

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
February 14, 2023 – 5:30 P.M.
Hybrid Meeting

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

Beginning: 5:00 PM

Location: City Space

Members Present: Commissioner d’Oronzio, Chairman Solla-Yates, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Russell, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Habbab, Commissioner Stolzenberg (Via Zoom)

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Missy Creasy, Matt Alfele, James Freas, Jeff Werner, Sam Sanders

Chair Solla-Yates called the meeting to order at 5:00pm and asked if commissioners had questions on the agenda. There were no questions on the Buford item. On the 2005 JPA item, Commissioner Mitchell asked about the use of noble materials and would like to be ready to discuss the stucco during the regular meeting. For the Zoning Ordinance, Chair Solla-Yates noted that discussion will review questions provided by staff for consideration. Commissioner Habbab asked if the comments from Commissioners could be compiled in advance of the meeting. Ms. Creasy noted that can be done with materials shared. Commissioner Mitchell noted that he likes the one-page topic pages and would like to suggest that a few lines that outline the character of the districts be added to the documents. Commissioner Schwarz asked if the character wording would be the guarantee or something to strive for. Mr. Freas noted that the materials will reference the comprehensive plan language.

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

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Space

A. COMMISSIONER’S REPORT

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I attended the MPO Technical Committee meeting where we recommended new safety targets for the upcoming year. Thanks to our new transportation planner, we recommended the more ambitious targets for fewer fatalities. We discussed the upcoming long-range transportation plan and a conceptual look at how we potentially prioritize different things. That process will continue to develop. Charlottesville Area Transit is developing a new strategic plan. JAUNT is developing a new transit development plan. The TJPDC will be submitting grants for preliminary engineering on the Rivanna pedestrian bridge to hopefully reduce some of the contingencies. The next smart scale round, the cost estimate hopefully comes in lower because there is more certainty.

Commissioner Mitchell – No Report

Commissioner Schwarz – The BPAC (Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee) meeting was on February 1st. At the end of the month, there is a mobility summit. Charlottesville, Albemarle County, and Piedmont Mobility Alliance are hosting their 3rd annual Piedmont Mobility Summit February 24th in City Space from 9 AM to 3 PM. At this free workshop, representatives from organizations, businesses, agencies, and individuals will work towards common goals of a better-connected community and everyday access to the outdoors. The

gathering will focus on local success stories and actionable, equitable outcomes. Registration is required. You can sign up at pecva.org. We talked that Bike Month and Bike To Work Week are coming up. BPAC used to be more involved in that. BPAC is going to try to get involved. There was some discussion with Safe Routes to School. There is a consideration of photo traffic enforcement in front of a couple schools in the city and only during school zone hours. The city is working on a proposal from VEO, which is the dockless mobility provider in scooters to the city, to see if they can get some better rules and some better management of parking. They are looking at some parking hubs along West Main Street. With the BAR meeting in January, I mentioned that I would give a description of what went down with the solar panels on United Methodist Church. I sent Councilor Payne an email. I don't think that I should read the whole thing. It is a complicated issue. I am not even sure that I voted the right way. To put the panels on the roof required removing a 100-year-old slate roof and replacement asphalt shingles. Our guidelines are vague. Our ordinance says to look to the Secretary of Interior Standards. The Secretary of Interior Standards guidance is more conservative than we have been in practice. The guidance there was to deny. From those who approved, the idea was that you really can't see the roof. Visually, it is not a big deal. It was complicated and difficult. Some guidance from Council would be useful. We do need to update our guidelines. The BAR is not allowed to look at the Comprehensive Plan the same way the Planning Commission can. We are not supposed to consider financial situations. The Climate Action Plan is not our purview. Our purview is what our guidelines say. There are instances where the BAR must rule in a certain way. The process is set up for Council to overrule the BAR if that is the case, if we want a different outcome, we need to change our guidelines.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – Mr. Ikefuna expressed that if Commissioners wanted to have a participatory role on the CAHF allocations or Housing Advisory Committee to see if they are qualified for a category and apply, which I did. We have Planning Commission representation on the HAC and the CAHF (Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund) Committee. I was named to both.

Commissioner Habbab – On January 18th, the Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee met. We looked at the long-range transportation plans web page redesign and some additional content that went up on that. It is available through the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission website. We looked at the smart-scale project pricing that came back. Only one project was recommended to be funded, which was the Avon Street multimodal project. That included a sidewalk, bike lane, and improvements from Druid Avenue to around the bridge over Moose Creek that crosses there. My second meeting was the Tree Commission meeting yesterday. There were a few announcements. It was the annual review meeting. The one announcement was that wood was collected from the trees that were cut on the Downtown Mall. It is being stored. They are looking for ways to use it. There are a few projects. People have approached them to use the wood. 162 trees are going to be planted around the end of February/early March. A winning bid was given for those to be planted. They are mainly going around the schools or on the school properties.

Commissioner Russell – The TJPDC (Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission) met in February. One exciting thing was that the TJPDC received a safe streets and roads for all award from the US Department of Transportation in the amount of \$857,000 to develop a comprehensive safety action plan for the region. These grants provide funding for communities to implement strategies and projects that will significantly reduce or eliminate transportation related fatalities and serious injuries. On March 24, the TJPDC hosts the second annual Central Virginia Regional Housing Partnership Summit. It is called coming back home. It will present a regionally focused summit on affordable housing needs. It is all day at The Omni. Registration can be found online. The theme for this year, Coming Back Home, recognizes the important role local and regional housing policies play in the recovery from COVID-19. Sessions will focus on programs, partnerships, and policy that can be utilized. The keynote speaker is Jay Grant, the Executive Director of the Local Initiative Support Coalition out of Hampton. He will talk about his time at HUD and DHCD. He will share valuable perspectives about regional collaboration on affordable housing. I will be attending.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Palmer – No Report

