

Minutes
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET
July 10, 2018 – 5:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
NDS Conference Room

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

Beginning: 4:30 p.m.

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference

Members Present: Chairman Lisa Green, Commissioners Jody Lahendro, Genevieve Keller, Taneaia Dowell, Lyle Solla-Yates, Hunter Smith, and Hosea Mitchell

Absent: Brian Hogg

Chair Green called the meeting to order at 4:50pm and provided an overview of the agenda. Commissioner Mitchell asked for clarification of the ownership and use of the alley associated with 1206 Carlton. Matt Alfele noted that the alley is currently used by adjacent properties. This applicant has proposed use of the alley allowing for residents on that site to access it one way. This would not limit use by other adjacent properties. Lisa Robertson provided information on how alley ownership works legally and noted the changes to the process that Council is considering. Chair Green asked for clarification that the only change since March was the addition of a proffer statement. It was noted that was the only change. She also asked if the Traffic Engineer had taken into account the traffic impact of all the proposed developments in this area in the analysis of the traffic impact. The process for analysis was outlined and it was noted that future developments are not included in this review.

Commissioners Solla-Yates asked if it was possible to have two separate Certificate of Appropriateness votes for Seminole Square. Jeff Werner confirmed that the report was sent up with separate motions to allow for this. Chair Green asked how the application fits into the recently adopted small area plan and Mr. Werner read the portion of the report addressing this.

Commissioner Dowell pointed out a difference in dates on the report. It was confirmed that the advertisement was correct so items could move forward.

Chair Green reviewed how hearings will be addressed this evening.

II. Commission Regular Meeting

Beginning: 5:30 p.m.

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers

Members Present: Chairman Lisa Green, Commissioners Jody Lahendro, Genevieve Keller, Taneaia Dowell, Lyle Solla-Yates, Hunter Smith, and Hosea Mitchell

Absent: Brian Hogg

III. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Commissioner Lahendro: reported he attended the Tree Commission meeting on July 9th. The Commission reviewed the city arborist's (Mike Ronayne) work plan for FY2019. The focus was on invasive plant removals, managing the EAB treatment program, identifying and treating hazardous trees at city schools, and implementing the mall tree study. Updates were made to the list of suggested tree species for city entrance corridors. This list was initially created three years ago as recommended by local landscape architects to create city street entrances that use native plantings instead of inappropriate exotic species. The Tree Commission discussed options for getting this information to developers doing projects that require entrance corridor review. Neighborhood Development Services will include this list on its development website.

Commissioner Keller: no report

Commissioner Dowell: no report

Commissioner Solla-Yates: reported he attended the Housing Advisory Committee meeting on June 20, 2018. He said we mainly reviewed the by right Friendship Court redevelopment presentation which is not coming to the Planning Commission. We talked briefly about the Housing Needs Assessment and Bonus Height Analysis, and scheduled another meeting for July 2nd to talk about the assessment. He said Piedmont Housing Alliance found that by right was the best method to produce affordable housing, and that affordable childcare provision onsite was an essential component of the plan. He also attended the Housing Advisory Committee on July 2, 2018 which was a special meeting. He said there was a lot of interesting information from the Allocations Subcommittee. The top ranked option 808 Cherry Avenue did not receive funding since zoning would not allow affordable scale development where they proposed to build. There were \$4 million dollars in requests for the \$2 million dollars in funding available. The Thomas Jefferson Community Land Trust did not receive funding because it was not as cost efficient as others. He said most of the money went to Carlton Views for the Low Income Housing Tax Credit match. Habitat received full funding for several projects and AHIP received emergency repair money but no efficiency retrofit money because the thinking was that there are other sources for that. He stated that the new ranking system will be adjusted based on what was learned here and best practices elsewhere. It was discussed to address some area housing needs including narrower streets, parking reform, more UVA housing, and better coordination between the Housing Advisory Committee, the Planning Commission, the Comprehensive Plan update and the Housing Strategy. There will be an additional smaller meeting of the policy subcommittee to synthesize everything Friday the 13th at 1 PM.

