

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2006 -- 6:33 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Ms. Karen Firehock (Chairman) Staff Present:

Mr. Jon Fink (Vice-Chairman) Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director of NDS

Mr. Craig Barton Mr. Ron Higgins, AICP, Planning Manager

Mr. Michael Farruggio Mr. Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Cheri Lewis Ms. Ashley Cooper, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Bill Lucy Ms. Missy Creasy, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Kevin O'Halloran Ms. Mary Joy Scala, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Lisa R. Kelley, Deputy City Attorney

City Council Members Present: Mr. David Neuman, UVA Office of the Architect

Mr. David Brown, Mayor

Mr. Kevin Lynch, Vice Mayor

Mr. Blake Caravati

Mr. Rob Schilling

I. REGULAR MEETING

Ms. Firehock convened the meeting at 6:33 p.m.

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

Ms. Firehock called for any matters from the public not on the agenda.

Mr. Barclay Mullins, of 5615 Boyden Place, Richmond, and co-owner of the Richmond PODS franchise, stated he had met with City Council and the Mayor to explain PODS after finding out about the ordinance which had been passed. He hoped the Commission would understand how important it was to work together to make an ordinance which was beneficial for the City and PODS.

Ms. Firehock stated the Commission had been in receipt of a memo from Mr. Mullins' company which she thought was full of helpful and constructive suggestions.

Mr. Wesley Mullins, of Richmond, stated the letter had been written with Valarie Long, Esq. He

stated his understanding that the letter has been sent to Ms. Kelley in order to work together to possibly change a few things and tweak the ordinance.

Ms. Valarie Long, Esq., of McGuire Woods, was also present on behalf of the PODS issue.

Mr. Harry Smith, of 2030 Spottswood Road, stated he and most of the neighborhood had not been aware Arch's Frozen Yogurt would be discussed until the previous Friday. He stated the neighborhood had 40 years of experience with noise, light, trash pollution and environmental pollution. He urged the Commission to consider the neighbors' suggestions on how to make it better. Mr. Smith stated he had no problems with the proposal of making it a two-story building; however, he did have problems with it having an open area for customers in the back which would increase the noise level and light pollution.

Mr. Dan Lovern, Director of Operations for Grant Avenue Development which owns and operates the adjacent Arby's. He stated they also had no opposition to Arch's. He stated they did have concerns about the number of parking spaces. He stated there did not seem to be enough spaces and expressed concern that the parking would migrate to the adjacent lots.

Mr. Michael Masters, of Hessian Road, expressed concern about the potential second floor food service area proposed for Arch's. He also expressed concern about the proposed number of parking spaces. He gave the Commissioners a list of businesses and their existing parking spaces; Arch's was to have only 12 spaces.

Ms. Adena Imlay, of 2014 Meadowbrook Road, expressed concern about the impact on Meadowbrook Creek since she had discovered a team of people cleaning up a sewage spill from Hong Kong Buffet.

Mr. Carl Tremaglio, of 3365 Braymer Court and representative of Trem Commercial Rentals which owned and adjacent property, stated he too had counted parking spaces and measured buildings. He felt foot traffic was not being addressed. He stated his opposition to Arch's additional square footage and reduction in parking spots as this would have a tremendous impact on adjacent property.

There were no additional matters from the public.

B. MINUTES

March 14, 2006 -- Regular Meeting

Ms. Lewis stated Mr. Dreyfus' name had been misspelled on the bottom of page 3. She also noted a letter had been dropped from "wordsmith" on page 8. Ms. Lewis also asked that "deep" on page 10 be changed to "steep."

Ms. Firehock asked for a motion to accept the minutes. Mr. Barton so moved. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Ms. Lewis wanted to know what had been changed on the Transit Center site plan. Ms. Cooper stated most of the changes had to do with the ramp system going up to Belmont Bridge. Mr. Tolbert further

stated they had been going back and forth with the BAR to get the ramp right; it had been a minor adjustment to the handrail.