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Solla-Yates – During our last work session, you might have noticed I was distracted. That was because legislation was being debated at that moment over whether the city of Charlottesville should be permitted to adjust its taxation to reduce the burden on buildings and increase the tax burden on land. It is something that I believe is important strategically and for affordable housing. Sadly, it died in committee on a party-line vote. I continue to believe it is important to consider. It is illegal to enact at least for the next year. We are free to think about it and study it.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Ms. Creasy – We have Module 1 out for review. A lot of people have been looking at that. We have been getting comments. Conversations have been happening. Next week is our big participation, community open house week on the 22nd of February. We have 3 open houses. They are all similar in 3 different locations. This is on the Cville Plans Together website. If you go to the city website under zoning ordinance, it will get you there. You can choose one of these 3 open houses or go to all 3 open houses. On February 22nd, one is at Charlottesville High School from 6 PM to 8:30 PM. Our second one is February 23rd at Buford Middle School from 6 PM to 8:30 PM. These are drop-in open houses. On February 25th, we are going to be in City Space from 11 AM to 1:30 PM. We are hoping that we will get a broad audience to come to those events. If we continue into the next week, we have our work session on the 28th. On March 1st, there is the steering committee for the project, Cville Plans Together. We are also working on other opportunities as we have outreach from groups trying to get scheduled. If you didn't catch any of those dates, you can go to the city website under zoning ordinance. All those dates are there.

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

Steven Johnson – I am here on behalf of Livable Cville to discuss homelessness in the Charlottesville and Albemarle areas. Housing is a human right. It is a clear violation of that basic right when someone experiences homelessness in our community. The other underlying problem is clear: insufficient housing. Homelessness is getting worse in our area. According to the Blue Ridge Coalition for the Homeless, the point and time count for our area jumped by 50 percent to 266 people in 2022. There are more than 440 people that have accessed The Haven Day Shelter services over 19,000 times in 2022. We need to overcome inaccurate stereotypes and address the factors that cause people to experience homelessness. While certain risk factors might increase the likelihood of an individual losing access to housing, attributing homelessness to individual choice or behaviors, not only misunderstands why people become homeless, it results in harmful policies and defers real solutions. In a recent book, homelessness is a housing problem. Greg Colburn and Clayton Page Aldrin analyzed data from around the country. They concluded that it is not the levels of drug use, poverty, unemployment, or mental health problems that predict levels of homelessness in an area, nor is it the weather. It is all about housing. The authors found that the cost and availability of housing explains regional variation in homelessness, specifically low rental vacancy rates and high rent. I am here to share copies of the book with each of you. You will find a flyer from the staff at The Haven with information about the invaluable work that they do. We hope that you will read the book. As the city rewrites its zoning code and develops its budget for the next year, you will help implement its lessons so that homelessness becomes rare, brief, and non-recurring.

Kenneth Hill (Washington Avenue) – I am the owner of the duplex on Washington Avenue, which is basically across the street from the 2005 JPA project. I have several concerns with the project. The height up to 101 feet

on the side of Washington and Observatory Avenues is too high in conjunction with other nearby buildings. It doesn't fit in well with the JPA neighborhood. As planned, the structure will tower over surrounding houses with common effects of natural light, shadows, and quality of life for the residents and people living nearby. Parking is also a problem. With the traffic, that will be expected to increase with 390 tenants for this project. The plan calls for 122 on-site cars with a single entryway on Washington Avenue. It is not enough for 390 tenants, visitors, and service vehicles. As a result, overflow parking will occur on Washington Avenue, Observatory Avenue, and other nearby streets when the enclosed parking is full. The added traffic will create bottlenecks and safety issues for vehicles, bikes, and pedestrians in the area. There will be mechanical equipment for the building that will be in the parking area. This equipment will come off and on and generate a lot of noise. It will disturb the neighbors and tenants in the area. We would like to know more about that.

William Schaaf (113 Washington) – My property and the next-door neighbor (the previous speaker) are the most significantly impacted by the proposed design. As to the ingress and egress from the parking garage, from the relationship of our location of garbage facilities, and mechanical systems, they are all opposite the driveways of our properties. Over the years, I have tried to provide affordable housing to Charlottesville residents. They are not rich developers, and they are good tenants. They deserve to be treated well. I want you to understand that they will suffer because of this design. Washington Avenue is not designed for the ingress and egress that the traffic design creates. I ask you to consider making them put the garage entrance and some of mechanical equipment in the middle of the walkway in the back and put the garage entrance in the front that would exit and enter off JPA, which is a street more suitable for handling the number of cars that will be involved with the owners or occupants of the property. All the things that Mr. Hill mentioned are important to me. We stand in solidarity with our other neighbors. There is a short and a long run of concerns with the consideration of parking, noise, lighting, environmental impacts, and safety services. I encourage you, as you review this application, to reject this plan and have the developers redesign it to minimize the impact of these items on the people who live there and are neighbors and owners of the houses.

Lorna Martens – This comment is about 2005 JPA. I submitted 6 questions that I had about the new proposal that was published in the Entrance Corridor Design Review materials. I did not receive an answer to my questions. I would like to know the height in feet of the building that is featured in the revised plan submitted to the Entrance Corridor Review Board. How does the new height in feet compare to the height in feet in the original plan? The new plan shows porches going on to Observatory Avenue. Who will be allowed to enter and exit via these porches? Is it just residents of the apartments that open onto the porches? Is it going to be all residents of the building? A bike path was originally suggested or recommended behind the building. This has become a pedestrian walkway. I was interested in hearing more about that. Originally, 2005 JPA was going to have 119 units. Is the number of units in the revised plan the same or not? Originally, the building was planned for 390 students. I was wondering if there had been any change in that figure in the revised plan.

