

MINUTES

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 14 AUGUST, 2007 -- 6:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

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

Mr. Jon Fink (Chairman)

Mr. Bill Lucy (Vice-Chairman)

Mr. Michael Farruggio

Mr. Hosea Mitchell

Mr. Michael Osteen

Mr. Jason Pearson

Mr. David Neuman, Ex-officio, UVa Office of the Architect

Commissioners Not Present:

Ms. Cheri Lewis

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director NDS

Ms. Missy Creasy

Mr. Brian Haluska

Ms. Ebony Walden

Ms. Mary Joy Scala

City Council Members Present:

Mr. David Brown, Mayor

Mr. Kevin Lynch

Mr. Dave Norris

Mr. Julian Taliaferro

Also Present

S. Craig Brown, City Attorney

Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

II. REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Fink called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

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

Mr. Fink called for matters from the public not on the formal agenda.

Mr. Peter Engelmann, of 200 Douglas Avenue, Unit 3D, expressed concern about the Coal Tower Development. He stated it was a huge, very important project which would set a pattern for the area. Mr. Engelmann provided the Commission with a letter expressing his concerns.

Mr. Paul Grady, of Crozet, expressed concern about the West Main/Ridge/McIntire intersection. He suggested it would be a good place for a roundabout to make the intersection work better.

B. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Mr. Mitchell stated the Block Grant Task Force had met a few times to begin organizing to figure out the priorities for the Task Force and to begin figuring out the application review process.

Mr. Osteen stated the Streetcar Task Force has been on hiatus for the summer and had not met. He stated the Downtown Zoning Committee had resolved their work and their recommendation would be moving forward to City Council. The BAR had met with its typical issues but nothing of particular relevance to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lucy stated the PAC Technical Committee had met but he had nothing to report from that meeting.

Mr. Pearson stated the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission had met 12 July and had received a report on the Northwest Fluvanna/Southwest Louisa Multimodal Corridor Study.

Mr. Farruggio stated the Federation of Neighborhoods had not met. The 250 Interchange Committee would be meeting 16 August. The MPO Tech Committee met and discussed preparing for future traffic improvement programs for the 29 Corridor and the region. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee met and talked about the status of the infrastructure of the City Parks and Rec.

Mr. Neuman had also attended the PAC Technical Committee meeting where a renewed attempt at coordination among the City, County, and University had been discussed.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Mr. Fink stated City Council had approved the new Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Fink acknowledged all the Staff and his colleagues who had worked so diligently on the Comprehensive Plan over the past 18 months. Mr. Fink stated none of his committees had met in the past month. He stated Mr. Farruggio had stepped down from the Nominating Committee and been replaced by Mr. Fink. Mr. Fink stated there would be a joint meeting with the Albemarle County Planning Commission on 25 September. He stated the work session planned for 28 August had been cancelled.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS/STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Creasy stated many members of Staff had attended the Virginia American Planning Association meeting and received the Innovation Award for the Neighborhood Planning Process. The award was accepted by Ms. Creasy, Ms. Walden, Mr. Haluska, and Ms. Firehock.

Mr. Fink suggested the Commission hear some matters out of order while awaiting the Joint Public Hearing to begin at 7 p.m.

I. SUBDIVISION

1. Harris Road, 400 Block -- Preliminary -- six lots with road extension.

This includes a sidewalk waiver request.

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report on the sidewalk waiver. This is an application for approval of preliminary subdivision with a sidewalk waiver. The final will come before the Commission later. Mr. Haluska cited Section 29-62(c): "Concrete sidewalks at least four feet wide exclusive of curbing and constructed to city standards shall be provided on both sides of unless the Planning Commission waives sidewalk on one side. The commission shall base its decision on such waivers upon the criteria for establishing sidewalk construction priorities set forth in the comprehensive plan of the city. In all instances the dedicated right-of-way shall be sufficient to permit installation of sidewalk on both sides of the street." Staff finds that waiving the sidewalk as the applicant proposes would not affect the system of sidewalks throughout the community. No new lots would be served by the section of sidewalk the applicant proposes to waive.