Mr. Farruggio wanted to know what had been changed on the Fifteenth Street Apartments. Ms. Cooper stated a handicap ramp had been added to the front of the building and changed a grass drainage swale to a concrete swale. Mr. Farruggio asked if that would affect sidewalks or pedestrian movement in the area. Ms. Cooper stated it would not and that it would enhance movement to the buildings for everyone.

Mr. Fink moved to accept. Ms. Lewis clarified that he moved to accept the list of site plans and subdivisions approved administratively. Mr. Farruggio seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

3/1/06 TO 4/1/06

1. File No. T-04- Veliky 15th Street Apartments 15th Street, NW
000035 Apartments – Utility Amendment

Signed by: Ashley Cooper

2. File No. T-04- Wertland Square Apartments Wertland Street &
000029 - Site Lighting Amendment 216 14th Street, NW

Signed by: Ashley Cooper

3. File No. T-04- Cherry Hill PUD off of Cherry Avenue
000032 Signed by: Ashley Cooper @ Johnson Village

4. File No. T-04- Transit Center Amendment Water St. @ East End 000026 Signed by: Ashley Cooper of
Mall at 7th Street, SE

5. File No. Meadow Creek Golf Course - 1300 Pen Park Road
1041-A Maintenance Complex Wash Pad

Signed by: Missy Creasy

LIST OF SUBDIVISION APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

3/1/06 TO 4/1/06

1. Division of TM 56, Parcel 116 Two new single-family lots
1618-B East Market Street William B. Kerner, Jr. & Catherine Dee

File No. 1367 Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 3/14/06

Signed by: Jon Fink & Brian Haluska

2. Redivision of TM 38, Parcels 66 & 71 No new lots

1706 Rugby Circle Barbara Nolan

File No. 1368 Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 3/23/06

Signed by: Karen Firehock & Missy Creasy

D. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Mr. Barton had nothing new to report since the last meeting. The PACC Tech Committee would be meeting April 20th at the County Office building.

Mr. O'Halloran also had nothing new to report. He stated the BZA would be meeting later in April.

Mr. Fink stated his committees had met but he had been unable to attend as he had been out of the country.

Mr. Lucy stated there were three large, important projects beginning to move through the Board of Architectural Review -- a partial demolition on East Main Street, the CVS mixed use project, and proposed nine-story building on Water Street.

Mr. Farruggio stated the 250 Bypass Interchange Committee had met; he had been unable to attend due to a previously committed engagement. The Parks and Recreation Committee would be meeting later in April. Mr. Farruggio stated the Neighborhood Federation had not met.

Ms. Lewis stated she had not been at the public session for the 250 Bypass Interchange Committee either. Ms. Lewis had attended the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission Meeting;

the Route 29 study would be coming back before the TJPDC over the next two months. Ms. Lewis wanted to note she had been disappointed to get the letter from Ms. Long on the PODS ordinance since she had been fairly vocal about her criticism of this ordinance during the Commission's consideration of it. Ms. Lewis expressed her disappointment that the PODS company had not been contacted.

Mr. Neuman stated he had circulated some information about the South Lawn Project which was approved by the Board of Visitors. He stated they had begun meetings with City staff related to logistics of the planning. The earliest possible construction start would be the first of next year. Mr. Neuman stated the quarterly Neighborhood Advisory Group would be meeting April 12th. He stated the John Paul Jones arena would be opening ahead of schedule. Mr. Fink sought clarification of the final build out of the South Lawn project; Mr. Neuman stated it would be 2009 or 2010.

E. CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Firehock stated none of her committees had met. The Green Building Forum would be meeting April 20th at the Design Center on the Downtown Mall to further the ideas for how to encourage environmentally sustainable building design in Charlottesville.

In the absence of a quorum of City Council, Mr. Tolbert was asked to begin his report.