Bobbie Williams (JPA Neighborhood) – I am not directly affected by the development of 2005-2007 JPA. As a neighborhood, we have been inundated with students. As a result, everyone in the city seems to think that is what we should be even more so. The building that is going up is going to house students. Students are the responsibility of a university that is next door. As far as we are concerned, not having to have that as their source of housing is default. This building is not going to help affordable housing. This is going to be student housing. The rents that the students can afford in a building like this does not add any affordable housing to the city. It is difficult for us to accept it. The building is out of character of the JPA Corridor/Entrance Corridor Design. There are a lot of factors that are causing us distress. We are a small community of owners. We have housed students. We are not against housing students. We shouldn't be the only area to house students in large numbers. We are distressed about this. The zoning changes are not going to make it any easier. It is going to add more commercial areas. It is going to take away more areas for housing. I have no qualms about a building going up there. This is out of character and not solving the total needs of what they are saying.

Anne Benham (116 Observatory) – I am almost right across the street from the proposed project (2005 JPA). I share the concerns of all the people who have spoken about this. I am concerned about traffic and noise. I am concerned about whether there will be a representative from the city or developer that residents can contact if a problem should arise. Regarding the noise, the excavation or construction, which I believe is supposed to go on for 2 years. I understand that it is supposed to start early in the morning and go until 4 PM. I don't know how many days a week this is going to be. I am wondering if there will be any limit on the volume of the noise or the length of time that noise can go on in any given day. If so, will that be communicated to the residents? With traffic, I was on Washington last week. There was a truck that couldn't move for a couple minutes. There were cars parked on both sides of the street. I was using Washington to go to JPA. I had to wait 10 minutes. This is before anything happens with the project. There could be longer delays when construction starts.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – October 11, 2021 – Work Session
2. Critical Slopes Waiver – Buford Middle School

Motion to Approve – Commissioner Russell – With the following condition on the Critical Slopes Waiver:
1. The applicant will work with the City's Urban Forester on tree preservation and replanting. – Second by Commissioner d'Oronzio – Motion passes 6-0 with 1 abstention (Commissioner Schwarz)

II. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 PM

Continuing: Until all public hearings are complete

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

No Scheduled Public Hearings

III. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

Continuing: until all action items are concluded

Chairman Solla-Yates called the ERB to order.

1. Entrance Corridor – 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue

i. Staff Report

Jeff Werner, Preservation Planner – This is a design Certificate of Appropriateness request for the project at 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue. It is 3 parcels. This is within the Fontaine Avenue, JPA Entrance Corridor. It is subject to review by the ERB. When you are reviewing a CoA request, there are 5 primary criteria for you to consider: the overall architectural design, form, and style but not limited to height, mass, and scale. You are looking at exterior architectural details and features. You are looking at the texture, materials, and color that are proposed. You are looking at the design and arrangement of the building/the structures on the building site. The 5th criteria are all those bundled together. As a whole, is that something that is architecturally compatible or incompatible with the Entrance Corridor? It is a brick and stucco building composed of a five-story, U-shaped, two-wing building surrounding a central courtyard and set atop a two-story brick foundation [or podium] of approximately 150-ft (at JPA) and 312-ft (at the sides). Each wing is approximately 62-feet wide separated by a roughly 30-ft wide courtyard. The site slopes downhill, approximately 30-feet, from the NW corner on Observatory Avenue to the SE corner at JPA and Washington Avenue. As such, the seven-story primary façade (at JPA) is reduced to a five-story elevation at the NW corner and a six-story elevation at the NE corner. The

recommendation that staff has is that the improvements are appropriate, given the Comprehensive Plan and the Design Guidelines. We recommend approval of the CoA. I have included a list of recommendations/conditions of approval should you choose to go that route. I have made some notes to amend the motion to address the question about the stucco. The ERB Guidelines advise against the use of EIFS. A condition that you could add would be ‘the stucco will be a durable synthetic material mechanically fastened over appropriate drainage mats and over a code compliant water-resistant barrier.’ In a recent project on West Main, the BAR had a requirement that they wanted to review a mockup panel prior to installation. That was to check the color, the texture, and the material.

Commissioner Mitchell – I want to talk about the stucco. We have traditional stucco and synthetic stucco, which is more elastic. It doesn’t crack like the traditional stucco. The synthetic stucco that you are referring to is not EIFS. Where on the traditional stucco-EIFS continuum does the durable synthetic material lie? Is that better than traditional stucco?

Mr. Werner – There is a yes and no. I will let the architect get into the specification, the details, and the materials. It is not the Styrofoam material. The BAR has approved this type. If there are questions about the material they are going to use, you can adopt a condition to address that. You can request a deferral of this until you get that information. You could deny this request based on not having that information available. I cannot give you an engineering breakdown of the synthetic stucco material. We can provide that, or the applicant can provide it.

Traffic and parking are not under my purview. The parking is inside and not visible. With the height and specific numbers, I will let the applicant address that. The height of this project was approved. There was a special use permit approved by City Council. It established those conditions. We are now working with the boxed in conditions that Council approved. With the porches on Observatory Avenue, I don’t have any purview over who goes in or out of a door. I don’t have anything like that in the guidelines. With the bike path in the rear, that is behind. I need to pull in the language from City Council. This must meet the conditions that City Council put in there. We had talked about some connection not being eliminated. With the number of units and number of students, the density was established by the SUP. Those are not anything that we have purview over. This could be a building with one big room in it or a solid block of concrete, the only thing that matters from the design review is the exterior of that building.

Commissioner Mitchell – Your recommendation is that if we decide to move forward, we have one more contingency that the stucco be made of durable synthetic materials.

Mr. Werner – We have 2 architects here who can better explain/give you the tech language for that. I am comfortable with it. If you are not, we can express it in the language.

Ms. Creasy – Your language seemed comprehensive.

Commissioner Habbab – I have a question on the glazing requirement. I saw that it was generally where all the brick was and not where the stucco was. Is there a reason why we should make all the windows meet the requirement?

Mr. Werner – I would refer to Attachment 4 in the staff report. It was 4 or 5 years ago that the ERB was reviewing the Tarleton Oak project. The question came up about the definition of clear glass. The BAR has come down on 70 percent or higher. We never look at the VLT on glass on someone’s new house on 2nd Street. The question was: What does that mean and in what circumstances? The ERB asked the BAR to review it. We had a good discussion about it. The primary spot you want that clear glass is like something on The Mall or store frontage at street level. People are seeing into that space and not seeing their reflection. As you go up the

building, it becomes less important. The recommendation you received from the BAR was that variability was possible. It came down to the design goal and still respecting those issues at the streetscape. It is not a rule. It is a recommendation. You can interpret that up or down. With the conditions, the applicant may want to suggest something different. They can certainly do that.