Commissioner Smith: no report

Commissioner Mitchell: stated he has been assigned the liaison for Parks and Recreation and for the UVA Master Planning Council.

- B. CHAIR'S REPORT, Lisa Green: reported that assignments have been made for Mr. Smith and Mr. Mitchell. Commissioner Lahendro will be our Board of Architectural Review representative. She also stated that there is a Place Task Force meeting on Thursday and a Bike/Ped Advisory Meeting on Thursday.
- C. DEPARTMENT OF NDS Missy Creasy: reported that a work session is scheduled for July 17th, and she has sent out information from the June work session and reminders to the commission for the things they assigned themselves to accomplish. She said on August 23rd there will be a joint work session with City Council for additional direction on the Comp Plan. Additional meetings are scheduled for July 31st, August 7th, August 21st, August 28th and those are already on the calendar. We have locations so if community members would like to attend we will have space so no one will be crowded. Communication has been sent out regarding the time for the needs assessment presentation between the Planning Commission and the Housing Advisory Committee. The coordinator will see if those dates are available for the consultant to come and I will keep you informed on that. We have met with our internal chapter champions on some of the Comprehensive Plan chapters that aren't as concerning in the community. We are getting them materials to provide an updated draft to the commission at one of the late August meetings based on comments we received from the community since June 2017. On July 17th we will begin the process of addressing the next steps and how we will be addressing land use type issues.

Chair Green: addressed the joint meeting with the Housing Advisory Committee and the commission is going to reach out to Piedmont Housing Alliance as well. She asked if Ms. Creasy had received any public comment from any other organizations.

Ms. Creasy said we received one comment from one organization. She said we are waiting on recommendations from you all and who you would like to add to the list. Staff has set up data to collect the information needed to help contact but is awaiting the feedback from you all and the community members who noted they would provide that.

Chair Green: asked when would you like this information from us?

Ms. Creasy said as soon as you have it.

Chair Green: said first thing at the next meeting on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 would be good.

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

No one spoke during Matters by the Public

E. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

Commissioner Keller moved to accept the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Lahendro motion passes 7-0.

Recess for 5 minutes 5:56 pm - reconvened for Public Hearing at 6:07 pm

The City Council was absent.

III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION/ COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 p.m.

Continuing: until all public hearings are completed

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

1. ZM-17-00004 - 1206 Carlton Avenue – Justin Shimp (Shimp Engineering) on behalf of Chris Hulett (owners of 1206 Carlton Ave) has submitted a rezoning petition for 1206 Carlton Avenue (Subject Property). The rezoning petition proposes a change in zoning from the existing R-2 Two family Residential to R-3 Multi-family with proffered development conditions. The proffer redevelopment conditions include: (i) affordable housing: one unit will be designated affordable and will rent at a rate set by HUD home rents, making the unit affordable to those with income of up to 80% AMI for a period of not more than 10 years, (ii) building height: no building on the site shall exceed 35' in height from grade. The Subject Property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map 57 Parcels 127. The Subject Property is approximately 0.26 acres. The Land Use Plan calls for Low Density Residential.

Report by Matt Alfele, City Planner

Commissioner Solla-Yates: asked if the neighborhood commented on this.

Ms. Alfele: said the applicant did hold their community engagement meeting and they did provided comment. He said traffic and parking have been a major concern and he said he had heard from multiple residents and had received phone calls and emails.

Chair Green: asked if this got re-advertised and if all of the mailings went back out since this was a new posting?

Ms. Alfele: said yes and he said he had the affidavit and the mailing list.

Chair Green: said she had heard from many people that they did not receive the mailings. She said in full disclosure that she lives near the site (less than a block away) and she had had several conversations with neighbors who received a letter the first time but not the second time

Commissioner Solla-Yates: stated he was reading a Charlottesville Tomorrow article that said Deb Jackson supported the development and asked if that was accurate.

Ms. Alfele: said it was not necessary support. The Belmont Carton Neighborhood association had put a letter together and did not have specific concerns but did want to make it clear that the city should put more focus on infrastructure in the Belmont Area

Chair Green: said she had a question regarding traffic calculations. She asked if staff was only looking at this property individually when they calculated traffic.