J. DEPARTMENT OF NDS/STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Tolbert stated there would be no work session in April as most of the Planning staff was out of town. The Mall Crossing was taken up by Council and they decided to open a temporary crossing at Fourth Street for one year to do traffic and pedestrian studies; if they decided to move forward, Fifth Street would be the permanent crossing. Mr. Tolbert stated the letter from Ms. Long about PODS had contained some good points and he had forwarded it to Ms. Kelley. Mr. Tolbert stated he had asked Ms. Kelley to draft an amendment to the ordinance. Mr. Tolbert stated he had talked with the Mullins' and had told them NDS would have loved to have had their input if they had been able to find them.

Mr. Fink asked if the associated signage discussed at a recent meeting would be included at the Fourth Street crossing. Mr. Tolbert stated the Wayfinding signage would not be ready yet.

Mr. O'Halloran asked if there would be parking on Fourth Street. Mr. Tolbert stated there would be some parking on Fourth Street similar to what was on Second Street.

Ms. Firehock asked the Commissioners if they wanted to meet later in the month if there was any topic which did not require staff's presence. Ms. Firehock suggested they confer via E-mail to see if there was a quorum of interest to meet on any particular topic.

II. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS (Beginning at 7:00 P.M.)

With a quorum of Councilors present, Ms. Firehock opened the Joint Public Hearings at 7:08 p.m.

F. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ZM-06-1-2: An ordinance to amend and re-ordain Sections 34-1101 and 34-1200 of the Code of the City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended (Zoning Ordinance), to modify the appurtenance regulations allowing certain projections of balconies, decks,

platforms and other features into required setbacks. Deferred from the March 14, 2006 meeting.

Mr. Tolbert gave the staff report. The appurtenance Ordinance had been before the Commission previously. The draft before the Commission was prepared as a result of the March meeting and work session and is a much better organized draft.

Ms. Firehock called for questions of Mr. Tolbert.

Mr. Fink asked if all the concerns discussed at the previous meeting had been covered in the draft. Mr. Tolbert stated they had.

Mr. Caravati asked if there was any consideration for second story appurtenances on a property with a significant or severe topography change. Mr. Tolbert stated he did not know how to regulate that since all properties must be treated alike.

Ms. Lewis asked if it was addressed by the definition of "grade." Mr. Tolbert stated grade talked about what was on the site, it did not deal with off site.

Mr. Lucy sought clarification of page 3, "Other requirements" if the first paragraph should say "wide," as written, or if the intent of the paragraph was "deep." Mr. Tolbert stated the intent was "deep." The Commissioners asked that wording be changed.

Ms. Firehock opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dan Ortiz, of 411 Altamont Circle, stated the proposed amendments represent improvements over the original proposal, but still had some problems. The new definitions create at least one category which is a logical impossibility while core concerns still fall through the cracks.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Ms. Firehock closed the public hearing.

Mr. Fink sought clarification of the potential referenced by Mr. Ortiz. Mr. O'Halloran stated he thought Mr. Ortiz had been talking about uncovered structures. Mr. Ortiz clarified he was expressing concern about section D(4).

Ms. Kelley reminded the Commission they had set the draft to depend very much on the definitions and changing the wording of the ordinance could cause conflict with the definitions.

Mr. Fink stated they should put additional language in the Ordinance to address Mr. Ortiz's points which were valid. Ms. Firehock asked if that could be done in this meeting. Mr. Barton did not think they could; he thought it required more careful study.

Mr. Fink asked Mr. Ortiz to E-mail his concerns to Mr. Tolbert so they could be forwarded to the Commissioners.

Mr. Barton suggested they look at other jurisdictions to see how the appurtenance issue is addressed. He stated simple graphics may make the ordinance easier to understand.

Mr. O'Halloran moved to defer this indefinitely.

Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

III. REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (Continued)

G. SITE PLANS & ERB ENTRANCE CORRIDOR REVIEWS

1. Arch's Frozen Yogurt - 1232 Emmet Street – site plan for new replacement restaurant

Ms. Creasy stated the applicant had submitted a preliminary site plan for approval. The site plan meets the criteria of the Site Plan portion of the Ordinance. There would be seating areas in the

front on each level and on the rear of the building on each level. Ms. Creasy stated numerous correspondence had been received from residents near the area who were concerned with the lighting and parking.

Ms. Firehock asked Ms. Creasy to comment on how the applicant does or does not meet the parking requirement. Ms. Creasy stated the actual requirement for on site parking was five spaces based on square footage of the eating areas and office space after a reduction based on nearness to a bus stop and for having an on site employee shower. The applicant proposes 12 spaces.

Mr. Fink stated that one parking space per 250 square feet was not the reality of a food service business.

Ms. Firehock expressed concern that the outside seating did not affect the parking calculation.

Mr. Fink expressed concern that the proposal only had 25 percent of the parking spaces as compared to the other food service organizations. Mr. Fink stated this was something the Commission should look at as this area begins to redevelop so they don't create a problem. Mr. Fink expressed concern over what kind of problems this could create ultimately in a very small site.

Ms. Creasy clarified that the outside seating had been included in the parking calculation.

Ms. Firehock recognized the applicant.

Mr. Rob Archer stated they had dealt with parking issues at the other Arch's locations.

Ms. Evelyn Tickle, project architect, stated they had checked with the City to make sure everything they wanted to do was within the letter of the law. She stated they had wanted to create a building which had a back presence to it as well. She stated the creek was one of the beauties of the site which they were celebrating in the design. Ms. Tickle stated they were making use of the existing trees to sustainably cool the building and to serve as an acoustical barrier between the building and the residential neighborhood. Ms. Tickle stated they had decreased the amount of pavement on the site by using a lot of pervious surfaces underneath the trees. She also stated the lighting was residential-type lighting.

Mr. Fink expressed concern about noise abatement for the mechanical handling systems and sought clarification of the applicant's plans to be a good neighbor to the neighborhood directly behind the site.

Mr. Archer stated the mechanical systems would not be on the rooftop so it would not be an eyesore and so it could be covered by a deck and trellis which was meant to help baffle the noise.

Mr. Barton sought clarification of the scope of the review allowed to the Commission in the site plan review. Mr. Fink took issue with that because they were talking about public welfare. Ms. Firehock stated the neighbors had raised issues with a lot of things over which the Commission did not have purview to rule on during site plan review; however, the fact they had raised them made Ms. Firehock

feel it was fair to air them in a public forum. Mr. Fink felt they had purview on containing errant garbage. He stated the creek and its banks were trashed.

Mr. Farruggio sought clarification as to whether studies had been done to identify the area as pedestrian or auto oriented. Mr. Archer stated they had looked at it as pedestrian oriented; however, they realized a lot of people drive.

Mr. Barton stated he had not been able to find on the site plan the shower which granted one parking space reduction. Mr. Archer stated there was to be one in the upstairs bathroom. Ms. Creasy stated a reduction had also been granted due to the bike rack which would be on site. Ms. Tickle stated they did not mean to get an exemption for the shower.

Mr. O'Halloran stated he understood the neighbors' concerns about lighting and trash and buffering. He stated those were zoning concerns. He noted the project meets all of the current zoning very easily. Mr. O'Halloran felt this was an improvement over a lot of the other development along that strip. He stated he could get behind this and vote in favor of it. Ms. Firehock asked if that was a motion. Mr. O'Halloran stated it was a motion to approve. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Arch's Frozen Yogurt - 1232 Emmet Street – ERB design review for new restaurant