Mr. Fink called for questions from Commissioners. There were none.

Mr. Lucy moved to approve the sidewalk waiver for the south side of the proposed extension of Naylor Street as shown on the preliminary subdivision plat for property located at 400 Harris Road. Mr. Pearson seconded the motion. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Haluska continued the staff report. A different proposal had been before the Commission with a steep slope waiver which had been denied. The applicant had reworked the proposal as a six unit subdivision with the extension of Naylor Street.

Mr. Fink wanted to know if there were any unresolved issues in the application. Mr. Haluska stated there were not.

There were no other questions from the Commission.

Mr. Pearson moved to approve the preliminary subdivision plat for Harris Road, 400 block. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Osteen stated the trees were significantly out of whack with the legend; he hoped that would be resolved with the final site plan. Mr. Haluska stated that was one of the notes the applicant was addressing.

III. CONSENT AGENDA * (Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

E. CONSENT AGENDA

1. List of site plans and subdivisions approved administratively

2. Minutes -- July 10, 2007 -- Pre meeting

3. Minutes -- July 10, 2007 -- Regular meeting

4. Minutes -- July 12, 2007 -- Work Session

Mr. Farruggio moved to adopt the consent agenda. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called a vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

G. SITE PLANS

3. Madison Place PUD, Phase II -- Corner of Madison Avenue and Meadow Street

Ms. Creasy gave the staff report. The Commission had seen this at the July meeting. There were a number of comments that needed further resolution prior to preliminary site plan approval. All of those items have been addressed. Many of the items pertain to the landscaping and the City Arborist has looked at the plan; he found that the plan could move forward. Staff recommends approval of the preliminary site plan. However, final site plan approval will require: compliance with all final site plan check list requirements; an E and S approved plan; the Storm Water Management BMP must be revised, reviewed and recorded, then receipt of the recordation submitted to the city before final approval; and signed and recorded Madison Place PUD Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions Amendment.

Mr. Fink called for questions of Ms. Creasy or the applicant. There were none.

In light of the fact that all of the issues from the last meeting have been adequately addressed, Mr. Pearson moved approval of the preliminary site plan for Madison Place PUD Phase II at the corner of Madison Avenue and Meadow Street. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called the vote by acclamation. The motion carried unanimously.

4. Carver at Preston

Ms. Creasy gave the staff report. This site plan corresponds to a steep slope waiver and an Entrance Corridor Review which came before the Commission in the previous two months. The site plan reflects the information which was requested as part of the Entrance Corridor review. The site plan for the preliminary phase meets all of the requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Fink wanted to know if the light fixtures were approved fixtures in keeping with the Dark Sky Ordinance. Ms. Creasy stated that was required.

Mr. Malachi Mills, of RK&K Engineering, was present on behalf of the applicant. He stated another photometric plan had been done earlier in the day. He stated there was some additional shielding that needed to be done on the lamppost in question.

Mr. Fink called for questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Osteen sought clarification of how grading would be done in the right of way of Albemarle Street. Ms. Creasy stated that street was closed and half was going to this property and the other half was going to an adjoining property. Mr. Mills stated they had permission from the other property owner to grade the property.

Mr. Farruggio moved to recommend approval of the Carver at Preston preliminary site plan with the realization that the final site plan must contain the following: all final site plan requirements including photometric; pedestrian utility easement vacation/dedication must be approved by City Council prior to the final approval; review and approval of the homeowner association documents by the City Attorney will be required prior to final approval; and approval block on the cover sheet of the site plan can be changed only to include a line for the Director of Neighborhood Development Services. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Pearson commended the applicant for the progress the project has made. Mr. Fink called for a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

IV. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS (Beginning at 7:00 p.m.)

F. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ZM—07-07-19: (Rialto Street PUD) A petition to rezone from R-1S Residential to Planned Unit Development (PUD), with proffers, the property along Rialto Street. The application is to increase the density to allow single family dwellings of different types. Proffers include donation of lots to the Charlottesville Police Department Foundation, construction of public sewer main, monetary contribution for a stream restoration project on Moore's Creek and limit that Phase II of the project will not be built until adequate public sewer capacity is available. These properties are further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 59 as parcels 375, 375.1 and 379 having 390 feet of frontage on Rialto Street and containing approximately 98,000 square feet of land or 2.25 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Single Family Residential of three to seven units per acre. Report prepared by Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner.

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. He read the first proffer for the record, stating the applicant had decided to modify it slightly: "Four lots improved for the construction of single family attached homes or the value thereof shall be used to provide housing within the City of Charlottesville for employees of the Charlottesville Police Department. This shall be accomplished by direct sales of the lots to Police Department employees for occupancy as their primary place of residence or by donating the sales price to a non-profit organization with the condition that said funds be used to provide homeownership opportunities within the city for members of the Charlottesville Police Department, or any combination of the two alternatives." Mr. Haluska stated there had been several changes to the site. The open space waiver has been withdrawn by the applicant. The application now meets the open space requirement. By right the applicant could build 12 units, not nine as previously reported. The second and third proffers remain unchanged. A fourth proffer affects the timing of the phasing of the development. Staff feels the Commission should consider the by-right build out of the property under the current zoning against the proposed build out in the concept plan. A by-right development of this property would involve the extension of Rialto according to city standards, with an acceptable turnaround at the end. The applicant would be required to meet the minimum requirements of the subdivision ordinance as well. Staff believes there are some benefits to developing the site as a PUD, such as the site going through the site plan process rather than subdivision process, and the additional potential benefit to Moore's Creek.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know how Phase I would be affected with a potential six year wait for Phase II. Mr. Haluska stated there was no site plan for Phase I yet.

Mr. Fink sought clarification of the fourth proffer which said in part approval by the City of any rezoning that increases the unit density served by the stadium sewer line. Mr. Fink saw this as an imposed condition and not a proffer. Mr. Haluska stated this was written by the applicant and whether that diminished the value of proffer four was a decision the Commission needed to make.

Mr. Lucy sought additional information behind the sewer line. Mr. Haluska stated there were three phases to construction of the stadium sewer line. The first phase was under construction. Phase II was under design. Phase III was still in the planning stages.

Mr. Brown, the Mayor, wanted to know when the four units for the Police Foundation would be in Phase I or II. Mr. Haluska stated the proffer did not mention the Police Foundation by name. Two units would be proffered in each phase.

Mr. Fink wanted to know what the Commission had the right to reject a proffer if they did not feel it was a proffer at all. Mr. Brown, Esquire, stated that could be part of the recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Fink opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sam Tower, of 1601 Green Street, wanted to know if the sewer line proffer would be done in Phase I as the development would cut off four of his properties from the sewer line.

Mr. Bill Fritz, of 1506 Rialto, spoke in favor of the proposal.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Fink closed the public hearing and called for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Farruggio stated he could not support the rezoning at this time. He thought the current zoning was appropriate. He stated he did not see the fourth proffer as a proffer and stated it was too vague and did not fix the problem.

Mr. Lucy thought the proffer was useful. He thought the rezoning was better than the by right.

Mr. Fink cited Virginia Code: The adequacy of public facilities can be one but not the sole consideration of reviewing a rezoning.

Mr. Mitchell did not think they could support proffer four.

Mr. Osteen stated that in general he liked the concept of a PUD on this site. He agreed that proffers one, two and three were good. He stated that proffer four needed to be worked on. He wanted to see Phase I and Phase II articulated more thoroughly with the proffers tied to them.

Mr. Fink stated he could not support this.

Mr. Pearson concurred with his colleagues. He further stated that either by-right or rezoning would put the sewer over capacity, and the marginal difference in load to the system would seem minimal, so he did not consider this an appropriate consideration for the rezoning discussion.