Mr. Alfele: answered yes and said when the traffic engineer looks at a rezoning or an SUP they are looking at that particular site. He said this has been something that the Planning Commission has been looking at in the update to the comp plan – to look at parking in a more holistic way but right now the system the city had in place was to only look at the specific.

Chair Green: clarified that this project could be on the moon and we would be only looking at this property and the cars on this site and not the other possible projects that could come next to it? There is not a holistic look at traffic and parking?

Mr. Alfele: answered yes that is true and he said he hopes it is something the Planning Commission can look into with the update to the Comprehensive Plan

Commissioner Lahendro: asked what was the assessment by the traffic engineer?

Mr. Alfele: answered the traffic engineer felt that the project would have no impact on the neighborhood.

Commissioner Lahendro: asked if this was the same type of assessment that the Planning Commission had done in the past?

Mr. Alfele: answered yes. An application that is reviewed by the traffic engineer is looking at that specific site. They are not looking beyond the site to a certain boundary. But again he said this is something the comprehensive plan and small areas plans could look into.

Ms. Robertson: said just so people were not confused, it was not entirely in a vacuum because they know what the existing LOS on the adjacent roadways is. The traffic engineer is looking at whether the increased traffic from this development on top of the current traffic conditions would impact the area in a way that would require new infrastructure.

Chair Green: said that all of the other corners could be built at a very high density and just because this is the first one built, the planning commission is not looking at what is already approved

Ms. Robertson: answered yes, that that is not how the city is set up that they could move to looking at things that are existing as well as things that are proposed in the future.

Ms. Creasy: added that the city also has a lot of things in process, and we do not know how those projects may progress – they may not come to fruition.

Ms. Robertson: said some localities do look at it that way.

Chair Green: clarified that it would take Planning Commission and City Council action to tell NDS staff to not look at this not in a vacuum so that they could plan the city's traffic systems better

Lisa Robertson: said that legally we are always looking at what we can hold one person responsible for. She said what we are talking about is a way that could be good traffic engineering and good planning and could take into account other known numbers. But it is something that you do have to incorporate into your site plan ordinance. You have to put people on notice that when they submit a site plan you want a traffic plan that accounts for those numbers and presents that as part of a traffic analysis.

Commissioner Keller: said the adjacent R3 property was owned by someone from Northern VA. She asked if there was a potential to combine these two parcels if the zoning change was made.

Mr. Alfele: said because there is an SUP on the lot, even if the lot line went away, the SUP would not move and would stay over where that previous lot was.

Chair Green: reminded the new members that the Planning Commission has standards of review for rezoning and number 1 was whether it conformed to the guidelines of the City's current comprehensive plan. She asked if it was the staff's opinion that this conformed to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Alfele: answered no.

Chair Green: said the second standard for SUP asks whether the proposed development is harmonious with the current conditions and whether it will have a potentially adverse effect on the neighborhood. She asked if staff was saying that this meets those guidelines for the standard for review.

Mr. Alfele: said for that you cannot give a simple yes or no and that with certain conditions it could be more in line. He said as far as the rezoning amendment it is clear that it does not conform to the comp plan. With the SUP it would be more fluid depending on how the Planning Commission looked at it.

Commissioner Dowell: said she had a hard time supporting the project because the presentation was citing pieces of the staff report that refer to renting and homeownership and the proposal only offered rental units.

Mr. Shimp: said this was a broad statement and the more important part was the "price points that support work force housing" and that we need a variety of housing. He said what the city was short of was rentals and workforce housing and that is where this project would fit in.

Chair Green: asked if they were considering this workforce housing.

Mr. Shimp: said people use different definitions of workforce: usually people refer to 80-120% of AMI.

Chair Green: asked if he knew who would fall into work force.

Mr. Shimp: said it would be a lot of county and city employees

Chair Green: stated that workforce was teachers and police officers who make \$36,000 a year and would not be able to afford the rents of the proposed development

Mr. Shimp: said he did not think that his rents would be that expensive and that he wanted to make the development simple and as affordable as possible.