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. There are a variety of standards and guidelines which must be met for the Entrance Corridor Review. The long north wall partially encloses the front two-story outdoor eating areas and to the rear it partially encloses the upstairs utility area. The mass and scale of the building is consistent with other structures on Route 20 North. The Emmett Street elevation features an outdoor eating patio with the second floor eating balcony above that. The rear of the property is intended to be an attractive part of the outdoor seating area. Trash will be stored inside the rear building and the mechanical equipment will be located on the second floor of this rear area partially screened from view. The applicant has designed the building and the site to convey a theme of natural

beauty and sustainability. A bike rack is shown in front of the front patio. Lighting will be shielded and low level. The roof is standing seam copper with natural wood cedar trellises at either end. The proposed design is compatible with other properties along Route 29. Ms. Scala stated the proposal met the Design Principles very well. The building represents a good contemporary design.

Staff commends the choice of natural materials, integrating the buffer into the site design, the patios, the bike rack, the pedestrian connection and the overall understated design. The applicant will need to get sign permits.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification of the trees being up lit. Ms. Scala stated that was permitted under the Dark Sky Ordinance if the lights are under 3000 lumen.

Mr. Fink asked if staff expected any kind of light spill over from the uplights. Ms. Scala stated the lighting would be way under what is normally seen on a commercial site plan.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification of what the applicant would be doing to make the back of the property inviting. Mr. Archer stated he and some friends would be out there picking up the trash to make the area look nice.

Mr. Lucy stated one of the problems with that strip of Emmett Street was the continuous entrances and exits, more than half of which are not needed.

Mr. Barton reminded the Commissioners that the applicant had pulled the building up to the street line. He hoped as the next generation of buildings developed, they should follow the example of moving parking to the rear. Mr. Barton stated this was a very important change that this project projects for the development of the rest of the corridor.

Ms. Firehock stated she liked the fact the roof water would be used to water the vegetation.

Mr. Farruggio agreed with Mr. Lucy that Emmett Street is problematic and it is a rather large problem.

He also liked and appreciated the way this building had been moved to the front of the property. He stated this was an incredibly well thought out and well designed design.

Mr. Farruggio made a motion that they approve the Entrance Corridor Certificate of Appropriateness subject to administrative approval of the lighting and future designs. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis stated this application meets almost all of the Design Principles: design for a quarter vision; preserve history; facilitate pedestrian access; maintain human scale in building spaces; preserve and enhance natural character; create a sense of place; create an inviting public realm; create restrained communication; mask the utilitarian; and respect and enhance Charlottesville's character. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

3. 2101 JPA Apartments -- 2101 JPA -- site plan for 4-unit student apartment building

Ms. Cooper gave the staff report. The proposed apartment building is at the corner of Jefferson Park Avenue and Observatory Avenue with 11 parking spaces behind it. No public comment had been received about the proposal. The property is currently vacant. The site plan proposes saving an ash, some sweet gum trees and a dogwood tree. The required parking is eight spaces; the applicant is providing 11. The trash area in the rear of the property will be screened with wooden fencing. Parking will be as far away from the Entrance Corridor side as possible. Large canopy trees are proposed as well as shrubs. This is a by right site plan and all requirements are being met.

Mr. Lucy asked what the site plan ordinance said about where building entrances needed to be. Ms. Cooper stated the site plan ordinance did not say anything about that; it is addressed in the Entrance Corridor Review.

Mr. Farruggio sought clarification of the parking lot lighting. Ms. Cooper stated that information was provided on sheet 6; one light would be on the rear of the building and another pole light would be located on the northern side of the parking area.

The applicant was not present.

Mr. O'Halloran moved that they approve this preliminary site plan. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

4. 2101 JPA Apartments -- 2101 JPA -- ERB design review for new apartment building

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. The materials are nice. The landscaping plan is exceptionally good.

The building will be painted brick. The roof will be red asphalt shingles. This is similar to a recently approved building catty-corner across JPA. The foundation is split block; the guidelines do not speak to creating a different texture for the foundation. Ms. Scala had suggested the architect use the same red brick for the foundation which was screening the parking lot.