Commissioner Habbab – You can get high impact stucco. They even make them hurricane proof. That might be the language we could use. They do use a synthetic stucco in an EIFS system. EIFS is like a system of different parts, with synthetic stucco being the face of it. You could do a spec higher impact resistant one.

Commissioner Schwarz – It seems like everything that would be EIFS is above the street level. It is not touching the ground. EIFS today is not EIFS from years ago. The concern is not the impact. When EIFS was first developed, it trapped water in the building assembly. It would rot the building. They have fixed that. There is a drainage plane. No architect would design a building without a drainage plane in there. EIFS does not scare me.

There was the requirement in the SUP approval to follow The Streets That Work Plan to have a 3-foot buffer between the sidewalk and the street. That seems silly because we are basically not allowing trees in that buffer by making it 3 feet. I don't know why we landed there. I checked The Streets That Work Plan, it does say a 3- to 6-foot buffer is suggested for these areas. We settled on 3 feet. The BAR tends to have a feeling that they can push and pull during these applications. Does the ERB have a similar flexibility?

Mr. Werner – My understanding is that if there is something established by SUP, it is locked.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I am looking at the front elevation at that blank wall along the street. It looks like a breeze block situation happening there with the tables and chairs in front of it. Is that whole setup, including the tables and chairs, part of this CoA? Can they remove the furniture because it is not part of the building elevation or the façade, they presented to us?

Mr. Werner – You can require it. A lot of things are seasonal and get moved around.

Ms. Creasy – We are not going to be concerned about the locations of tables and chairs that show up in drawings.

Mr. Werner – I will let the applicant speak to how that space is programmed and if there is seating built into the wall designed into the masonry walls versus metal furniture that may appear there.

Councilor Payne – In this process, what locks in what is approved from happening?

Mr. Werner – With a historic district, there would be greater detail in the elevations, wall sections. The Entrance Corridor tends to be more of a general view and what this generally looks like. This isn't the first time I look at something. It is the same thing with the historic districts. It will come in for approval. A lot of these are reviewed for the site plan. There are things that we are looking at there. It also comes back in for a building permit. I try to look at the application. It is somewhat different than when we review it with the BAR. I know that something is going to come back as a building permit. Is it significantly different or slightly different? There is some flexibility. The building permit drawings better look significantly like those drawings there or I am not going to sign the building permit.

Councilor Payne – Is the point you (Commissioner Schwarz) were making about the setbacks is that it is preventing the landscaping and trees?

Mr. Schwarz – It wasn't the setbacks. It was that a 3-foot planting strip and 7-foot sidewalk per the Streets That Work Plan. It seems like something that falls to The Streets That Work Plan. All the street trees are pushed inwards up against the building.

i. Applicant Presentation

Kevin Riddle, Applicant –

Next Slide

The first section is highlighting some of the parts of the ERB guidelines that are most relevant to what we are going to be discussing tonight and how they relate to it.

Next Slide

I will start by mentioning Chapter 5 of the Guidelines. It describes the vision for the Fontaine Avenue and JPA Corridor. It uses these words. "Foremost considerations are traffic calming provisions for pedestrian safety and pedestrian amenities, such as sidewalks, landscaping, and transit stops." In other words, how the project engages the street is of first importance. This project proposes robust edge spaces, continuous sidewalks, a variety of planting beds supporting a range of flora, and big paved major spaces adjacent to corner entries. In addition to that, we have these smaller, slightly more intimate spaces along Observatory Avenue, porches that relate more to the smaller buildings that are on the other side of the street. Together these steps, terraces, and site walls have the potential to expand the public realm beyond the city sidewalk and encourage social activities. The project proposes tiny spaces where people can gather. These spaces would include tenants, but it is not exclusive to them. With the entry terrace in the middle image and the pedestrian path we propose at the rear of the site, we expect that those would be used by many of the people in the neighborhood, not just the people in the apartments.

Next Slide

To help strengthen these hedge spaces, the project envisions a generously planted perimeter. Pedestrian routes and gathering spaces will enjoy beauty, shade, and comfort provided by street trees, and, in the process, functional needs beyond comfort and aesthetics will be supported where the landscape contributes to stormwater treatment.

Next Slide

Within the layers of the landscape, we imagine a building that gradually emerges. Massing is reduced in several ways with this current proposal. We use step-backs at upper stories to create a terraced effect. We allow taller parts of the architecture to recede in a different material. The material changes further discourage impressions of a monolithic form. The brick facades that we have restricted to 3 stories above the podium level, we hope that they shift focus to the lower stories and the darker muted stucco tones would recede more in the background.

Next Slide

The fenestration is oriented vertically and scaled to residential proportions. We have larger windows and storefronts. They are proposed only along JPA and at the entry where more prominent openings are appropriate. The range of openings helps to mitigate against repetitive facades.

Next Slide

We will look at a couple of images of the JPA Corridor.

Next Slide

With the slide after this one, we consider it an example of some strengths of the corridor that we would like to pursue. This slide, in a way, is a counter example. You see a lot of properties. We did not have to cherry pick to find these that have lots of paving and parking in the front yards, little to no street trees. It goes to show how the setting, the siding of the buildings has as much to do with whether they are supporting the corridor goals as does the size of the building. On this page, there are several smaller buildings. They don't engage the street. They are not very welcoming.

Next Slide

Here, you see some better examples. You see many street trees, prominent steps, site walls, and the plantings. The plantings are an important factor. That image of 2011 JPA at the bottom strikes me. The architecture itself under those trees is fine. It is nothing special. That canopy is terrific. Even newer projects like 1725 JPA has a nice, largely glazed stairwell that announces entry and gives the residents a nice way up and down with lots of visibility that is somewhat unusual. In the top right corner, you see an example of a nice porch on one of the apartment buildings across the street.