Mr. Farruggio stated the sewage was not the only issue.

Mr. Farruggio moved to recommend denial of the rezoning at this time.

Mr. Fink stated he did not think a Staff member would stand before them and say that areas of the City had inadequate sewer capacity.

Mr. Fink called for questions from the public.

Mr. Andy McGinty, of Little High Street, stated he had written the fourth proffer after E-mail correspondence with the City Engineer. He stated he wrote the proffer to protect his interests as well as to protect the City. Mr. McGinty asked to defer the matter.

Ms. Creasy suggested the Commission provide Mr. McGinty with some guidance on what he could do to enhance this application.

Mr. Fink suggested proffer four be worded as simply as possible, absent of any conditions imposed on the City.

Mr. Farruggio stated one of the issues he had with the site was the pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Fink sought clarification from the applicant as to what he wanted done. Mr. McGinty stated he would like to defer his application. Mr. Fink stated **the application was deferred by the applicant.**

2. ZM—07-08-20: (Ridge/McIntire & West Main) A petition to rezone from West Main North Corridor to Downtown Corridor, with proffers, the property at 301 and 315 West Main Street (the corner of McIntire Road and West Main Street). The application is to allow for increased height and density not allowed in the West Main North Corridor. Proffers include limiting access points to 4th Street and McIntire Road, streetscape improvements on adjacent right of way, affordable housing and utility capacity. These properties are further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 32 as parcels 197, 198 and 199 having approximately 228 feet of frontage on West Main Street and containing approximately 47,700 square feet of land or 1.09 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Mixed use. Report prepared by Ebony Walden, Neighborhood Planner.

Ms. Walden gave the staff report. The applicant proposes a nine story mixed use building. The subject property is one of the larger parcels in the immediate area of the West Main/McIntire intersection, and adjoins the Downtown Corridor along two sides to the north and east. A Downtown zoning district designation would better suit this property and would be in keeping with the mixture of commercial and residential uses and intensity to be more harmonious with the downtown. This rezoning will have the effect of quadrupling the density currently allowed on this site. The engineering division recommends a capacity analysis of the sewer lines serving this property be performed by the applicant. Staff recommends approval of this rezoning application and acceptance of the proffers providing streetscape improvements and the provision of two units of affordable housing.

Mr. Fink called for questions of staff.

Mr. Farruggio sought clarification as to whether proffer four could actively name where money was going and how the \$200,000 balanced out. Ms. Walden thought the Applicant put PHA because that had been mentioned by staff and commissioners.

Mr. Mitchell sought clarification that Ms. Walden's recommendation was that the Commission not accept proffer four. Ms. Walden concurred.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know if there had been any consideration for a traffic circle in the intersection. Ms. Walden stated there was not.

Mr. Norris felt the intersection was in jeopardy and wanted to know what kind of analysis had been done. Ms. Walden stated a traffic study would be needed at the site plan level.

Mr. Fink called for questions of the applicant, Mr. Bob Englander.

Mr. Farruggio wanted to know why the applicant chose PHA for proffer three. Mr. Englander stated Piedmont Housing had a history of performing well with providing incentives or grants or ways and means for people to get into housing, which was important to the applicant.

Mr. Farruggio asked the City Attorney if he had any concerns with one particular organization being ordered. Mr. Brown did not.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know what kind of LEED opportunities were being considered by the applicant. Mr. Englander stated the second floor above the retail would have a plaza.

Mr. Mitchell wanted to know how this project affected capacity. Mr. Englander stated they were on an eight inch line on McIntire and a ten inch line on 4th Street, which would allow them to split capacity.

Mr. Fink opened the public hearing.

Mr. William Danerlin, of 711 Palatine Avenue, was present on behalf of the owners of 333 West Main Street. He stated they recommend approval of this application.

Ms. Jennifer McEver, of 1140 Locust Avenue, liked the vision that this developer has brought forth, but would like to see a traffic study. She stated traffic had to be one of the utmost concerns in this site.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Mr. Fink closed the public hearing and called for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Lucy reminded the Commissioners that this project had been before them previously and had been denied because the density was too low.

