is going to be at Forest Hills Park. The last update relates to Oakwood Cemetery. There has been standing water in Oakwood Cemetery. It has been there for a while. There used to be a stream that ran through or around the park. The drain that we built to manage that stream is broken. We believe that we can fix it. The challenge will be fixing it without disturbing the remains that are there. We have experts coming to help us get that fixed and fixed in a way that is respectful to the remains and the families of those people that are there.

#### **D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS**

**Missy Creasy, NDS Deputy Director** – If there is anyone in the audience that is interested in those Parks and Recreation items that Chairman Mitchell has been referring to, I am guessing that they are on the Parks and Rec Advisory Board site. I haven't yet found them. If you are inquiring and having trouble with that, please give me a call or email. I will assist in getting to those resources.

We do not have a work session scheduled for April. We are slowly working ourselves back into that. We were meeting once or twice a week for several months. We will work ourselves back into some work session topics. We are on week 3 of meeting with applicants on pre-application meetings. We have been doing those meetings every Wednesday morning. We have had a good team of people to be able to communicate with people concerning projects. We have found some things that we need to work on to try and see if we can get projects to fruition. It has been very productive. We have talked with several people who are interested in implementing aspects of the current ordinance. We do not have anything that is coming for a hearing. People are still working through the initial phases of that. I anticipate that we will have some things in the coming months. The CDBG and HOME items will be coming forward for a public hearing. We are working with the staff to work through how best to make that advertisement happen in our questionable situation with the timing. That is normal for that funding source. They have given us some ways to be able to maintain that process.

**James Freas, NDS Director** – I have been appointed to the Deputy City Manager of Operations role. I will remain as interim Director of NDS until we fill that position. That position has been advertised. We should be

shortly advertising our Planning Manager position. We recently filled one of our property maintenance positions. At the next Council meeting, there will be a request for funding for a small project to put together pre-approved stormwater solutions for small scale infill development projects. This is recognizing that our projects that are between 3 and 8 units struggle to deal with the stormwater management issue under our current requirements at the city and at the state level. This is an attempt to see if we can't come up with a pre-approved approach that works out the engineering design aspect of a project so a project can come in and say that they are going to use our formula, our specs, and how it fits on the site. It is a funding request in front of Council to support that work. Commissioner Schwarz brought up the project at the Artful Lodger. That was approved under the previous zoning ordinance. They are now proposing to move forward with a different project under the new ordinance. I have met with the developer and talked about the basis for the decision. It is not about the current ordinance. It is a financial decision.

Missy Creasy has been both Planning Manager and Deputy Director of the department for several years. The idea is to recognize that is 2 roles. Ms. Creasy has done an admirable job of carrying both of those. We are going to carve those out. The Planning Manager will oversee the entire planning division and the development review process. The Planning Manager will be partnering with our partner agencies that we work with on the development review process to achieve the improvements that we are seeking to do that and expediting and resolving several issues with how we approach development review. That will be one aspect. Pursuing that project and overseeing that division is a full-time job leaving aside anything that comes with being Deputy Director.

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

No Public Comments

## **F. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. Minutes – February 13, 2024 – Regular Meeting
2. Minutes – March 12, 2024 – Regular Meeting
3. Minutes – September 12, 2023 – Regular Meeting
4. Minutes – September 13, 2022 – Regular Meeting
5. Zoning Text Initiation – Code Conformity in cases of property acquisition

**Commissioner Solla-Yates moved to approve Consent Agenda with changes to minutes – Second by Commissioner d’Oronzio – Motion passes 6-0.**

## **III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL**

*Beginning:* 6:00 PM

*Continuing:* Until all public hearings are complete

*Format:* (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing, (iv) Discussion and Motion

1. **ZT24-01-01** – A proposed amendment to the text of the Charlottesville Development Code, Chapter 34, Article 5 Division 5.4.2. for a lot, building or structure established in conformity with this Development Code will not create a violation of this Code as a result of the acquisition, purchase or condemnation of a portion of it by an agency of the federal, state or local government possessing the power of eminent domain.

### **i. Staff Report**

**Mr. Freas** – This item is addressing a mission from the development code. This is language that recognizes that when the city acquires property from a property owner (let’s say) as part of a street right-of-way acquisition and

because of that acquisition, that property becomes non-conforming or non-compliant with the zoning ordinance, that property owner is held harmless. This is something that was in our previous code. It needs to be carried forward. We have several street right-of-way acquisition projects in the works.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Does acquisition include acquisition for zero cost if someone was to give the city room for a sidewalk?

**Mr. Freas** – I think it would cover that.

## **ii. Public Hearing**

No Public Comments

## **iii. Discussion and Motion**

**Motion – Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Based on a finding that the proposed zoning text amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare, or good zoning practice. I move to recommend approval of a zoning text amendment as proposed Division 5.4.2 (Compliance with Chapter) of the Charlottesville Development Code. Second by Commissioner d'Oroznio. Motion passes 6-0.

## **IV. Commission's Action Items**

**Chairman Mitchell** gaveled the Planning Commission out and gaveled in the Entrance Corridor Review Board for The VERVE Entrance Corridor Review.

### **1. Entrance Corridor Review**

- a. VERVE** – JPA, Emmet Street, Stadium Road, Montebello Circle

## **Staff Report**

**Jeff Werner, Preservation Planner** – This is an entrance corridor CoA request for 100 Stadium Road (VERVE). It is being reviewed as a PUD request that was approved by City Council. With that, the pre-February 19, 2024 ordinance prevails. This is a 3.3-acre project located within the Fontaine Avenue/JPA Entrance Corridor. You, as the Planning Commission, serve as the Entrance Corridor Review Board and are responsible for the design review of Entrance Corridor projects. The development of the site includes construction of an apartment complex. The current existing structures on the site will be razed. The project, at a street level, presents a continuous façade that I described as starting at JPA and circling counterclockwise along Emmet Street, along Stadium Road, and to the intersection with Montebello Circle. The proposed buildings range in height from 8 to 12 stories and predominantly feature at the first story an EIFS masonry panel. That is what is proposed with the upper stories being EIFS and some metal panels. We will have a continuous sidewalk around the project. It features some stepped walls, terraced public areas, entrances along the facades, a segment of commercial storefront, street trees, and landscaping. The on-site parking will be concealed within the building. There are currently 9 structures on the site that will be razed. Most of the structures were constructed between 1927 and 1961. None of the properties are designated as historic. This is a large project. Looking at the height, massing, scale, and the spacing of the buildings, this project was reviewed at least 2 times when you were looking at the PUD. City Council looked at it twice. Given that review and some of the approvals, I assumed that the heights, spacing, and the scale were appropriate. A lot of what I am talking about is more the design of the buildings themselves. One of the things that I looked at was the building lengths. These building lengths generally fall in the middle. I looked at the project as a city block. It does represent those 4 streets and a building form within it. It is not out of scale with a lot of what is in the city. There is a variation in the building materials, in the color. The wall panels are articulated both physically and materially with the changes. The

buildings do vary. There are streetscape elements that encourage pedestrian activity. The overall perception of visual impact of the height, massing, and scale will be mitigated. A big question for this evening is the EIFS, which is a synthetic stucco material. I realize the guidelines, which were written in 2011, do not recommend this. That material has significantly changed in the last several years. There are a lot of synthetic materials that we allow on buildings. You recently approved 2005 JPA, which had some EIFS. There was a specific condition that was added to the CoA. I have recommended that in the proposed conditions. The question had come up about the wall detail. I included that rendering. The panels can have a joint that is ‘proud.’ By ‘proud,’ we mean it extends above the surface. It can be in the form of a reveal. That reveal could be slender or wide. That is the 2 kinds of themes that we are talking about here. It can be flush in the sense that the reveal can be tight. It is a like a line, so the joint is seemingly flush. I will allow the architect to present the information that they have. I know that they did provide and bring some samples tonight. When you look at this project, I know that Council requested that gap as you are coming down Emmet Street. That achieved a lot visually. What is left here is where you stand on this detail of this material. If you have issues with the material overall, we can certainly explore that. I thought that those were the 2 things that, along with the recommendations that I have made, those can be EIFS. The detail question can be resolved. If the conditions I have offered make sense, I would support approval of the project.