Commissioner Mitchell: said this was a difficult lot and that there would be some infrastructure issues that they would need to address specifically concerning storm water. He asked what they would do to mitigate the storm water problem?

Mr. Shimp: said there was a storm sewer at the front of the site that they could tie into so there would not be sheet flow coming off the site into other areas. The site plan was preliminary but it was very possible to collect all of that runoff and treat it.

Commissioner Lahendro: said the onsite detention was depicted in the site plan and showed the inlets leading up to it.

Commissioner Keller: asked how many of them were two bedrooms?

Mr. Shimp: all of them.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: asked about parking: why seven spots when six are required?

Mr. Shimp: said that came from a discussion with the neighborhood. Folks were concerned about the parking and they provided one extra nod to that. He said he believed that there was sufficient on street parking on Leonard and Bainbridge so that if a resident had guests they could easily walk to the site because of the traffic driven by the restaurants. He said that we were “parking challenged” especially if people had guests over.

Mr. Shimp: said this is part of a broader philosophical discussion that the city intentionally made the parking requirement lower so that we would not be so car-centric. He thought this was the right direction to go in and even though it may come up as a challenge it was challenge worth fighting.

Chair Green: asked if they actually looked at the neighborhood that would be most affected which is the north part over Carlton. She said when those houses were developed there was not a requirement for off-street parking so their only parking is on street. She asked if they counted that when they planned to use that area to account for their site’s overflow parking.

Mr. Shimp: said he thought that the primary place people would park would be Leonard and Bainbridge where at least Leonard has driveways. He said they are talking about only 4 or 5 cars spread out over a couple of blocks but they did not do a space by space analysis. He said they did drive though the area multiple times and saw that there was ample on-street parking. They used this evidence to show that a few extra cars could be accommodated on the streets.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: had a point of clarification that the bus stop was not in front of the site but was on the corner of Carlton and Carlton.

Commissioner Keller: noted that the developer has addressed some of the issues they would encounter but asked how they would address the alley situation on the site.

Mr. Shimp: said they know that they have access to the alley and they know that they can make improvements to it.

Commissioner Keller: asked if it would be their intention to pave the alley

Mr. Shimp: said it is already paved right up to the property line but that they would pave their portion and possibly the entire thing. They felt that they could work with the neighbors on that issue.

Commissioner Keller: asked if they had spoken with any of those neighbors yet.

Mr. Shimp: said they had not.

Commissioner Mitchell: said he had walked the alley recently and certainly would not drive an automobile down there because it is grassy and pitted. He said that it would need to be paved all the way through.

Mr. Shimp: said that when the city reviews the site plan they would meet the paving standards that the city required.

Chair Green: asked if Mr. Shimp had spoken with any of the neighbors that live on Bainbridge or Leonard yet where they are proposing to put their parking.

Mr. Shimp: said they had only met with the neighborhood association but had spoken to those residents through that method.

Open the Public Hearing

Charlie Near: said he lived at 310 Chestnut St. He heard it said that there was no opposition in the neighborhood but he knew for a fact that there were at least 6 letters of opposition. Their main reason for opposition was that there was not enough parking. There are six units proposed but only six spaces plus one handicap. He asked if people had roommates or were a couple how many of them would only have one car. Because of this he said there could be a potential for 6 spill over cars and these people would most likely park as closely as they could to the site. Plus if there are any other visitors or a party all of these people would have nowhere to park. He said he is someone who has no off-street parking. He said if there are cars spilling up the road then it is going to blow up the neighborhood in terms of parking. He offered the names of the people who are opposed. Fred Schmitt and his wife Vivian, Amond and Rebecca Cunningham, Matt and Sarah Shields, Paul Sense, Dennis and Teresa Haines. He said this shows that everyone on his street is opposed. He asked for additional time from his friend Frederick Schmitt. He continued that this is a bad idea for the neighborhood because the only logical place for spillover parking is Chestnut Street and people would not park on Bainbridge because it is too far away. Also he said this is too much density for a quarter acre lot. He asked the Planning Commission to reaffirm their previous denial of the application to rezone the property. He said R-2 is plenty sufficient and it would not have a blow up effect on the rest of the neighborhood.