Ms. Lewis sought additional information on the oversized brick. Mr. Barton thought they were economy or jumbo bricks that are 4 to 4 and-a-quarter by 8 or 9. They are typically the full thickness of regular bricks but there would be fewer of them in a vertical course. Mr. Farruggio expressed concern about the oversized brick as well as they were noticeably larger than standard brick. Mr. Farruggio asked if the applicant had provided a sample or had given any examples of its use in any other building in town. Ms. Scala stated her impression was that it was just slightly larger than regular brick.

Ms. Lewis asked if vinyl clad windows were recommended under the Guidelines. Ms. Scala stated they were permitted under certain circumstances. Ms. Lewis asked if Ms. Scala had been given a sample of the proposed windows; she had not. The proposed windows were simulated divided light.

Ms. Lewis stated she also had concerns about the concrete masonry foundation.

Mr. Barton stated this seemed to be a relatively small building and the Commissioners seemed to have questions about the foundation, the wall and the windows. He stated those were three of the major systems of the building. He stated he was not comfortable putting this through without having the ability to have those questions answered. He stated those could be answered quickly but he was not confident they should be pushing this forward without having more information about those materials and whether they could be adjusted if the Commission found them to be wanting.

Ms. Lewis agreed with Mr. Barton.

Mr. O'Halloran stated it was unfortunate the applicant was not present. Mr. O'Halloran thought they should defer.

Ms. Lewis stated neither this application nor the previous one had provided modeling from the Entrance Corridor which is something the Commission has requested in the past.

Mr. Fink moved that they defer Entrance Corridor Review for 2101 JPA Apartments. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. Mr. Lucy asked if they could call the applicant to come down rather than defer.

Mr. Barton and Mr. O'Halloran stated the meeting had been noticed and the applicant could have made the effort to come. Ms. Lewis stated the applicant was in the same office building she was and the phone number provided seemed to be an office number. Ms. Cooper stated she had sent an E-mail asking if the applicant would be present. Ms. Lewis moved that they call the question. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

H. SUBDIVISIONS

. "Brookwood", Phase I -- Brookwood Drive to Fifth Street, SW and Raymond Road -- 18 lots

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. Phase I encompasses the road system from the end of Brookwood Drive to Fifth Street and the connection between Raymond Road and Brookwood Drive. The application is in line with the previously approved preliminary site plan. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. O'Halloran sought clarification of what had been approved. Mr. Haluska stated the preliminary site plan had been approved in January; the final site plan was currently in review. The site plan has some minor things from the Entrance Corridor Review that needs to be shored up but other than that was ready to be signed. The applicant still needs to post their bonds for the erosion sediment control and public improvements. Approval of this would enable the applicant to gather building permits for the first 17 lots.

Ms. Lewis, seeing that this was an administrative function, made a motion to approve this subdivision. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

I. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS

1. Grove Street PUD -- 1000-1002 Grove Street at Tenth and King -- seven (7) units at 24 DUA

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The proposal is to rezone Tax Map 23, Parcels 51 and 52 from R-1S to PUD. The applicant proposes seven units, three of which would be detached houses. Nine off street parking spaces would be provided. The applicant shows 45 percent open space, 16 percent of which would be a common garden usable to all units.

Mr. Farruggio asked if the community had said anything about the proposed density since the units were in the middle of all single-family housing. Mr. Haluska stated it had not yet been advertised for public hearing. Mr. Tolbert informed Mr. Farruggio that this preliminary discussion was a chance for the Commission to talk about any concerns they may have so the applicant could decide if he wanted to address those concerns and alter the application.

Ms. Firehock recognized the applicant.

Mr. V.G. Sullivan, of Cary Lane, and Mr. Mark Saunders, of Fourth Street Northeast, were present. Mr. Saunders stated this was their first project like this as an LLC. He stated they had gone to the Charlottesville Community Design Center to seek ideas on proceeding. Mr. Saunders stated the idea was to do several things in the service of improving density. He stated they saw a need for houses in the \$200,000 to \$400,000 range. He stated they were sold on the idea of having a common space; however, each unit would also have some private area.