Mr. Fink stated he liked how the project had come along. He did not think proffers one and four were true proffers. He could support the application.

Mr. Farruggio stated there were only two proffers, not four, with the application. He stated fixing the streetscape would impact the development that occurred.

Mr. Mitchell stated he liked this project, but thought it was wrong for the Commission to approve without a capacity study and traffic study. He stated he would like to be absolutely sure.

Mr. Osteen appreciated the efforts that had been made on the project. He felt that a project of this size should be approached from a LEED standpoint. He was not sure he could support it tonight especially with respect to affordable housing.

Mr. Pearson stated he was concerned enough with it that he could not support the application at this time with the proffers in place.

Mr. Mitchell moved to approve the application subject to a capacity study being done and being shown there is enough infrastructure to support the sewer. Mr. Brown, Esquire, stated that would need to be a separate motion rather than as part of the rezoning. Mr. Mitchell withdrew his motion.

Mr. Farruggio moved to recommend denial of the application to rezone tax map 13, parcels 197, 198 and 199, from West Main Street Corridor to North Downtown Corridor for the following reasons: lack of public necessity; lack of general welfare for the community; lack of mitigating factors; and, therefore, lack of good zoning principles. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion passed, 4-2; Mr. Lucy and Mr. Fink voted against.

Mr. Fink called for a ten minute recess at 9:08 p.m. Mr. Fink reconvened the meeting at 9:23 p.m.

3. SP-07-08-21: (513 Dice Street) An application for an amendment to a special use permit granted for an infill development on the property at 513 Dice Street. This request is to reduce the rear setback to 10 feet. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 29 as parcel 63.1, having approximately 92.7 feet of frontage on Dice Street and containing approximately 9,104 square feet of land or 0.209 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Single Family Residential. Report prepared by Ebony Walden, Neighborhood Planner.

Ms. Walden gave the staff report. The applicant seeks to amend the approved Infill SUP for 513 Dice Street to allow for a reduction in the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 10 feet. This reduction in rear yard requirements was requested in the original SUP application but was abandoned when the applicant proposed a different building location than recommended by the BAR. Staff recommends approval of the Infill SUP amendment as shown on the site plan.

Mr. Fink called for questions of staff.

Mr. Farruggio sought clarification that the sidewalks were the standard five foot wide sidewalks. Ms. Walden stated they were.

Mr. Fink opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak to the matter, he closed the public hearing and called for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Lucy stated it had been a close call when it came to the Commission before. He stated there was more potential for jurisdictional stresses or conflicts between the BAR and CPC.

Mr. Osteen moved to recommend approval of the infill Special Use Permit for 513 Dice street to allow a reduction of rear setback requirements from 25 feet to 10 feet; this approval is based on the finding that the proposal meets the criteria for a special use permit and would serve the interests of the general public welfare and good zoning practice. Mr. Farruggio seconded the motion. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (Continued)

Items G 3 and 4, as well as Item I were heard earlier in the meeting.

G. SITE PLANS

1. 513 Dice Street

Ms. Walden gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval of a site plan for an infill special use permit to build an additional 1,648 square foot single family residence at 513 Dice Street. 513 Dice Street is an individually protected historic property containing the Shackelford-Banister House which was built in the late 1800's. It meets all of the requirements set forth in the zoning ordinance. The only unresolved issue was the street trees. The director can grant a waiver for medium trees, however the applicant is requesting a waiver for five small trees. Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions: Planting street trees between 10 feet and 15 feet from the curb; Approval of the Infill SUP amendment for a reduction of the rear setback to 10 feet; and Staff approval of final site plan.