Next Slide

We will get into some of our imagery showing the previous design and the current proposal.

Next Slide

Here is the site plan. This is to remind you of what some of the parameters were in the approved SUP.

Next Slide

This is the first image of the previous proposal. We are looking at the corner of Observatory Avenue and JPA.

Next Slide

We reduced the original design to an outline.

Next Slide

We have overlaid the new proposal. The dark red is the outline of the previous proposal. The lighter red fill shows you what in a way has been reduced or subtracted to get to the current proposal.

Next Slide

This gives you a sense of the different material palate. You can see up at the corner near the entry where Washington and JPA meet. If you look up Observatory Avenue, there is a lot more terracing that we used at that back corner to address massing where the building gets the closest to the smaller houses that are up the street there.

Next Slide

This is from across the street toward the main entry.

Next Slides

You can see how the massing has changed at the front-most wing where the entry is located.

Next Slide

This is the proposed project. In some of the images, you are seeing some landscape that we initially put in as a placeholder. It does give you a fair sense of this atmosphere we would like, especially as trees have matured.

Next Slide

We took away some of the trees so you can get a better look at the architecture at the lower stories.

Next Slide

This is at the corner as you approach from UVA.

Next Slide

This is the previous proposal and the new proposal. You can see at the upper 2 stories that we have stepped back about 12 feet.

Next Slide

What you have is an architecture where there are fewer elements vying for position. We think that it has gotten quieter as it sits here on this corner. We have revisited the way that we use that brick base. It used to travel around the building. The building had a stratified effect. In this case, we wanted to go more for juxtaposition. The bricks come up in certain places and creates a better variation over what was before.

Carlin Tacey, Applicant –**Next Slide**

You are seeing the site plan. We are getting to see all sides of the intended streetscape. We are going to talk again about those different views on Washington, Observatory, and JPA.

Next Slide

Looking here at a section across JPA, you can see that we are trying to nestle ourselves into that streetscape. It is important that we do the work on some of those street trees there in our front landscape since the power lines run through the middle of that median. It is our intention to bring them in towards the site to allow for a larger soil volume and success, as the sewer runs on that corner of JPA in front of our building. You can also see our language of sight walls and trying to bring this down to the pedestrian scale with those precedent images up at the top.

Next Slide

Here, we are looking at Washington. We are using street trees that are approved from the Charlottesville Master Tree List as preferred or secondary for entry corridors. Here we anticipate a nice higher canopy story. These trees would be about 60 feet at maturity. This isn't quite their mature height we are showing here. We are showing that upper canopy with a lower street planting more at the pedestrian level at the hip level there with some shrubs and grasses.

Next Slide

The side here is Observatory. We also have an intention for a biofilter, terraced walls here to bring our stormwater down that grade change that was described earlier. This nestles into those intentions with the porches on the side. The trees here would be something that likes to be adjacent to biofilters and water for those inundation periods.

Next Slide

We took those trees away for a moment to give you a look at that architectural intention along that corridor. It lets you see some of that understory planting that is intended there. Those would be a mix of natives that have a lot of ornamental value and low maintenance. That is what we are going to try to do across the entire streetscape.

Next Slide

Here, we are bringing ourselves back to that front view with a little more detail on the intended planting there. You can see a mix of native and ornamental ferns, some native grasses, some flowering trees, and those street

trees holding that space nicely up at the front. We are trying to get as many as we can in there. That is a nice palette of stone and brick for those pedestrian areas up to that entry.

Mr. Riddle –

Next Slide

This is another look at that same terrace. We like to give you an impression of how the space could be occupied. There is some furniture there that some of you were asking about. It is possible that furniture could be bolted down. We also wanted to leave the owner the flexibility to have furniture that could come out at certain times of the year. What we think is important though to have as a permanent part of the architecture in the site walls you see there is that they are in a way that they have a comfortable seat height. This is always going to be a realm in which it is not just people coming and going. There are opportunities to relax and gather with people here.

Commissioner Mitchell – With the trees on Observatory and Washington, how many years before they get to 60 feet and maturity?

Ms. Tracey – You could start seeing around 20 feet in height in the first 5 years.

Commissioner Mitchell – It would be around 15 years.

Ms. Tracey – Yes, before they start holding a presence up there at the second story, depending on how well they are growing.

Commissioner Mitchell – Do you think there is enough space for the roots to grow?

Ms. Tracey – This is a generous planting within our property line of about 8 to 12 feet in some areas. That should be plenty of room for those trees to reach out.

Commissioner Mitchell – What do you guys think of staff's recommendation regarding the stucco, that it be durable, stable materials?

Mr. Riddle – I like the recommendation. At this point in the design, we had not reached a point where we were looking specifically at certain assemblies or manufacturers that we were going to go with here. We wanted to make sure that the broader strokes of our redesign were finding some support first. It is our intention to use a synthetic stucco that will be durable. It is mostly located at upper levels. The application methods have greatly improved among contractors. There used to be a habit of using drainage mats that had vertical grooves in them. Sometimes, installers would not apply them so that they were oriented vertically. You would have trapped moisture because that synthetic stucco does not breathe like traditional stucco does. We would be making certain to have a product that would be durable, look good. We are happy to show staff and members of the Commission more about that later if that was necessary as a condition of approval.

Commissioner Mitchell – My first trip through this was in 2006. There was a lot of EIFS going up. After a year, there were holes in it. I would hate to see something like that in the entrance corridor.

Mr. Riddle – I agree. Some of our reasons for pursuing the synthetic stucco is that we see a lot of apartment projects where unfortunately it is an entry level where fiber cement panel is used. They are partly responsible for imparting a slightly generic quality to some multi-family housing. We think the stucco, even though it is not the traditional kind in its application, it still has an appearance that is closer to what is a material you see traditionally more in the city.