**Chairman Mitchell** – On my first round with the Planning Commission, John Fink was the chairman of the Planning Commission. His counsel to us was always to insist on the use of noble materials in the entrance corridor area. One of the most un noble materials in his opinion was EIFS. That was 10 years ago. I hear that it has evolved in a significant way. I am wondering if you can help me get comfortable with the new iteration of EIFS so we can start thinking of it as a noble material.

**Mr. Werner** – I am not a fan of artificial synthetic materials. I haven’t been a builder for almost 25 years. I can’t comment on that. I believe a lot of it has to do with how something is done. I could show you some masonry projects that are terrible. It comes down to the execution, a quality material, and qualified mechanics. There are materials out there that are generic. The STOW product has a good reputation with how far you want to go in specifying a particular product. I am not an expert on EIFS. I certainly learned a lot working with the BAR. If it is done right and done well and it is the right product in the right location, it can perform as hoped for. I feel uncomfortable feeling like I want to convince you to use EIFS. I don’t know enough to say that you should use it versus something else.

**Chairman Mitchell** – What is the most recent iteration/use of EIFS in Charlottesville?

**Mr. Werner** – It is in a lot of places such as West Main.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – If the apartment buildings were done properly, those would be EIFS. The hotel was a weird non-EIFS synthetic stucco that they had to replace with EIFS. They used synthetic stucco. It wasn’t on insulation. I am not sure what they did, but they did have to replace it. It is the apartment building at Ridge and Cherry that is EIFS.

**Commissioner d’Oronzio** – I have a vast amount of experience with the installation of EIFS and its variations at a detailed and expansive level. What I have seen is that, with EIFS, it is about the installation and the proper monitoring of that installation. I am not sure what should we move forward with? It seems it would come with a stern admonition: “Follow all the directions.” I don’t know how else to handle that. One of the tragedies of earlier EIFS products was in the installation nobody explained how it had to be done. There are a couple buildings in town where the felt underlayment lies against the plywood. From top to bottom, you need to lap each sheet so that you are creating a path for moisture to stay on top and go down between that and the material. All sorts of buildings were built exactly the opposite. That felt was applied in the opposite fashion. Instead of

being overlapping to drive water down, it was underlapping and driving the water into the building. It starts to rot the wood and the termites show up. If it is not installed properly, you have a disaster 15 years from now.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – The STOW products are a complete system. That is one of the things that you use the complete system, you follow their instructions. They are built in with a drainage plane that is behind the installation. The problem with EIFS is either water got in through infiltration from cracks or people didn't understand how water vapor worked. It would either come from inside the building or from the outside. It was stuck in there. That has been resolved. EIFS is a better product than stucco. Stucco is more problematic. That is my opinion.

**Chairman Mitchell** – The 'devil' is in the insulation details. When we start talking, we can talk about what we can do to mitigate this to make sure that the installation goes well.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – From an aesthetic perspective, are we talking about installation making it look worse or will it make the building rot inside? As an entrance corridor board member, I don't care about the building rotting.

**Mr. Werner** – The last house I built; the owner wanted a maintenance free house. We had to explain that there was no such thing. You are looking at aesthetics. There is an assumption that quality materials build a quality building. Something wrong can still be done. We are seeing this proliferation of artificial materials. The jury is still out over what it is going to be in 50 years. The Code Building was supposed to be brick. When they value-engineered it, it was a brick tile. You can't tell the difference. From the aesthetics perspective, if it is the STOW product, we have specifications for materials. From what I understand, with this STOW product, that is the line. If you are going to do it, you will need to do it right. What that building is going to look like in 20 years, I don't know. If it is built right, done right, and maintained, the owner has a built-in interest to keep that building standing and looking nice.

## **Applicant Presentation**

**Neil Reardon, Applicant** – This is the view as we approach from JPA. There is a street view along JPA at the southeastern corner of the building. You can start to see the major materials; both the STOW brick at the base and the STOW metal panel, 3-color champagne. You have seen this before in previous presentations. This is the direct east elevation at the northeast corner of the project. You can see the keynotes there on the site plan. This is the northeast corner. You have already seen this. Zooming in to understand some of that materiality of the charcoal STOW brick panel. We are looking to achieve this material by using this EIFS product. You can see these 2 major volumes and much of the base of the project. It does have that charcoal masonry material. The 2-story volume turns into a 1-story volume. With the brick base, what we are trying to convey is the depth and materiality you have already seen and approved through the PUD process. At the walkups, there are some accents of metal panel that you see in the tan color and the light fixtures. Another shot of the north side of the building showing those active uses of the walkups and that same materiality. Moving around to the commercial space, there is a question here on the materiality of the decking that we are proposing there at the landscape terrace where this outdoor gathering area would happen in front of that market. What we are proposing there is simple material decking to handle some of the verticals and possibly some of the horizontal changes in that grade change. It will be a nice dynamic piece in front and near the main entrance for people to congregate. The simple decking material will be a tan and earthy colored tone that compliments other things we are doing on the design. On the northwest corner of the building, this landscape triangle is out in the right-of-way where Stadium and Emmet bisect each other. This is the view of the main corner of the building. You can see that charcoal brick volume holding that main entry of the western building. The tricolor panel majority material in 3 modules on the north building. We have a view pulled back from the same corner. You can see the massing of the north and west buildings. We wanted to show a few more renderings. This is the drop-off zone primarily at level one.

At the main entry, there are the storefront windows. We have the relationship at the public right-of-way with bike lanes, sidewalks, and some of the retaining walls.

We have the front and side elevations. We have the masonry panel with the STOW brick, the dark charcoal color. The other major material is the 3-color blend of the champagne colors. This is a metallic finish EIFS product. We do not have any concerns on the water envelope. EIFS has come a long way in the last 15 to 20 years. It is a much different product. We would never do something without a drainage plane. The thermal properties of the EIFS panel and the wall system that you get with the envelope has been significantly enhanced. While many architects were not comfortable specifying this product 20 years ago, it is now something that we are comfortable doing. It allows us to have much more variation in the façade. When we designed this, we wanted to allow for some flexibility with the jointing and the patterning we did here. A key here is having the masonry look at the dark charcoal and having the modularization and jointing pattern on the tricolored champagne be varied and dynamic on these large façades. That was intentional. These products in front of you are allowing us to carry that out.

The applicant did pass around physical samples of the materials to be used.

There is a 4<sup>th</sup> color of this metallic. That is a dark charcoal version of it. This primarily exists on the upper levels of the floor as we step back. The façade usually changes towards the top of the building. That is representational of some of the texture. What we are not able to do is get an exact sample of the color. It has the thickness of the product itself. The backing and the wall envelope would be much thicker than that. The mortar variation and that texture is improved from that. The photo representing the masonry/mortar color is more representational. It is closer to the actual brick color, which is a key for us to have in these charcoal zones. The photos you see here as supplementary to the material board are conveying the materiality and the depth of that mortar. This is a project in Nashville built by Subtext. It has, while a different masonry color represented in the red brick and a more standard mortar color, the quality there is representational of having a texture on the brick. If this was to be a stenciled brick without any variation, texture, or depth to the mortar, we wouldn't want to do that product because it is not achieving what we are looking for. The climate of cost escalation with the construction market is the spot we are at to achieve the design aesthetic we have set forth on the project.

You can see on this straight-on view the built form of that different color of masonry and a different color of mortar. That conveys what this would touch and feel like from within 10 to 20 feet at the street presence. As we go up the building, you wouldn't need this level of texture and articulation.