Frederick Schmitt: said that as you go down Carlton Avenue the road narrows, and right now it allows parking on both sides and there are trucks that park there. Effectively it is a two way road and if someone is parked on one side then it is a one way road. He has had to do this in Scotland but should not have to do this here. It is a question of growing congestion in Belmont and that Chestnut is the natural place for anyone to park if they are coming to visit.

Close the Public Hearing

Commissioner Keller: asked if auxiliary dwelling units are allowed in R-2?

Ms. Creasy: answered no.

Commissioner Dowell: said she knows that we definitely need more units, but she did not know if these were it, and that it doesn't seem that affordable. She said that they are offering at least one affordable unit but her problem is that it is currently zoned R-2 and all of the future land use maps that they have worked on do not show this area changing. If they are to base their decision on current and future land use then this is not harmonious with where they see the city going.

Commissioner Lahendro: said he would disagree with Ms. Dowell. He said that this site being zoned R-2 is an anomaly because it is squeezed between commercial on one side and multifamily on the other. He said if they are being consistent it should be a multifamily lot. He said we need more units and this site is complying with the city parking requirements. He also trusts the city engineer's statement that this would not add significantly to the traffic in the surrounding area.

Commissioner Mitchell: said while it may not add significantly to the traffic, on weekends the parking there would be impacted in a big way. He said the developers walked it on Monday but all of those restaurants were quiet on that day. On a Friday or Saturday those businesses would be much busier and if those residents had family over it would add to the parking problem. He said he also has heartburn about the ingress egress and the alley because the Planning Commission has not had a chance to talk to those who have access to that alley.

Commissioner Keller: said she would come in somewhere between Commissioner's Dowell and Lahendro in that it is not an anomaly because she is not just looking at the one street it will front. She said if you look at the area there are a number of land uses and anyone of them could be appropriate and that the Planning Commission is in the midst of undertaking some comprehensive rezoning in the city. She would like to see this be part of something more comprehensive. She does not see this moving the needle. When she looks at the greater neighborhood and she sees the R-2s and the R-1s she sees these as still affordable. She said when she does a rezoning she looks at whether the existing zoning is reasonable and here she believes that it is reasonable. She is looking for other compelling reasons to change and did not see those yet. She said she thinks this is an important area that deserves some scrutiny and a holistic look in the future about how to address recreational and entertainment uses in that area. She liked the presentation about the history of the zoning but would say that the 10 units allowed in 1958 was probably in response to the VA industries and the need for housing related to it. She said she sees that you could make an argument to go to R-3 and she could just as easily see it staying at R-2 and still meeting the needs of the city. When we look at the zoning map obviously we need to look at this holistically.

Commissioner Solla Yates: said he appreciated the history of the zoning and the maps were helpful in seeing the strange story of this space. He does not see this as a good zoning practice. In the greater scene he does not see this as making or breaking the city but it is a good time to evaluate the city's priorities. He noticed that they provided one more parking space than required which was responsive to neighborhood concerns. He sees this as a reasonable change and does not see the current zoning as reasonable given the housing crisis.

Commissioner Smith: said from the historical variety of uses this could go either way. In a holistic approach it strikes him that there is a need for housing and the city has a vacant lot. He is familiar with the parking issues but generally sees this as a reasonable rezoning.

Chair Green: said she wanted to refer back to the Comprehensive Plan and how in 2013 they did not rezone so zoning may not be right but that they did adopt the 2013 Comprehensive Plan. She said that if people did not live there then they did not know what she was talking about. She said the NCC corridor has had a huge negative effect on Belmont. While this area is zoned the way it is they should really be looking at the comprehensive plan. She

said if they looked at this comprehensively the developers were not taking into account the fact that not everyone has off street parking. She thinks to put that parking overload on those residents is not good planning. She said we are not yet to a less car-centric world. She said that it is short sighted to think that they can put the overflow parking on people who have no off street parking. She also said that there was a huge runoff problem from that site already.