Commissioner d'Oroznio – This is my first at one of these. I don't have a lot of questions. I am trying to listen and learn. In your discussion of the stucco, it is a triggering event for me. Not only would you have a situation where the cloth barrier was installed improperly in orientation, but also it would be lapped improperly. There would be water funneling in. You essentially have funnels pushing the water inside instead of out.

Commissioner Habbab – This is a lot better than the first one that we saw. You have done a great job. I had a question about the enclosure that is next to the entrance to the garage and what was going to happen there.

Mr. Riddle – We have some elevations and an appendix. As you come up Washington Avenue, we are going to have an entry into the parking level. To the left of that entry, there is a wall that is going to come up about 4.5 feet. That will be a place in which trash bins can be rolled out on trash collection mornings. That is the only time that they would be out there. They would be rolled back into the parking level with non-trash days. The owners plan to have this be a professionally managed property. It wouldn't be up to the tenants to go down and roll the bins out. The equipment for heating and cooling is going to be up on the roof of the building. We don't anticipate there being a noise problem issue. That is unusual with this project.

Erin Hannegan, Applicant – It is possible that a transformer will also be there along with the generator. The generator will likely only run once a month, cycle on and off to test it and not go in use except for in emergencies. It is not going to produce constant noise or disturbance. The cycling on and off can be scheduled at a daylight hour to not cause residents of the building or across the street issues.

Commissioner Habbab – With the color retention of the stucco, what is expected?

Mr. Riddle – That is a good question. We might have to get back to you on that. We are still exploring what stucco system we would be using. I hear what you are saying. You don't want that to start looking blached out and bad within 5 or 6 years. Allow us to investigate that. We want to make that a priority.

Commissioner Russell – Do we have language on and regulation around commercial generators, siting, and run time? Is that something that would be worth potentially including in an entrance corridor review as a provision?

Ms. Creasy – I do not ever recall having a condition like that.

Commissioner Russell – I would think trying to make sure it is shielded from view.

Ms. Creasy – With the mechanical equipment, it is required for that. It is advantageous to all sides that they address the noise in such a way that it does not affect their residents and those surrounding neighbors.

Mr. Werner – In the staff report, I refer to it on page 4 where I talked about the screening. I also incorporated it into one of the conditions. There is a guideline about citing mechanical equipment in such a way that it is not. The guidelines are not an ordinance. We have started doing this with lighting. In a similar condition here, if there is an issue with lighting, we have required that applicants will work with us to address glare, brightness. You could incorporate a similar condition about noise. It is in the guidelines.

Commissioner Russell – It will also need to get fueled. It is a consideration. This is addressed in the staff report. This is maybe not the appropriate way to pose this question. Can you convince me that the color palette is in the compatible range of the surrounding neighborhoods, and it is not too dark?

Mr. Riddle – With the color range you see on the corridor, it does vary quite a bit. I know that there is a lot of red brick. There are some lighter colored buildings. Our goal here is to have a building that maybe has a

distinction of its own. It is not pursuing a traditional vocabulary in its detailing. We felt that the darker colors have a slightly more modern connotation. We felt they contrasted well with the brick in a way with a more non-committal color palette, maybe something creamy or beige. I feel you see that around Charlottesville a good bit. This palette represents something a little tougher, especially when combined with the landscape. When I look at some of the illustrations, it seems to me that the plantings, the greens, the colors of the understory plantings are in a way more vivid even though they are some distance away from the darker stuccos that are above.

Commissioner Russell – The trees that are shown in the renderings are not at the proposed or expected planting height. They are demonstrating some later stage.

Ms. Tracey – They are not showing what they would be when they are initially planted. They are also not showing at the full maturity. They are in between there. It is hard to predict how well a tree will grow. It is typical to show them in that medium.

Mr. Werner – The problem with renderings is what age in the life of this project do they select. To be clear on color, if this was an existing building that had been there 20 years and the owner wanted to paint the stucco, I would probably approve it. If they would want something else, they will have to go to BAR/ERB. If they want to paint this 10 years from now, the person in my position could make a judgement on whether that color is appropriate. If you feel strongly about that light color, you may want to consider it as a condition.

Commissioner Habbab – Since you mentioned that green, I wanted to ask what you thought about that vivid color in the courtyard.

Mr. Werner – Trees are difficult to read. If you take those and strip them away from the image, it becomes completely different to look at. I was not concerned about the green. I have been in a lot of conversations with them about it this whole project. When I went through and saw the changes from what we saw with the SUP, I was excited about the darker colors. There has been some difference of opinion within the office. This is where the guidelines are for you to interpret. There is nothing that says you must use a particular color scheme.

Commissioner Russell – I believe what you are saying. I appreciate what it is doing and making the brick stand out.

Mr. Riddle – Something that stood out to me when we were looking at this corridor and working on this project, one of the projects that I featured in the early pages at 1707 JPA, if you look that on the city GIS map, there is a thumbnail image of it. You see it raw shortly after it was constructed. I think that was built less than 15 years ago. You can see what those London Plane trees have done within 15 years. Those trees have some size, and they are not in huge planting beds. I don't think it is optimistic to think that this project could have trees at these heights within 20 years.

Commissioner Russell – I am not sure why you are showing these variations of brick. Maybe it is because you haven't figured out what direction you want to go. I feel very strongly against one of them.

Mr. Riddle – We wanted to leave some flexibility there. The owner inevitably is going to have to go through a pricing exercise. It could be that either of those end up not being available or the prices have gotten sky high. That gets you close to what we are going for. One is a nicer, rougher texture and one not as much. There might be a little more variation in color. They each have their own strengths. What you see in the illustrations is a close approximation.

Commissioner Schwarz – Behind the storefront windows, is that all amenity space?

Mr. Riddle – It is amenity space. You have an entry lobby. As you go to the left, the way that it extends over toward Observatory Avenue, I don't know that the owner has all the programs, spaces. They are liable to be maybe exercise rooms, meeting rooms, and study lounges. We are hoping that corner part of the building there at Observatory and JPA, especially with the terrace that adjoins it, it could have a potential use at some point for the public. There could even be a little retail presence there. I don't know if that is in the plan.