**Chairman Mitchell** – I love The Lawn. I want to make sure we protect the views from The Lawn. You did a pretty good job of 'walking me' through what this is going to look like. This suggests that I will not be able to see this from The Rotunda.

**Mr. Reardon** – That is correct. These exhibits were submitted in a prior submittal and various points along the project's history. I don't think we have explicitly had them up in front of this body. We are happy to go through them. That is why we included them in the packet.

**Chairman Mitchell** – There is a lot of concern from the community, especially the University community from people who love the institution. A lot of people are worried about this looming over The Lawn. This suggests that it will not.

**Mr. Reardon** – This is the view from The Rotunda. We go south in subsequent pages/slides. We tried to pick views where we thought it would be visible. We can say that it isn't visible from anywhere on The Lawn. What we did hear with the views shown in these exhibits was to pick spots where we thought it could be visible. This is the worst possible scenario for visibility. It was not viewable from there mostly due to the buildings that do

surround The Lawn and their proximity and closeness to The Lawn. Additionally, our project is down in grade significantly. That is the major reason why it is not seen from much of Grounds.

**Commissioner Joy** – Can you expand about the process in which you were able to do this montage? I have seen these typically done. You usually see the 3D model of the surrounding environments. It seems that the dashed lines you have identified in each of these images is shockingly close to being visible. There is not a lot of buffer. Knowing that these are crude, photo representation exhibits, how can you ensure the accuracy of what is being shown?

**Mr. Reardon** – You are not wrong. It is difficult to ascertain the exact specificity of an angle from a half mile away, considering vegetation on trees and the tops of buildings. We know that the buildings do hide it. We specifically chose depictions here where there were no leaves on the trees. We are not counting on that. What we can verify to an extent level of accuracy is that we know the grades exist. We know what grade our building is at and the height of our building. The viewsheds are relatively close to the treetops. The accuracy of the depiction is there to a level. I don't know what kind of level we could do more than this without significant survey work and other items.

**Commissioner Joy** – Was GIS used to model this? Was it an extrapolation from a 2-dimensional representation and an approximation from a photo point?

**Mr. Reardon** – We have a 3-dimensional model with accurate grades. On Google Earth, that is public knowledge. There also is GIS public knowledge to buffer it on what those points of elevation are. We didn't randomly pick a viewpoint and assign it a grade-point elevation that we didn't know. We did know what the grade-point elevation was.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I am not sure that you gave us the specific products. When I go on STOW's website, you look up architectural panel and there are different products. Have you narrowed that down?

**Mr. Reardon** – We haven't narrowed it down to a specific product for you. If that was to be something this body would want, we can do that. We were not under the impression that was a requirement for this presentation or your review. Specifying an exact material in many of these cases would be early to commit to something. We want to make sure that product doesn't change in price. We want to make sure that product is available when this project is built. Committing to specifying exact materials is a difficult thing to do.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – You list these as architectural panels. When I think of a panel, I think of something that is prefabricated and put on the building. Is that what it is? Or are you going to do it with the traditional system where you put up the EIFS and you spray everything?

**Mr. Reardon** – These would be field finished; not completely panelized in a factory. It is a field finish for both major materials for the tricolor champagne as well as the STOW brick. At the time of the submittal, we were considering a panelized version. One of the reasons we are using this process is that there is a lot of constraints out here, which drives up the labor. That is one of the reasons other materials had that cost price point that didn't work for us.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – You have the 3 different champagne colors, and you are going to field finish those. Does that mean you must go around the building 3 times?

**Mr. Reardon** – I don't know the exact process that the contractor would use. It would be quartering off two of the three, finishing one, and subsequently doing that with the other two.



**Commissioner Schwarz** – That is not really our purview. I was curious how that was going to work. You are showing some deep reveals and profiles on the faux masonry. Are we going to get what we are seeing?

**Mr. Reardon** – There is a rendering at the northeast corner where you are referring to some brick details in prior renderings. Those renderings from last time are where we were looking to achieve some dynamic things towards the base of the building.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – You are carrying it all the way up on the renderings. Is that not the case anymore?

**Mr. Reardon** – Is there an inset or these types of brick details that were conveyed in the renderings? We would love to achieve those. I don't know they will be achievable at all locations using this product. At the base, where you see it between the 2 windows, that would be an instance where we would want to give it some depth to achieve what we have already presented to you as the exterior design.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – The renderings are a guide at this point.

**Mr. Reardon** – With a building this big, as the process goes, we are conveying an overall design aesthetic. The execution of those individual details must happen later. I do understand your question and the value that brings to the overall design. Perhaps, if none of those were executed, this doesn't 'sing' in the same way.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Without the specific products, you don't have any warranty information. We don't know how long the color is going to last.

**Mr. Reardon** – We don't know that. I don't think anyone would know that even with a warranty for certain. From a maintenance perspective, operationally, we must have a lifespan here that is nearly equivalent to a more expensive material. I could not speak to an exact warranty date or lifespan. We are comfortable that this is not going to fail like you have seen from EIFS products from 20 years ago fail with either water infiltration or other issues. We use this product in extreme weather conditions. We are comfortable with the technical envelope of this material on a building that is rather large.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – This is an entrance corridor. It is not an architectural design control district. At the same time, this is going to be the tallest building in Charlottesville on a very prominent location. This is why I am nervous. What is the wood product that you are trying to use on the concrete?

**Mr. Reardon** – It has not yet been honed in on specifically. We would probably go with a composite deck that would be complimentary. The idea here is that the color of it and the use of it is complimentary of that major champagne color. We have not honed in on the specific texture of it or the exact color of it. We want to compliment what is happening at the lobby on the inside of the building; giving that as a thing that carries through the building. We will also have some of it in the courtyard on the interior of the building and the private side.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – It is like a trex-like product to laminate the concrete.

**Mr. Reardon** – It would not be something that would be refinished on a year-to-year basis. That level of maintenance is not what we want. We want it to be given some hard use by people using that space, residents or public accessing that market.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I know that staff flagged this. What is your thinking now for the reveal?

**Mr. Reardon** – One of the things we showed of a zoomed in view of a rendering was an outboard joint, vertically and horizontally. We are not committed to that being an outboard. If it was inboard, that is probably more likely detailing scenario of those joints. The joints were aligned when we didn't know for certain what material we would be proposing to you in this packet. The pattern and the color summary that you get is meant to be shown to you tonight. With the outboard/inboard question on the detail and the way it is detailed, we are open to how you might see it.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Currently, are you thinking it is a typical EIFS detail where you use thicker or thinner insulation?

**Mr. Reardon** – It will be the thickness of the material. The insulation will probably be varied at that detail. I couldn't draw that exact detail here.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – It sounds like it is not a metal extrusion.

**Mr. Reardon** – I don't believe it would be a metal extrusion in this detailing scenario. A fiber cement panel might have a metal extrusion.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Do you have any lights that you are planning for the rooftops? I know you have some rooftop decks and the pool.

**Mr. Reardon** – The pool is in the lower courtyard. Operationally, there is nothing like that on the roof. There is one roof space. It is on the east building at the east end at JPA and Emmet. There is a small exterior roof deck at that location. That would have an exterior roof terrace. There would be some wall-pack lighting associated with that but nothing major. There is no overhead structure that exists on there right now. If we were to do that, that would be set back against the building and nonvisible. The lighting in those areas is not an airport lighting situation. It is minimal. It is creating a comfortable ambiance.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Nothing is going to be spilling out onto the street from up there.

**Mr. Reardon** – I don't anticipate any lighting other than what has already been depicted at the storefronts.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – You have a transformer that is located on the plan at the corner of Emmet and JPA. It doesn't look like it shows up in the renderings. What is it? How big is it? What are the plans for screening it?