Commissioner Lahendro: said it seemed to him incredibly unfair that a problem created by the city that should be resolved by the city is resulting in one property owner being penalized. The problem being parking and the overlay issues that are broader than just this site.

Commissioner Mitchell: said he thinks it is unfair but to do otherwise might be unfair to the residents who will be effected.

Commissioner Lahendro: said those residents should be pushing the city to do something about it and not penalize a particular owner.

Commissioner Keller: said she did not see this as penalizing a particular owner when they have a property that is zoned and they have a use for it. She said saying “penalized” may be too strong.

Commissioner Lahendro: said and yet we need housing and to limit the number of housing units does not help the city.

Chair Green: asked if we were short on two bedroom housing

Commissioner Lahendro: said we are short on all types of housing.

Commissioner Dowell: said we are short on affordable housing and providing only one unit would not fix this. To say that the owner is being penalized is a strong personal preference because he can build by right.

Commissioner Smith: said we should note that these are rental units as opposed to home ownership. So while they may not be more affordable they may be more accessible to people with lower incomes.

Commissioner Keller: said if this was coming from Habitat, for one or two houses the Planning Commission would say this was affordable and be done. She said this parcel would be utilized no matter how it is zoned.

Chair Green: said she wanted to go back to the Comp Plan. She said if they had rectified their zoning in 2013 to match the comp plan they would not have to have this conversation. So when they start rectifying the zoning with the new comp plan will we have this same argument? She said that eventually the Planning Commission would need to come up with a plan and follow that plan.

Commissioner Dowell: said that the City has a plan already in place and even on the land use map they are working on, this area is zoned as low density residential. She said the proposal does not fit into either the current land use map or the future map.

Commissioner Keller: said if we just think we need more housing (and we do) then will the Planning Commission just approve every project that is adjacent to higher density?

Commissioner Mitchell: said it had to do with what infrastructure is already there to support the development and he does not think the infrastructure is there to support this project.

Commissioner Keller: said this line of thinking should be open to community input

Chair Green: said if the Planning Commission was having this conversation about Locust they would not have a conversation about “penalizing” the property owner for trying to build more housing.

Commissioner Keller: said she would like to see the Planning Commission look at this holistically.

Commissioner Mitchell moved to recommend denial of this application to rezone the subject property from R-2 to R-3, on the basis that the proposal would not service the interests of the general public and good zoning practice, seconded by Commissioner Dowell motion passes 4-3.

2. SP17-00008 - 1206 Carlton Avenue – Justin Shimp (Shimp Engineering) on behalf of Chris Hulett (owners of 1206 Carlton Ave) has submitted an application seeking approval of a Special Use permit (SUP) for 1206 Carlton Avenue (Subject Property). The SUP application proposes increasing the density from a By-Right 21 Dwelling Units per Acres (DUA) to 24 DUA (per City Code Section 34-420) and adjusting the southeastern side setback from 10’ to 8’ (per City Code Section 34-162(a)).

Reported by Matt Alfele, City Planner

Commissioner Mitchell moved to recommend denial of this application for a Special Use Permit in the R-2 zone at 1206 Carlton Avenue Seconded by Commissioner Solla-Yates motion passes 5-2

IV. COMMISSION’S ACTION ITEMS

Chair Green gaveled out of the Planning Commission into the Entrance Corridor Review Board

1. Entrance Corridor Review Board – Jeff Werner

a. Seminole Square Shopping Center Separate Site Plans have been submitted for the two projects (1) Seminole Square Redevelopment and (2) Seminole Square Expansion. Staff recommends that separate actions be taken on the COA request for each project. The proposed transition of the shopping center is:

- The Redevelopment component is generally consistent with the guidelines and a welcome transition from the existing. If the design, materials, finishes and site improvements are satisfactory to the ERB, staff is supportive approving the COA for the proposed Seminole Square Redevelopment.
- The Expansion component of the project requires further clarification and discussion. Specifically, the treatment of the rear elevations of the North Wing buildings has not been addressed satisfactorily. The visual impact of these walls was a key concern during preliminary discussion about the re-grading of the site and the construction of the greenway trail.