Commissioner Schwarz – Below that, is that a pierced screen?

Mr. Riddle – There was that instead of some more storefront there with an occluded or opaque glass, maybe it would be nicer to use the masonry the way it can be used and have something that is a little more open. That is not the main reason. The main reason is to break that wall up.

Ms. Hannegan – It is also the intention to grow greenery up there.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You guys did not mention vivid colors in the courtyard. What color are those panels going to be? Where are those vivid colors?

Mr. Riddle – They are on certain facades that are within the courtyard. If you look at the perspective that comes around and looks at the corner of Observatory and JPA, you see as much as you are going to see of it. There is one that especially before the trees are large is going to be more visible and more prominent. We realize this is probably going to be a stretch for some. Even though I think the darker colors work well with the brick and with our massing strategies, with this vivid color within, while we like the idea of aligning that courtyard with something else, especially for the tenants to have something that makes that environment livelier, we thought it could be a promising addition. We are not wedded to it. We would not want support for the project to hinge on whether that is a bright chartreuse or not. It is going to be important to the owner that we are looking more at views within the courtyard to make sure that is a color that everyone would be comfortable with. We wanted to put it out there since it was an idea that came to mind.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Going back to the breeze blocks in front of the garage, would car lights shine through that?

Mr. Riddle – The bricks are laid in a dense enough fashion that you might occasionally get some dispersed beam coming through. We have not done an actual study of headlights panning through those as they might be as they are coming into the garage or down the ramp. We could perhaps try and do a study of that. We were also thinking that especially with a student project like this, you are not going to have commuters, people coming and going all the time. We assumed that an occasional view of lights through there are not going to be any worse than what you would have of lights just occasionally coming down a street. It would be infrequent. We feel optimistic that it is screened enough that they would not be harsh or ruin the atmosphere out there on an evening.

Ms. Hannegan – There is going to be limited parking that far down into the plan. You will have less traffic just by virtue of there being fewer parking spaces down that low.

Commissioner Russell – Is it a ventilation thing? Could it be blocked?

Mr. Riddle – It can be totally solid.

Ms. Hannegan – With the lighting comment staff made as a suggested condition, if it is a problem after it is built, I am sure we can address it then.

Mr. Riddle – I must admit that an occasional swing of lights through there could be intriguing and gives you a hint of what is going on in there if people didn't have their high beams on all the time. I don't think it will be that bad.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Are the trellises for the plants to climb up between those relief? Is that all over all of them? Would the plants be climbing directly up those brick pattern areas?

Ms. Tracey – That is yet to be further studied on the type of climbing system that would be needed. That would depend on the final species selection for those climbing plants. We will continue that coordination with our architects.

Commissioner Palmer – I appreciate the 4 sides of this design. In some of the past projects that have come through, that has not always been the case. Regarding the back of this project, there was a comment that they thought there was going to be a bike path through there. It now looks like a walkway. I want to hear what the difference is. Does that mean it has steps now? Is it a continuous ramp?

Ms. Hannegan – The SUP resolution requests that it be a multi-purpose path, both bike and pedestrian.

Ms. Tracey – There is a fair amount of topography through there. We are trying to minimize the disruption of that by doing a series of steps. It is not a big stair that you must climb to get up there. You may want to walk your bike down that. We feel that is a nice compromise given the topographical changes along that swoop.

Commissioner Palmer – It brings the question of who decides what a multi-purpose path is. I am not trying to say I don't appreciate your reason for that. It is more of a question for staff. How is that determined if it is appropriate or not?

Bryan Cichoki, Applicant – It is important to understand the relation of the language and the condition for that piece where it says the 'landowner shall consider construction of the multi-purpose path.' It was an intent to link the 2 sides together and the ideal being for bicycles and pedestrians. As we have gotten into the fine details of it, the topography between the 2 makes it difficult to accommodate the bicycle connection. There is a connection there. It has been adopted into the plan. We are trying to accommodate that grade change as well.

Ms. Creasy – I don't have the language in front of me. It sounds like 'consider,' and that gives enough flexibility there.

Mr. Werner – They read it perfectly. "The landowner shall consider construction of a multi-purpose path for bicycles and pedestrians linking Washington Avenue and Observatory Avenue within the rear setback." The Council established that they should consider it. They have. You all also still have design guidelines that you can refer to. That is your option. What I felt was most important was that we did not preclude it. I remember that Commissioner Lahendro had talked about the building from Observatory to Washington. I thought about the idea, if you split the building in half and ran steps down it, I was surprised how many stairs there are. They are working with a grade that is difficult. I would say that they have met what Council said. They have considered it. It is not required. If you all deem it to be something that they should do, you can have that discussion.

Chairman Solla-Yates – I appreciate the progress that has been made. It makes sense. Three years ago, the Planning Commission had a work session on this item with the design team. I recommended looking at 1707 JPA, which you did. I am pleased to see that. I do see an influence here.

Councilor Payne – It is significantly improved.

ii. Planning Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Mitchell – I like where they are. Several amendments have been suggested by staff. I believe Commissioner Russell has a couple of amendments in mind. I have one in mind.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I concur with Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Russell – I agree. There are a couple of things to add around the stucco. I don’t remember what the first discussion of light pollution was. I mentioned a condition about if the breeze blocks become an issue. They could be blocked out/made opaque. I don’t think the color of the interior is in our purview. I think it is going to be something where the owner may say that the tenants may not want to look at this green out their window. I appreciate breaking it up.