**Mr. Reardon** – It is shown on the site plan. If you look at the northeast part of the site, there is a transformer location there. It is near the secondary entry. There are some bike racks there. We plan to screen that with vegetation. We plan to screen that as much as possible. We don't love the location of that and why it must be there. This is a big project that requires numerous screenings. We would want to screen that. I would welcome your thoughts on how you see that best being screened out in the right-of-way. Some people like vegetation for that screening.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Is there room for vegetation?

**Mr. Reardon** – There is room for vegetation. It is currently not on the site plan as depicted. We intend to screen that either way with something robust with vegetation or a combination of a structured fence with vegetation on it in the growing season. I don't think the guidelines had anything specific; just that it needed to be screened. Contextually, the other 2 are just different than that one. They are on the side of the building towards the right-of-way. It will be a major entry to the building for residents. Because we have been stuck with that location, we

would do an enhanced version of screening. They are 6 feet high. Whether it is a structured fence with vegetation on it or vegetation that grows 6 feet, we are open to both of those things.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Six feet is what you are thinking for the typical height.

**Mr. Reardon** – Yes. You want your screening to be 6 feet. The piece of equipment is 4 to 5 feet. The specific piece of equipment is specified by the utility provider. We would have to make sure we have that. I don't see anywhere around the country that are more than 5.5 feet tall. We plan for our screening to cover 6 feet, especially in these front facing locations.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – You list mechanical louvers on your elevation materials. Where are they?

**Mr. Reardon** – We have several of them. The major sized louvers would be at the garage. Because of the way the garage faces, any that were on the façade would be in the lowest level of volume along JPA in the dark charcoal panel. There are walkout units there. There is a break, where there is a break or a mechanical room. If we did exhaust the garage from the sidewall, that would be the location.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – It would be in between some of those units.

**Mr. Reardon** – It would be. If there is space on the wall, what is more likely, is the garage is ventilated vertically because it is mostly buried. There would be an area well. That grate that is horizontal is coming up that way. The western half of the garage would be ventilated that way. In these zones where we don't have a walkup condition, we would locate one of those area wells and have that exhaust happen from that arrangement.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – For the faux masonry, what type of control joints do you need for those? How often are we going to see something that is like a break in the masonry pattern?

**Mr. Reardon** – It is probably going to be at around 20-foot intervals. We would locate those strategically with the window pattern. In the charcoal brick, you can see that there are not huge zones of that. There are the sidewalls that end up being about 60 or 65 feet total. Each of those would have a strategic vertical joint; 2 or 3 of them amongst that longest façade that is 60 feet.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – With the brick, you can wrap all your details with it so that it looks like it is solid.

**Mr. Reardon** – Compared to a 4-inch masonry with a cavity wall, the brick joints here are easier to deal with. They are easier, less often, and less visible.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – All your corner conditions are going to look like a full brick.

**Mr. Reardon** – That is correct. The corners look pretty good. That was a concern of ours with this STOW brick panel and had to come far enough to convey actual corners, so it appears as a 4-inch brick.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Each brick isn't stuck on the building. Is it sheet applied?

**Mr. Reardon** – It is like a sheet applied. There is a factory version of it too. With the field applied version, I am still looking for the exact specifics of how they do that. All I know is that it is field applied. I know what the end-product looks like. I don't think it is one at a time. I think that it is more efficient than that out in the field.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – You have located streetlights around the building. We have changed our lighting standards. Are we going to get new city streetlights that are 3000 Kelvin instead of being 4000? It would be great if we could do that. Maybe start every time we put in some new poles, and they are the right color.

**Mr. Werner** – I know they are changing Dominion Power lights.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – At one point, the Belmont Bridge lights were going to become the new city standard. I don't know if that is now the case.

**Mr. Werner** – I know that they were developed in the Standards and Design Manual in the past. I urged them to incorporate something relative to the color temperature.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – When you were talking about the dark brick and the patterns that you have there, you have soldier coursing on each floor. You have that thing between windows. Were you saying those might go away?

**Mr. Reardon** – They will be executed differently than those previous renderings. We were giving ourselves flexibility and conveying overall design aesthetic in the PUD process. That is where those images are from. Through the site plan process here, we will submit updated elevations of those areas. Our intention would be to have some level of depth in between the windows as generally outlined in those renderings. I couldn't say for sure how that is executed. With the specifics on this product, we want it to be that way. Can it be executed like the depth on the inboard of the joint detail and the champagne? Can we convey that thickness change with the efficiency of having one solid wall behind that and not altering the exterior wall?

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – What about the soldier coursing? That is at the same depth. It is a change in pattern.

**Mr. Reardon** – It is a change in pattern. If we can convey it with depth, we would. In any instance, it would be turned, soldiered, and represented that way at the spots where we have done that. It does appear in some zoomed in renderings with that soldier course. On this elevation, you don't get into that level of depth there. Through the site plan review process, I believe we will be continually submitting elevations at each of the iterations of the site plan. That elevation can be updated as we go to clarify what we are doing.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – You note in your material selection you are using U-shaped bike racks. That is good. Your renderings have wave-shaped bike racks.

**Mr. Reardon** – We would be happy to change those to what is recommended. The renderings were somewhat aspirational.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Overall, I was focusing on how your streetscape is interacting with the public. You did a pretty good job overall. Where you have the private porches for these walkup units, it would be helpful for defining that private realm if you had a ledge wall.

**Mr. Reardon** – That is a level of detail we didn't define in these renderings. Your suggestion would be, rather than a privacy railing with a gate, more of a built wall condition.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – A gate would serve that purpose of defining the space. Here, you don't have anything. A wall would be more practical.

**Mr. Reardon** – We do see walkups around that have 2 walls on the 2 of the 3 sides as a level of privacy. Your comment is not security related. It is the defining of space related. These are public facing. We want to do contextually the best version of them. They change as you go around the building. The ones on Emmet are different than the ones on JPA. They are also at different heights as they go. Through the site plan review process, we did add a few things like this. You will see that come through with those drawing sets.

**Commissioner Solla-Yates** – Thank you for responding to the public concerns. I see a lot of changes and improvements.

**Commissioner Roettger** – My first thought was the reflectivity of the windows. That might have been addressed through some other forum. That is also in renderings that might need to be updated. Has that been discussed?

**Mr. Reardon** – We haven't gotten into the specifics of that. It is in the renderings depicted in a very reflective way. With our first pass of renderings, they were quite blue. One of the ways to make the windows not so flashy and distracting is to change that and make them grayer. The lighting changes all of this. We haven't specified exact reflectivity at this point. If there is something that is valuable to convey from this body, we would love to know that.

**Mr. Werner** – With glass, the number we have settled on is VLT (Visible Light Transmission) as a percentage with 100 percent being clear. Clear glass was the term we used. Anything that is 70 percent or higher is considered clear glass. That is primarily important in a commercial setting such as the Mall. We want that visibility into the street through the storefronts. There is a note in the drawings about using clear glass. That is something that I would check with the construction drawings. The question gets, as you start going up into residential space. I have never looked at the VLT of glass on residential windows. It is in your purview to request a certain level and even a certain color. A good example would be Dairy Central. That front building was reviewed by the BAR. On the east end, there is the glazed cube that has some variation. I think we went as low as 62 percent. There was some tinting of that glass allowed so it didn't end up looking like a big flash bulb. The fact that they have specified that they will be using clear glass hits the threshold for me. From a design side of things, if you have some additional views on that, it is in your purview to ask.

**Mr. Reardon** – At the ground plane, this is where this is important. It is perhaps less applicable to the upper levels. Even more applicable would be the common area spaces during the major entries where we do have storefront glazing. We did note the clear glazing specifically in this presentation.

**Ms. Roettger** – The massing is great. I know there has been a lot of work to try to break down the number of units getting put on that site. I was asking for the upper levels. I know there is a privacy thing. You don't want to let the metallic paneling be too office building.

