

**City of Charlottesville - City Planning Commission - Minutes: August 8, 2000**

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 2000 -- 7:30 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

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

Mr. Marshall Slayton, Chair

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Mr. Tim Supler, Vice Chair

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director

Ms. Nancy Damon

Ms. Susan Thomas, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Kathy Johnson Harris

Mr. Herman Key

Mr. Eldon Wood

Mr. Slayton called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

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

Ms. Sue Weber, of 601 Locust Avenue, introduced herself as the president of the Martha Jefferson Area Neighborhood Association. She voiced the neighborhood's concerns for the new office project being proposed for 10th and High Street. The neighborhood association does support the use of the building as offices and parking, but is concerned about the scale of the building, how it fits in with the neighborhood, traffic issues on East High Street, and the lighting that will be used. She indicated that she would like to request that the Planning Commission be open to public comment when this item is placed on the agenda.

**B. MINUTES**

Mr. Slayton stated that the minutes for June 13, 2000 and July 11, 2000 were up for approval, and called for any changes or comments on the June 13th minutes. Ms. Damon indicated that the sentence on page two that read, "[Ms. Damon] stated that she had also met with the Director of the Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development," should instead read, "She stated that the Planning District Commission met with the Director of the Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development."

Mr. Slayton asked if there were any further changes to be made to the June 13th minutes. Seeing none, he called for a motion. Mr. Supler made a motion to

approve the minutes, with the changes as indicated. Mr. Wood seconded, and the motion carried, with Mr. Slayton and Ms. Johnson Harris abstaining.

Concerning the July 11, 2000 minutes, Mr. Wood indicated that the reference on page one to the Virginia Department of Architecture should probably read, "the University of Virginia School of Architecture," as the former is not an existing entity. Directing the commissioners' attention to the fourth line of page two, he also indicated that

DISC is an acronym, and therefore "Disk study" should read "DISC study."

Mr. Supler made a motion to approve the July 11th minutes, with the changes as indicated by Mr. Wood. Ms. Damon seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.

## JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. SP--00-7-11: An application for a special permit for higher density residential at 1718 Jefferson Park Avenue and Maywood Lane. This would allow for an additional two (2) efficiency dwelling units, accessible to the handicapped, revising the total units on site to twelve (12), a density of 25.8 units/acre instead of the 21 units/acre allowed by right in the R-3 Multiple Dwelling Zone. APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED INDEFINITE DEFERRAL OF THIS ITEM.

THEREFORE, IT WILL NOT BE CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING.

Mr. Slayton suggested that if anyone had come to speak to this item, they should check with the Planning Commission from time to time to check on the status of the application.

## D. SITE PLANS

### 1. 1815 Jefferson Park Avenue Apartments (30 Units)

1815 Jefferson Park Avenue

File No. 1269

Mr. Tolbert indicated that Ms. Susan Thomas would be presenting the Staff Report.

Ms. Thomas stated she wanted to make sure the Commissioners had a set of the most recent revisions to the proposal, as well as three recent letters: a cover letter from Richard Boyd with Daggett and Grigg; a letter directed to Ms. Damon concerning trees; and a letter from Mrs. Barnes. Referring to illustrations of the latest revisions, she described the proposed development, indicating that it was for 30 units, divided into 16 four-bedroom units and 14 three-bedroom units. She stated that as this is a by-right development, the issue is not whether the apartment complex can be built, but how it will function and what it will look like. Jefferson Park Avenue is a designated entrance corridor, which means the proposed building is reviewed along with the site plan. The site plan itself is up for full review, due to its prominent location and concerns expressed about impact on the neighborhood, but the building material and design will be approved administratively, unless the applicant appeals Staff's recommended conditions of approval, in which case the Board of Architectural Review is the appeal body. She indicated that the applicant has submitted a revised plan, but there are several issues about which more information is needed or which remain unresolved. Concerning the issue of preserving two old oak trees, which are significant trees on the site, the applicant has agreed to work with the City in preparing a conservation plan for pre-construction, during-construction and post-construction measures to be taken to protect the trees. However, the impact the conservation plan will have on the site plan is still unknown. She indicated that, concerning the lighting impact posed by the parking lot luminaries poles, Staff has recommended minimizing the light pole height, and Mr. Grigg has agreed to consult a lighting expert. She then stated that the biggest unresolved issue is that of access. Of particular concern is the nearness of the property's driveway to the driveway for 1819 Jefferson Park Avenue. Various options have been considered, including combining the driveways into a single entrance or separating them further. Both options have inherent difficulties, but the applicant prefers the possibility of sharing the existing property driveway with the adjacent property. She indicated that the applicant's revised site plan shows the median pared back, but that is likely to invite conflicts in the direction of traffic, and so is not recommended. Regarding concerns expressed by neighbors about the use and design of the building, she indicated Staff did not feel those items could be addressed under the site plan ordinance, but people present at the meeting might speak to those issues. She stated that Staff does recommend approval of the application, with a number of conditions which are less specific than she would like, due to the lack of information.

Mr. Wood asked Ms. Thomas to go over what she had said about the possibility of review of this project by the Board of Architectural Review. Ms. Thomas indicated that if the applicant disagreed with Staff's administrative conditions of approval for the building, the Board of Architectural Review would be the appeal body. General discussion followed, in which it was determined that there is no process similar to the one in which Staff

recommends that a site plan go before the Planning Commission; it is a matter of the applicant's right to appeal, whether it goes before the Board of Architectural Review or not.

Mr. Slayton asked if there were any other questions for Staff. Seeing none, he indicated that although this is not a public hearing, there are several people who would like to speak, and asked