Mr. Farruggio recommended they approve the preliminary site plan with the requested landscape modifications subject to the following conditions: that the trees be planted 15 feet from the curb; approval of the infill SUP amendment for a reduction of the rear setback to 10 feet; and staff approval of the final site plan. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called a voice vote. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Coal Tower

Ms. Creasy gave the staff report. This property is zoned Downtown Extended. This is a by right development. The plan proposes the construction of a maximum of 287 dwelling units and approximately 98,246 square feet of commercial space on 10.656 acres. The density of this site is 27 dwelling units per acre. Multiple buildings are proposed ranging from 35 feet to 101 feet in height. This project also features a 10-foot wide multi-use public pathway along the southern border of the site that will connect from the existing portion of Water Street through to Carlton Road and tie into a trail the City will be constructing. All site work will be conducted in a single phase. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions: submission of an elevation drawing for Building B to verify that the setback requirement is met; revision to the traffic study to reflect the Future building traffic impact. This should specifically address the intersection of Tenth and East Market to determine how the addition of this traffic will impact the intersection operations; and Staff requested more details on the lighting plan, construction sequencing and underground parking. Legal documents must be approved and the applicant will be required to submit bonds for public improvements and erosion and sediment control measures. All final site plan requirements must be met prior to final approval.

Mr. Fink wanted to know how the proposal could go forward with fire department comments that the flow was not adequate. Ms. Creasy said that would have to be resolved between the applicant and the fire chief.

Mr. Dillon Baynes, of 279 9th Street, Atlanta, Georgia, and Mr. Martin Stonake, of Atlanta Georgia, were present to answer questions.

Mr. Farruggio wanted to know how confident they were that these trees are going to thrive and be healthy. The applicant stated they had a number of changes.

Mr. Fink wanted to know how the coal tower would be preserved. The applicant stated it would be an open public space.

Mr. Farruggio moved approval of the Coal Tower preliminary site plan with the following conditions: one, that submission of an elevation drawing for building B to verify that setback requirements are

met; two, revision to the traffic study to reflect the future building traffic impact which should specifically address the intersection of Tenth and East Market to determine how the addition of the traffic will impact the intersection operation; three, that the requirements of all staff reported details are incorporated in the final site plan; and, four, that the final site plan approval be brought before the Planning Commission. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Fink called a vote by affirmation. The motion carried unanimously.

H. Brookwood Phase V

1. Steep Slope Waiver Request

2. Site Plan Request

3. Entrance Corridor Review Request

Mr. Fink stated that if the steep slope waiver request was denied, then neither the site plan nor the Entrance Corridor Review would be considered as they were contingent upon the Steep Slope Waiver.

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The planning commission may grant a modification or waiver, upon making one or more of the following findings: that a strict application of requirements would not forward the purposes and intent of these critical slopes provisions; staff does not believe that this application meets that criteria. Two, the alternative proposed by the developer would satisfy the purposes and intent of these critical slopes provisions to at least an equivalent degree; this is the criteria on which Staff is basing the recommendation that was made. The site plan must be considered as approved. Criteria three is due to unusual size, topography, shape, location or other unusual physical conditions; staff did not feel it met that criteria. And, four, is the public purpose standard. That does not apply here either. Based on finding two, staff recommends the proposed plan have yard drains in the rear of the townhouse units. These yard drains will be tied into the storm sewer system.

Mr. Farruggio agreed with staff that this did not meet the criteria.

Mr. Osteen stated he did not like original proposal.

Mr. Farruggio moved to deny the steep slope waiver for Tax Map 25A, Parcel 41, Brookwood Phase V. Mr. Osteen seconded the motion. Ms. Creasy called the roll. The motion carried, 5-0-1; Mr. Pearson abstained from voting.

Entrance Corridor Review

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Staff had considered consistency with the townhomes across the street, which were Phase IV, when looking at the plan. Ms. Scala stated the only material question she had was the trim and the shutters. The only remaining item would be landscaping which would be important; staff wanted to see them reimport the black gum.

Mr. Farruggio expressed a preference for steel core doors.

Mr. Osteen did have an issue about the maple, and agreed with staff about the black gum.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Farruggio moved they adjourn. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 10:51 p.m.