**Mr. Reardon** – One of the things that often comes into play is that these are residential units. Many of these windows are bedrooms. There are shades and those shades are closed. To depict the building as never having a shade closed behind a window would not be realistic. Sometimes in night renderings, we can turn some windows with shades and some not, so you can see it both ways, especially when that is more apparent in the dusk light condition.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – What are you thinking for those walkup units? I can see it going both ways.

**Mr. Reardon** – Completely clear glass isn't good from a safety perspective. We are not going to frost that glass or do anything like that. That would feel non-residential. As a walkup, we want these to feel residential. The side lights there would have maneuverable shades on each of those. Sometimes, even the door does have those

in a public situation because you need that level of privacy on the inside. It speaks to the functionality and operations of those walkup units. We do a lot of those. Most of the time it is controlled on the inside by the resident with a different type of shade than would exist on a higher level of the building.

**Commissioner Roettger** – My only comment on the materials is that it looks better on paper and the renderings than the sample.

**Mr. Reardon** – The grout color matters in this. I think it matters in all masonry. I trend towards mortar color being close or complimentary to the actual clay or other masonry product. In this case, it is far better depicted. Our sample maker couldn't get the grout nearly dark enough or have some variation in that grout so that it looks real. Hopefully in the images conveyed on the screen and the digital version of the material sample board, it does come across that way.

**Commissioner Roettger** – On the bike lane, what is going on in terms of the JPA bike lane versus this bike lane coming into the sidewalk? It looks fine.

**Mr. Reardon** – The framework is off-street bike facilities. We are taking the curb coming out with it. That bike lane where it is mostly striped becomes a raised curb. What we wanted to do in most cases, best practice, is locate the tree and green zone between there in the sidewalk for a point of delineation for different users. That is generally the framework. It does swing in and out. One of the places it swings in and join on the east side on JPA would be the spot where the new bus facility would be placed. Right now, there is just a bus sign there. We understand, through the transit agency, that needs to be enhanced. That is one instance where we swing it to make sure that the bike lane comes behind that transit facility. There are a couple other instances where we have curb cuts. One came in the first round of site plan review. It was along Stadium on the west side. It made more sense to combine them. It was a better usage of space if they did combine and stayed consistently that way as to not weave in and out too much. We still do the tree planting canopy. We do it deeper off the curb. The big picture goal is to have these facilities for each user and have good solid boulevard trees in the right-of-way.

**Commissioner Roettger** – In terms of the prow, is that still the prow versus the flush reveal? Is that still up in the air? I like, on the rendering, that there is a nice shadow line.

**Mr. Reardon** – We are open to it being outboard or inboard. It creates a shadow line either way. I don't know which one is better. It will come down to the best way to detail each of those joints. What we wanted to convey here is the overall color texture and the varying 3 colors and what those look like in the general jointing pattern. We are not overly committed to an outboard or inboard joint detail. It might be dictated by the contractor working with us to detail the building.

**Commissioner Roettger** – I would hope that it remains at least what is shown here in terms of the shadow line.

**Mr. Reardon** – That is the best version of the exterior façade.

**Commissioner Joy** – What is Wolf-Ackerman's role in this project?

**Mr. Reardon** – We have a design team, which includes Wolf-Ackerman. Fred Wolf has been consulting as our local architect on the project. We also have Timmons as our civil engineer. They have been active on the project for the entirety of it. Our landscape architect is AJC, a design firm from Atlanta.

**Commissioner Joy** – Can you confirm the bed count?

**Mr. Reardon** – It was specified in the PUD. There was a maximum range given in the PUD. It was 550 DUs (Dwelling Units) and around 1200 beds.

**Commissioner Joy** – On page 55, there is a dusk rendering of the VERVE signage. It appears to be nonilluminated in the dusk rendering. I wanted to confirm whether the intent was to have it be nonilluminated.

**Mr. Reardon** – It is not lit in this rendition. The signage is noted here as a thing to be defined later in terms of its size and illumination. I couldn't tell you for sure if we were going to illuminate that right now. It is over the major entry. I think there will be a sign in that vicinity. There is a process here to articulate that.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – It is above the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windowsills. In our old code, it wasn't allowed. I think that sign can't be there.

**Mr. Reardon** – With your dictation of height on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor storefront window, there would not be space for that sign.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – The regulation is that it must be below the sill of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows.

**Mr. Reardon** – We will take that back and apportion signage.

**Mr. Werner** – It is in the staff report that any signage must meet the ordinance. It is a separate permit. Entrance corridor signage can be illuminated. You all have purview over this. If there is something related to the illuminating, you certainly could address the lighting relative to signs if you wanted to put something in the conditions. I don't want to close the door on it if there is a concern about lighting.

**Mr. Reardon** – If there is anything you want us to take as a note here tonight, we will comply with the signage ordinance. This rendering does not depict compliance with that. We will make that alteration.

**Commissioner Joy** – We talked about the EIFS, which is a disappointing development from a durability standpoint. In looking at STOW's recommendations on maintenance, it seems like inspection and regular repair is not uncommon. What roofing infrastructure is being proposed to maintain these significant facades? Will those pieces of infrastructure be visible that currently aren't shown in these renderings? How would one go about servicing this façade?

**Mr. Reardon** – There is going to be a DAVID system. Window cleaning is more often than any of this. There would be roof anchors on the top. That is how these buildings are serviced. There is a roof anchor. There is a structure that is hung off the side of the building from that for window washing.

**Commissioner Joy** – It is a portable system so it will collapse. It won't be visible.

**Mr. Reardon** – That would be the same way any maintenance issues with the envelope of the building would be dealt with if they came up or if there was a resurfacing of the exterior materials. It likely would be done that way as well.

**Commissioner Joy** – This is my third month of being a non-voting member of the Commission. I represent a significant neighbor to this project. I am aware of your other neighbors, the residential neighbors in this area. Looking for guiding principles on this process, I know there is the 2011 guidelines, which have been brought up for the entrance corridor. "The intent of these guidelines and the review processes is to ensure quality of development compatible with the city's historic, architectural, and cultural resources." Given that this is a 'stone's throw' from a unique site, The Lawn, which is a UNESCO World Heritage Site. They define that as

“the world heritage is the designation for places on Earth that are outstanding universal value to humanity. As such, have been inscribed on World Heritage List to be protected for future generations to appreciate and enjoy.” Looking at Chapter 1 of the checklist that went through that and was reviewed by the city, there was the last item in the chapter. Respect and enhance Charlottesville’s character. The response from the development team was that the building design is of a contemporary nature and does not attempt to be an imitator of a traditional architectural style. It is a unique design that is not lifted from external vernacular sources. The idea is that it is not lifted from external vernacular sources. My understanding is an architecture concerned with domestic and functional rather than public or monumental buildings. I scrolled through the body of work that is The VERVE. I think of this adjacency to a UNESCO World Heritage Site and the 2011 entrance corridor design guidelines with the intent of trying to acknowledge Charlottesville as a unique place, a place that we, as residents, are proud of, a place that has housing issues, which are significant. I have a hard time connecting the dots of meeting the intent of the design guidelines and have seen the context of The VERVE buildings across the country. I am at a loss to figure out how this building represents the intent that this community set forth in previous years, which may or may not change in the future and acknowledge the significance of the adjacency to The Lawn and UVA, which is the only higher education UNESCO World Heritage Site on this continent. It is more of a question for the commissioners and as a community. We have a new zoning ordinance. I know we need housing. Density is good. You have a good site plan. The amenities at the street level are great. With the scale, you have 1200 people. I understand the economics are challenging with the building materials and in this market. I wonder about the concept of stewardship. We, as this Commission, are reviewing projects that more likely will impact future generations than the current lived experience. As an architect at UVA, I am no stranger to reviews and oversight and attempts to try to address the complexity of construction and cost. It is not an easy task. This is a great site with its proximity. This affords a great opportunity. Subtext’s commitment to the idea of bigger projects that are more proximate are preferable over doing smaller, scattered sprawling periphery projects. With it comes this challenge.