Ms. Lewis asked if all the units were for sale or if any would retained for rent. Mr. Saunders stated they planned to sell all the units.

Ms. Lewis and Ms. Firehock suggested the applicants speak with Piedmont Housing Alliance to determine what price range was affordable. Ms. Lewis reminded the applicants that in the rezoning application, the Commission would accept proffers, one of which could be making one of the units

affordable housing.

Mr. Farruggio thought the design was beautiful; however, he was concerned that it seemed so much more dense than the rest of the neighborhood around it. Mr. Farruggio asked if the applicants had considered breaking the parcel into five instead of seven units.

Ms. Lewis stated the elevation drawing seemed self centered and did not relate to the neighborhood.

Ms. Firehock stated she had the same concerns. She stated she could not tell what the living space was designed to do. The applicant stated there were three different floor plans for the three single-family detached units.

Mr. Barton suggested the designer look at the parking set in front of the common garden. Moving that parking could improve the visual access of the common garden. Mr. Barton also asked that the designer address the nature of the buffer between the corner house and the development. He stated he looked forward to what would be proposed for the buffer.

Mr. Fink stated he was having difficulty in understanding how the development related to the corner property.

Ms. Lewis encourage the applicant to not clash with the neighborhood.

Ms. Firehock wanted to see more ways to infiltrate water into the site. She also suggested the applicants talk to the neighbors early and often as Ms. Lewis had alluded to.

2. Franklin Street PUD -- Franklin Street north of CSX bridge -- six (6) units at 7 DUA

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The proposal is to rezone Tax Map 56, Parcel 414.2 from R-1S to PUD. The applicant proposes six units comprised of two three-unit clusters. There is 69 percent proposed open space; 20 percent of that would be undisturbed in the process. The applicant shows 12 parking spaces for the units; six are required by right.

Mr. Fink wanted to know the by right density on the property. Mr. Haluska stated the by right was four lots each with a single-family residence.

Ms. Firehock recognized the applicant.

Mr. Kent Dougherty, of 123 Goodman Street, stated this was a great infill site and was a perfect 6 transition edge lot between the single-family matrix of East Market Street and Woolen Mills and the heavier industrial uses along the tracks at Franklin and Carlton. He felt this was an appropriate site for high density. Mr. Dougherty stated they had originally proposed a much higher density; after meeting with the neighborhood, the proposal was scaled back.

Mr. Fink asked if the units would be for sale. Mr. Dougherty stated all the units would be for sale.

Mr. Farruggio sought the dimensions of the buildings. The applicant stated they would be 20 by 40.

Mr. Farruggio asked if there was room for one more unit to would allow for an affordable unit. Mr.

Dougherty stated they did not want to cram too much in.

Mr. Farruggio stated townhouses seemed more appropriate in this PUD due to the curve in the road, the separation from the other detached houses by the lay of the land, the storage across the street, and the benefit of one entrance rather than having four driveways on that road.

Ms. Lewis explained that if a seventh unit was done as an affordable unit, the applicant would have a 15 percent affordability which is a requirement in the County.

Mr. Farruggio commended the applicant for putting the parking in the back.

Mr. Fink wanted information on how the applicant proposed to visually buffer the parking from the backyard of an adjacent homeowner. Mr. Dougherty stated they were proposing sustainable and native hedge or hedge of native species.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification that the units would have front porches fronting on Franklin Street. Mr. Dougherty confirmed they would.

Mr. Barton stated there did seem to be a potential for a seventh unit which could be affordable.

Ms. Lewis stated she liked the variations in setbacks along Franklin Street. She stated it was an attractive and thoughtful design.

Mr. Fink moved to adjourn until May 9th. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, Secretary

Approved:

Ms. Karen Firehock, Chair