Seminole Square Redevelopment

Jeff Werner, Historic and Preservation Planner, who reviewed the Seminole Square application, said staff members had reservations about what walkers and bikers would see from the proposed trail. The aesthetic improvements to the rear façades of the North Wing are minimal and, we believe, insufficient. While these elevations are not the primary façades and are not intended to serve as entries into the commercial spaces, they will be visible.

David Mitchell, Principal at Great Eastern Management Company, which manages Seminole Square, said we really needed to see the road operate before we understood exactly what we were dealing with. We have to reorient the structures and the whole layout to accommodate that. The construction of Hillsdale Drive cut

Seminole Square's North Wing, which was located north of Seminole Court, into two buildings. The Ebony Images hair salon relocated from the part of the building that was demolished to another shop in the North Wing.

Mark Kestner: of Henningsen Kestner Architects said the plan breaks up the flat façades of Seminole Square's North and East wings with canopies, trellises and new storefronts made from brick, stone and other materials. The design also removes 92 parking spaces and breaks up the remaining spaces with landscaping. He said we're reaching out with our trellises, sort of as open arms that say: Walk over here. This is a safe area. He said a second impetus for development is the center's lack of an anchor store. Since Giant Food left Seminole Square in 2012, fewer shoppers have made weekly trips.

Mr. Mitchell said right now, there are no plans to do anything with that property, and we can't do anything with it and are hoping if we can fix and upgrade the rest of the center, it will possibly spark something to happen on the other end.

Commissioner Keller: said the first time I ever went there, I thought, we're doomed. This is so Northern Virginia, I don't even know how to drive through this space.

Commissioner Mitchell: said the redevelopment component he is comfortable with but –the aesthetics in the rear part of the north wing are insufficient as Mr. Werner suggested.

Commissioner Smith: agrees with Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: suggested that the applicant might consider a deferral, to go back and work with us to make it look more interesting.

Commissioner Keller said she was disappointed that the design did not incorporate more elements from Albemarle and Charlottesville's joint Hydraulic small-area plan. She said she hopes that this kind of major reinvestment in this shopping center is not going to delay and preclude the kind of redevelopment that's shown in the Hydraulic small-area plan. But I don't see any way that we could not approve this. She would like a condition about new construction being reviewed and some language about vocabulary of materials. She is concerned as a public official that we don't know enough about these other parcels and it could show that we are giving a blanket approval.

Commissioner Mitchell suggested that the developers add metal frames for vegetation behind the buildings.

Commissioner Solla-Yates Having considered the standards set forth within the City Code, including the City Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed new construction, existing building rehabilitation, landscaping, site improvements associated with the Seminole Square Redevelopment satisfy the ERB's criteria and are compatible with the goals for sub-area A of the Route 29 North Entrance Corridor, and that the ERB approves the COA application with the following conditions:

- All glass must be clear, with minimum 70% visible light transmittance (VLT).
- While signage requires separate permits and approvals, all illuminated signage shall appear to be lit white at night.
- Rooftop mechanical equipment will be screened within appurtenance.
- In the event that there are any changes to the proposed site plan on pages 4 and 6 of the new proposed buildings, those changes will have to come back to the ERB instead of being administratively approved.
- The site plan revised May 22, 2018

- The redevelopment plan also adds two new buildings next to Hillsdale Drive, one 6,000 square feet and the other 12,000 square feet. The architects designed one new building as a potential restaurant and another as a potential retail shop.
- The stills from the video as captured by staff

Seconded Commissioner Lahendro, motion passes 7-0.

Seminole Square Expansion – Great Eastern Management, Mr. Mitchell asked to defer this part of the application.

Commissioners accepted the deferral with conditions that the architect work with Jeff Werner to look at the green-scape on the rear wall on the north end, ideally not the popular climbing, spreading ground cover ivy.

Chair Green gaveled out of the Entrance Corridor Review Board back into the Planning Commission

Adjourn: 9:20 pm – Commissioner Dowell motion to adjourn until the second Tuesday in August 2018