**Mr. Reardon** – This is challenging work. There are a lot of buildings. There is a lot of square footage that is built. I try to do it well. These are fabric buildings. We try to do them well. We don’t have the budget to execute good brick details all the way through a project. It does not exist in most cases. We try to do it where possible and find the opportunities to do it. Doing the work well is hitting the sweet spot of what you can do, what is in budget, and making sure, at the foremost, that all the things related to the exterior and right-of-way are being done as well as possible.

**Mr. Werner** – The ERB Guidelines are on my list of things that need to be updated. Your question is a good one. It is why I included the images of buildings around Charlottesville. We are going from seeing monumental scale buildings occasionally. We are going to see them more regularly. What is it that we are trying to emulate? I don’t know how to answer the question architecturally. Ultimately, it comes down to that subjective of liking this or not. I don’t know how to answer that question. Where I am stuck is that this is the 6<sup>th</sup> time with the elevations. I went back and looked at the prior submittals that went to the Planning Commission and City Council. It hasn’t changed significantly except for that opening as you come down Emmet Street. We looked at this. I must assume some level of acceptance from the parties that have been reviewing it. When I start to look at it, I am not sure what my canvas is. That is some of the difficulty of an entrance corridor project versus something we review with the BAR. The one thing that is still lingering out there is the idea of these reveal lines. They do present a transition of colors and whether that transition in there was due to shadow or shade. Does the width of that matter? I am not sure how to answer that. If there is something you would prefer to see stylistically architecturally, I would like for you to express it. That is the biggest detail tonight. I want to make sure we get that right.

**Commissioner Solla-Yates** – There are 8 conditions recommended in the packet from staff. Do you have concerns on those issues?



**Mr. Reardon** – Of the 8 conditions, we don't have major concerns over any of them. The last 2 are pertaining to EIFS. It sounds like there needs to be some level of specificity with those. I would withhold complete agreement on all 8 conditions. The last condition says that clarification is needed. The condition above that the EIFS product will be a STOW product as specified. It notes a durable synthetic material, which is mechanically fastened over appropriate drainage. We already got into that. We do not have a problem with that one. If there are modifications to any of these, we would want to re-comment on that. No major concerns with those other conditions.

**Commissioner Solla-Yates** – Condition 8 is part of the site plan process.

**Mr. Werner** – That was a placeholder. The second one up is identical condition from 2005 JPA. If you wanted to insert something, I put that in there as pneumatic device.

### **ECRB Discussion and Motion**

**Commissioner Schwarz** – When this first came to us, you won us over with some beautiful renderings. I remember the discussion the last time we saw you. It was about a metal panel building in masonry, which has become all EIFS. The renderings still say metal panel building with masonry. They show some very clear protruded joint details that look like metal extrusions. You have mentioned that with the faux brick that you are going to try to keep the details at the lower levels but get rid of them at the upper levels. We don't know what this joint detail is going to be. Because this is a 12-story building and because materials are important, going back to our guidelines, "choose materials that offer texture and avoid monotonous surfaces." You are trying to get rid of the monotonous surface. I get that. You are doing that with a lot of color. "Use a variation of materials, textures, patterns, colors, and details," with details being the key word "to break down the mass and scale the building." "Use massing reduction techniques of articulated base, water table, string courses, cornices, material changes, patterns, and fenestrations to reduce the apparent height of a large building." There is a whole page on details in our guidelines. Architectural details are important tools to create human scale and architectural character. Techniques include highlighting foundations, lentils, sills, and cornices with contrasting materials and breaking up the mass of the building with bands at floor levels, projections at entries, use articulated elements such as cornices, bell courses, water tables, beta visions, variations in wall plan and roof features to create designs of interest. As much as I don't like our guidelines for the ERB, there is a lot about details. You need to show us what details you want to use. I like your renderings. When you tell me that these are just a guideline, we are going to simplify them, and they are not going to be this, I don't have enough anymore to go on to approve this. You are moving in a good direction as far as the building is concerned. I would like you to figure out what you want to do with the skin of the building and tell us so that we can approve it or not. Your renderings show a lot of richness. When you tell me that you are going to take the details off the masonry, that does worry me because this is going to be the biggest and tallest building in Charlottesville. We have messed up a couple times with big buildings. The Standard on West Main looked fine on paper. The construction of it was terrible. The way it was finished was terrible. You are telling us that you are going to figure out as you go this 100 percent EIFS building. I am worried about the many ways it could go wrong. Looking on STOW's website, I was feeling Ok about this brick. That sample scares me. You are going to have to convince me that is going to do all the detailing that you say it will. I am not sure if you have another project that you have done that you have used this material that has all the ins and outs with the brick. EIFS can't touch the ground. What are you going to do when the brick comes near the ground? How are you going to disguise the fact that it is floating right there? I would like to see some details to understand it. I would suggest that you ask for a deferral unless everybody else wants to approve it. You need to find a way to screen that utility box. With the rooftop lights, no lights greater than 1600 lumens where the light source is visible from beyond the property line. Any building mounted light should be shielded and directed to only light the surface of the building and not shine out from the building. This is something we ran into with some of the buildings on West Main Street. You are showing shielded lights on your façade, which is great. With some of the buildings on West Main, we

had to go through and get the developer to reduce the brightness of those lights because they were creating some serious glare issues to people on the streets. Any appreciable loss of canopy trees from the depictions presented in this application, regardless of cause, should require review by the ERB. I am saying that because things happen during the site plan process. Make sure you have that figured out before you promise us that this building is going to be ringed with street trees. Tonight, I am not prepared to approve this without some more detail on what you want to do with the building skin and to beg you to find something else other than the fake brick or do something to convince me that it is going to do what you think it is going to do.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I don't disagree with Commissioner Schwarz on the fact that these renderings appear to be something different from the cladding that we have been presented tonight. My view of a CoA is that what matters to me and ultimately to most of the ERB guidelines is how that building interfaces with the public realm. While the cladding is not nothing, it is a small piece of that. They have done a good job of building a streetscape here. I think they have done a good job of design in the public realm. While these aren't the cladding decisions I would have made, the guidelines tell me about my preferences for how buildings should be clad and appear are wrong. That building in Nashville looked pretty good. The guidelines would call that a cheap imitation of the Jeffersonian architectural style and say that it is neither appropriate nor desirable. Reading that in the guidelines, the guidelines are asking for buildings that are modern and different. Do I want buildings that are modern and different? Not really. Do I think it complies with the guidelines? I would have to vote to approve a CoA.

**Commissioner d'Oronzio** – I would 'mirror' a couple of Commissioner Stolzenberg's view on that. I would put it in a more sweeping way. Acknowledging the grittiness level of some of Commissioner Schwarz's concerns there and my own dubious relationship with EIFS that has come from a dreadful experience, I would be inclined to grant the CoA provided we had that solid consensus.

**Commissioner Solla-Yates** – I taught design at UVA. I don't feel qualified to talk about this. I like the rendering. It makes sense. There is a lot of good in it. I hear Commissioner Schwarz's concerns. I trust them. I don't know the best way procedurally to address those concerns. I am interested in thoughts from staff on that. To Commissioner Joy's concern about how to find a reasonable balance, which is the right question to be asking, I am leaning somewhat on the Comprehensive Plan. On page 24, goal 7-Entrance Corridors, 'ensure that the quality of development in Charlottesville's designated entrance corridor overlay districts is compatible with the city's requirements and standards and with the adjacent neighborhoods' historic, architectural, and cultural resources, while allowing for reuse of structures and evolution of uses in these areas.' To me, it is about finding the right balance. It is going to be hard. Broadly, I support the vision here. I see its merit. I am concerned about the details. I am interested in how we can resolve those details.

**Commissioner Roettger** – I am not sure on the procedures and options that we have available to us. On the architectural side, there are the mockups. Those are things we are doing where you get to see the materials. That is so far down the road that it doesn't come to the Planning Commission. I do like that the public realm has been worked out well. It is in a valley. It is hard to make those ground levels feel important enough. Because of the topography, it feels like it is squashed. That corner is nice. My question is about the material. We need housing for students. It is hard to push the massing and density in there. I drove over there. JPA has 2 ends to it. One end does have stores and more commercial space. The other end is a dead end into UVA, which becomes very historic and protected property. All the activity in the market seems like a very nice balance. The students who live there are usually flowing the other way. It hopefully gives them retail. It would benefit those coming to the UVA side. I support it. I don't know what we can do about the evolution of what happens with the material. We need to have these more approximate student housing to help us with our affordability issues.

**Commissioner Joy** – The PUD has been approved. My concern is the general massing, density, and the nature of the development. I feel that we are closer to this development discourse than average. I would have a hard

time imparting after seeing the presentation and why this is best for this prominent site in Charlottesville and for the students of UVA. I would have a hard time explaining other than it is expensive to build here. I think there is an opportunity for ingenuity and stewardship. That is what I was touching on. It is hard for me to catch the thread of what would make the VERVE at this site the best rendition of what it could be, even with the limitations. With the limitations come design opportunity. You get more to the core of what would make a place great. I concur with everybody here. It is hard to look at that board. I understand the challenge you are in. It is a design issue. I would be hard to advocate in future years.

**Chairman Mitchell** – The PUD has been approved. Something is going to get built here. I agree with everything that Commissioner Schwarz said. There needs to be more detail, more specificity. If I had to vote today, I would vote not to approve the CoA.

Chairman Mitchell conducted a straw poll on approving or denying the CoA. The straw poll was 3-3.

**Chairman Mitchell** – If it is deferred, they would have the opportunity to address a lot of the detailed concerns that Commissioner Schwarz raised. We can vote to approve or deny. They can opt to come back to us next month.

**Ms. Creasy** – They can choose to defer. The ERB applications don't have the same time frames that others do. You could vote for the deferral. They could come back with the same material. It would probably make sense to have some conversation on that with the applicant.

**Mr. Reardon** – We hadn't planned for that scenario. We do have time through the site plan review process.

**Dylan Lambur, Applicant** – I would say we are open to deferring. I would assume that means next month. We would be happy to defer and come back with more details for you guys.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Would you prefer next month?

**Mr. Werner** – You requesting a deferral puts 'the ball in your court.' The challenge is that you would have to get some back to us. If the applicant requests a deferral, it becomes their decision when to bring it back.

**Ms. Creasy** – We would let them know the time frames of when we would need materials back. Once those materials are received by Mr. Werner, we work with them to get to an agenda that makes sense.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Can I understand what you guys are looking for out of a deferral? Are you looking for renderings with EIFS?

**Commissioner Roettger** – If we could select 1 or 2 renderings and look at the shadow line joints, how the metallic might look. I don't know if there is an opportunity to do some brick around the immediate entrance. If there is a way to take a rendering and show a corner, we can focus on taking some photos of those more in detail.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I want to see a full-height view. If you are going to be reducing the details on the brick, I want to know what you are planning on reducing it down to and understanding what this is going to look like. It still looks like dark metal strips for all these reveals and understanding what that is going to look like if it is just EIFS as a depression or if it is a protrusion. Is that going to be painted a different color?

**Mr. Reardon** – I understand what you are looking for in a future version of this meeting with a deferral. I will summarize in 2 pieces: 1. anywhere where we have an older rendering and where that can be updated and what

we are proposing in detail is depicted. 2. Some additional information on how those things you brought up tonight and we spoke on how those are detailed out. You are not asking for specified materials currently but a level of detail with the areas of emphasis from. It is updated graphic illustrations on the things talked about and additional content on details.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – A section showing the brick. You don't have to show us what is behind the wall.

**Mr. Reardon** – A key here is the details around materiality depth for the major materials. You are not asking us to detail every canopy overhang but the major repeating instances of the major materials. We would highlight the areas of emphasis and not overwork the other areas as to reach a timeline for proper staff review. When it comes back to the schedule, whether this is deferred to next month's meeting or thereafter, it would have to work in the timeline that staff have outlined.

**Commissioner Joy** – It was a great point about having a record that could be referred to. With regards to the EIFS, the guidelines explicitly says that the entrance corridor does not recommend EIFS, and we are going to sit there and put a stamp on a building that is top to bottom EIFS at a highly sensitive site. Is there something in this packet that would be helpful to show something that EIFS from 2011 to 2024 is different? How would we save face with our neighbors?

**Commissioner Schwarz** – Staff had started this with his proposed condition, talking about having the drainage plane and being a STOW product. We can probably elaborate that out possibly. Maybe you can elaborate on it however much you want to hold yourselves to certain detail standards with the drainage plane, the complete system. Somehow, we need to come up with some language to go with a condition that says why this EIFS is appropriate.

**Mr. Reardon** – Ideally, we would depict some details here, even a sectional detail that could allow you to provide that language that you were talking about. That would be at the meeting next month or the following month.

**Applicant requests a deferral of CoA Application – Commissioner Stolzenberg – I move to accept the applicant's request to defer the Entrance Corridor Certificate of Appropriateness application for 100 Stadium Road [The Verve]. – Second by Commissioner Schwarz. Motion passes 6-0.**

Commissioner Solla-Yates noted communication from the city forester on actions that the Planning Commission can do with canopy issues.

Chairman Mitchell gavelled the ECRB out of order and gavelled the Planning Commission back to order.

Commissioner Joy brought up the idea of an addendum to the ERB guidelines. There was further discussion amongst the Planning Commission on the ERB guidelines. Staff did bring up that there needs to be review and updates to the ERB Guidelines, ADC Guidelines, and the Historic Conservation District Guidelines. Staff also reminded the Commission that the city is still at the beginning of the new code.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 PM.

City of Charlottesville  
*To be a Place Where Everyone Thrives*  
Office of Community Solutions



To:	Planning Commission
Agenda Item:	<b>A Proposal to Approve the Annual Action Plan for Program Year 2024-25 (1<sup>st</sup> of 1 readings) <b>DRAFT</b></b>
Date:	May 14, 2024
Presenter(s):	Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst
Staff Contacts:	Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst Taylor Harvey-Ryan, Grants Programs Manager

#### **ACTION REQUESTED**

Approval of the Annual Action Plan for Program Year 2024-25 for the city's Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) programs and approval to forward same to City Council for review.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The City of Charlottesville is an Entitlement Community (EC) as designated by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD) and, as such, is the recipient of annual allocations of federal funds through the Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and or HOME Investment Partnerships program(s). Over the years, the City has used the funding it receives through these programs funds to invest in community organizations working to address a broad range of community needs, including economic development, housing, social programs and improvements to public facilities and infrastructure, among others, all with the goal of nurturing a Charlottesville in which every member of our community has the opportunity to thrive.

#### **DISCUSSION**

For the upcoming 2024-25 program year, the city's volunteer members of CDBG/HOME Taskforce have been tasked with carefully reviewing requests for funding from numerous community organization and present for review the following funding recommendations. This responsibility involves carefully evaluating each request for funding received and, in the end, making difficult decisions about where to invest limited funds to make possible the greatest possible positive impacts for those low- and moderate-income residents at the heart of this work.

Specifically, the Taskforce reviewed seventeen (17) requests for funding, fourteen (14) for funding through CDBG and three (3) through HOME. Total new requests for funding for both programs amounted to \$1,224,986.00, whereas the City had just \$431,616.70 to commit in the prior year ( $\Delta = \$793,369.30$ ). Additionally, new requests for funding for what HUD classifies as Public Service programs totaled \$272,986, whereas in the prior year the City had just \$63,750 available to commit ( $\Delta = \$209,236$ ).

While never an easy task, the work of the Taskforce this year has been made more challenging by the fact that as of May 6, 2024, HUD has yet to release its CDBG & HOME it's official formula allocations (by way of comparison, formula allocations are typically released sometime between late January through mid-March). In the absence of final allocation numbers to work with, the Taskforce has based its current CDBG & HOME recommendations on the program year 2023-24 allocations for each program and has identified a precise percentage value<sup>1</sup> of each new funding recommendation. When HUD does make it's new allocation numbers public, the recommended award values represented herein will be recalculated based on the new amounts and the final funding agreements with subrecipients will be adjusted accordingly.

## **CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, while the members of the CDBG/HOME Taskforce would have liked to have been in the position of being able to fund each applicant in full, the funding recommendations outlined in the Annual Action Plan represent the Taskforce's studied efforts to invest the limited funds available to them to maximize the positive impacts for our community and those residents at the heart of this work.

## **BUDGETARY IMPACT(S)**

As the funds proposed here are federal funds allocated to the City by HUD to address important community needs and, as such, do not draw from the city's General Fund, no adverse impacts to the City's budget are anticipated. Rather, investment of these funds as recommended in this action plan will instead serve to address multiple important and pressing community need(s) while at the same time supporting the city's eligibility to benefit from allocations of entitlement funds in future years.

## **RECOMMENDATION(S)**

Based on the anticipated benefits of the current proposal to the Charlottesville community, specifically in that the activities presented herein directly address important needs within our community, staff recommends that the members of the Planning Commission approve the

---

<sup>1</sup> Percentage values for recommended awards have been calculated to at least the hundred millionths, even though the attached recommendation summary only shows to the hundreds place.

Annual Action Plan for program year 2024-25 and similarly approve it be forwarded to City Council for review with the suggested motion:

**I move that the Planning Commission approve the Annual Action Plan presented here before us today and to recommend that staff present this plan to the City Council for public review.**

#### **ALTERNATIVES**

Given that these funds are provided by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development to the City of Charlottesville for the execution of meaningful community-benefit programs and, as such, are not drawn from the city's General Fund, no alternatives courses of action are considered.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Draft CDBG/HOME Taskforce funding recommendations for Program Year 2024-25
- Summary of Requests for Funding Received for CDBG & HOME Program Year 2024-25

**DRAFT****SUMMARY OF CDBG & HOME FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS PY24**

Recommended by CDBG/HOME Taskforce: Wednesday, April 17, 2024

Taskforce Chair: Phil d'Oronzio Vice-Chair: Syleethia Carr

**Funds Available to Commit (anticipated)\***

Available to Commit - CDBG	\$340,000.00
Available to Commit - HOME	\$91,616.70

*Subtotal Available to Commit: \$431,616.70***Programmatic Funding & Setasides**

Our Planning & Admin	\$ 85,000.00
Council Priority: Public Facilities & Imprv.	\$ 89,896.51
Council Priority: Economic Dev.	\$ 89,896.51
Public Services Cap @ 15%	\$ 63,750.00
HOME Program Local Match @ 25% (CAHF)*	\$ 22,904.18

**CDBG Economic Development**

	<i>Funding Rec. \$</i>	<i>% of Req.</i>
CIC Entrepreneur Programs	\$ 19,542.72	78.17%
CRHA Economic Opportunity Program Coordinator	\$ 70,353.79	78.17%

*Subtotal = \$ 89,896.51***CDBG Public Facilities & Infrastructure Improvements**

	<i>Funding Rec. \$</i>	<i>% of Req.</i>
NHDC BEACON Shared-Use Kitchen	\$ -	0.00%

*Subtotal = \$0***CDBG Public Service Programs**

	<i>Funding Rec. \$</i>	<i>% of Req.</i>
IRC Financial Capabilities Program	\$ 16,000.00	33.34%
PACEM Shelter Transportation	\$ 7,750.00	77.50%
LVCA Beginning Level Workforce Development Program	\$ 15,000.00	23.08%
PCLT Land Trust Stewardship and Community Engagement	\$ -	0.00%
PHAR Resident-Involved Redevelopment	\$ 25,000.00	55.56%
The Haven Coord. Entry into Homelessness System of Care	\$ -	0.00%

*Subtotal = \$63,750***CDBG Affordable Housing**

	<i>Funding Rec. \$</i>	<i>% of Req.</i>
AHIP Charlottesville Critical Rehab Program	\$ -	0.00%
CRHA Housing Stability Program (TBRA)	\$ 18,353.49	29.60%
CRHA Affordable Housing Preservation at Dogwood	\$ 150,000.00	100.00%
LEAP Solar Readiness Program	\$ 18,000.00	36.00%
PHA Building Community with Strategic Resident Eng.	\$ -	0.00%

*Subtotal = \$186,353***HOME Investment Partnerships**

	<i>Funding Rec. \$</i>	<i>% of Req.</i>
CRHA Homeownership Program (DPA)	\$ 41,308.35	118.02%
Habitat Affordable Housing @ 6 ½ Street	\$ 50,308.35	114.34%
NHDC Affordable Housing Program	\$ -	0.00%

*Subtotal = \$91,617*

\* Estimated based on PY23 allocations



## SUMMARY OF CDBG & HOME REQUESTS FOR FUNDING PY24

### Funds Available to Commit (anticipated)\*

Available to Commit - CDBG	\$340,000.00
Available to Commit - HOME	\$91,616.70

*Subtotal Available to Commit: \$431,616.70*

### Programmatic Funding & Setasides

CDBG Planning & Admin	\$ 85,000.00
Council Priority: Public Facilities & Imprv.	\$ 89,896.51
Council Priority: Economic Dev.	\$ 89,896.51
Public Services Cap @ 15%	\$ 63,750.00
HOME Program Local Match @ 25% (CAHF)*	\$ 18,323.34

### CDBG Economic Development

*Request \$*

CIC Entrepreneur Programs	\$ 25,000
CRHA Economic Opportunity Program Coordinator	\$ 90,000

*Subtotal requests CDBG Econ Dev: \$115,000*

### CDBG Public Facilities & Infrastructure Improvements

*Request \$*

NHDC BEACON Shared-Use Kitchen	\$ 250,000
--------------------------------	------------

*Subtotal requests CDBG Public Facilities: \$250,000*

### CDBG Public Service Programs

*Request \$*

IRC Financial Capabilities Program	\$ 47,986
PACEM Shelter Transportation	\$ 10,000
LVCA Beginning Level Workforce Development Program	\$ 65,000
PCLT Land Trust Stewardship and Community Engagement	\$ 30,000
PHAR Resident-Involved Redevelopment	\$ 45,000
The Haven Coord. Entry into Homelessness System of Care	\$ 75,000

*Subtotal requests CDBG Social Programs: \$272,986*

### CDBG Affordable Housing

*Request \$*

AHIP Charlottesville Critical Rehab Program	\$ 96,000
CRHA Housing Stability Program (TBRA)	\$ 62,000
CRHA Affordable Housing Preservation at Dogwood	\$ 150,000
LEAP Solar Readiness Program	\$ 50,000
PHA Building Community with Strategic Resident Eng.	\$ 50,000

*Subtotal requests CDBG Affordable Housing: \$408,000*

### HOME Investment Partnerships

*Request \$*

CRHA Homeownership Program (DPA)	\$ 35,000
Habitat Affordable Housing @ 6 ½ Street	\$ 44,000
NHDC Affordable Housing Program	\$ 100,000

*Subtotal requests HOME: \$179,000*

\* Estimated based on PY23 allocations