Commissioner Schwarz – I am leaning towards approval with some of the conditions that we have mentioned. I want to make sure that things happen during the site plan process. The site plan we’re looking at substantially should be there with all those trees or most of them. I am assuming that is a given. The grey is an aesthetic choice. I don’t think that the argument makes a building recede/go away works. It is an aesthetic choice. I am fine with it. There is a note on the lighting page that planting accent or up-lighting on the terrace plant beds is TBD. I would say ‘no up-lights’ if it is not in this plan. It is just light pollution.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I don’t totally hate the project. The big open questions are what to do with the bright colored panels. I don’t completely hate them either. I do feel that they break the flow of the whole project. Just making those more muted colors would be helpful. With the multiuse path, I would like for them to consider adding bike rentals to those stairs so you can roll a bike down there. I am still concerned about the garage breeze walks out front. The programming in the front mitigates it. If there is no programming and the trellises work out for the plants, you end up with a very long blank wall in the front that is basically a garage that our new zoning ordinance talks about not having blank walls. I want to make sure they do that well. I don’t have a condition to propose. The one condition about not having headlights glaring out that Commissioner Russell’s condition might make sense for that.

Commissioner Palmer – I appreciated Commissioner Schwarz’s comment on the site plan. I would add to that the biofilter areas. I know those are important for stormwater management. I would hate to see those get ‘value managed out.’ I don’t know if those have a similar standing to trees on a site plan.

Chairman Solla-Yates – It is significant progress. I am very pleased to see it.

Commissioner Habbab – The projector on the big screen makes it brighter than looking at the PDF. It might be better if it was a slightly far muted color. If we can’t see it from the entrance corridor, it can be whatever you want. I would go with the more muted there. Would we be able to put a condition on the vine system since it wasn’t in the images? Is that something we can add? If that doesn’t work, do what Commissioner Russell suggested by blocking the bricks from the inside?

Mr. Werner – It is something the BAR talked about was a shutter at a certain level. What is the height you are trying to block that light from? There are ways to do that. You could leave it to them. You can suggest on how. You can tell them that it must be done. Try not to totally enclose the opening. It can probably be screened in some way from the inside.

Commissioner Habbab – Do we not get material samples like the BAR?

Mr. Werner – You can request materials. We have had discussions about 3-D models and renderings. This is where those initial discussions happen. For this project and if it was in a historic district, there would be a required preliminary discussion. It would be before you. In that discussion you would have what would you want to see and what information is missing. We try to iron it out so that we get to an application that is approvable. That’s what has been different with my experience with the ERB.

Commissioner Mitchell – Back in 2006, we did get samples of the materials.

Commissioner Habbab – I am supportive of the project.

Motion - Motion by Commissioner Russell – seconded by Commissioner Mitchell

Having considered the standards set forth within the City’s Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, I move to find that the proposed design for 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue is consistent with the Guidelines and compatible with the goals of this Entrance Corridor, and that the ERB approves the Certificate of Appropriateness application as submitted, with the following conditions of approval:

- Glass will be clear, at the locations noted in the staff report.
- New railings, if required, will match the metal rail at the podium terrace as presented in the application materials dated 12-22-2022.
- All interior and exterior lighting from the parking garage will have lamping that is dimmable, has a Color Temperature not exceeding 3,000K, and has a Color Rendering Index not less than 80, preferably not less than 90. Additionally, the owner or representative, will address any reasonable public complaints about light glare by either dimming the lamp, or replacing the lamps/fixtures or providing additional internal screening.
- Dumpsters and trash and/or recycling bins to be located within the garage and pulled to the curb only on collection days.
- If used for mechanical units, utility/service boxes, storage, trash containers, the Mech Equip area noted on sheet 44, at the west elevation, will be appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- Any ground-level mechanical equipment and/or utility boxes will be appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- Meters and panel boxes for utility, communications, and cable connections will be located preferably within the garage; if not, then in non-prominent locations on the side elevations only and appropriately screened. That screening will be subject to approval by design staff and must be memorialized as an amendment to the site plan.
- Stucco used on this site will be a durable synthetic material which is mechanically fastened over appropriate drainage mats with a code compliant water-resistant barrier.
- Bicycle runnels shall be provided as part of the multi-use path at the rear of the site.
- There will be no up-lighting of landscaping on the site.
- The number, size, type, and character of all plantings (trees, shrubs etc.) and the biofilter shall be installed and maintained in substantial accordance with the drawing: (include the title, date, and sheet of the appropriate drawing in the ERB package)

ii. Discussion – Zoning Ordinance Update

Commissioners were asked to provide feedback to assist in planning for the February 28, 2023 Work session on Module 1. They were provided with the following questions in advance of the meeting to consider as they began review of the Module 1 draft:

1. What have I been hearing from the community on the ZO materials?
2. Topics for in depth discussion for the Feb 28th Work Session
3. Questions for exploration at the Feb 28th discussion

Commissioner Mitchell

Asked for clarity on the affordable housing regulations and how the bonus works. It was clarified that all units on site would need to be affordable to gain the bonus. Module 2 will have the ordinance language that implements what is seen in the summary. He noted that this ordinance has the intent of decreasing the number of Special Permit (SUP) applications that come forward for review. What would be an example of something that would need to come forward for a SUP in the context of the draft code. Please provide intent language for each of the zoning district classifications.

Commissioner d’Oronzio

He has not heard much from the community at this point but knows of a few contractors who are reviewing. He is interested in the SUP information as well. Additional information needs to be provided on the sensitive area overlay. Current information is not clear. For the “sublot” concept, it would be helpful to have an example of how that can be built (staff noted that we continue to await legal guidance on the concept)

Commissioner Habbab

What will happen for site plans that are under review now but not ready for approval until after the ordinance is complete? It was noted that staff has provided this topic for legal guidance but that generally, if a project does not have an “approved governmental action” before the new code is approved, that the code in affect during approval would prevail. There is concern about those currently working on projects and the timing of completion.

The elevation determination needs further explanation. 2 feet as proposed concerns him as it is not clear if an accessible entry can be accomplished, and ramps are not always the best solution. This could also eliminate a design treatment that would allow for steps proceeding up and down.

Entrance requirements – Could the CODE building be built using the draft code?

If lots are combined for a development that have multiple zoning classifications, what would be required? It was noted that zoning down not follow lot lines. The applicant could work within with the regulations of both zoning classifications or chose to rezone the whole site.

Commissioner Russell

It would be helpful to “game out” examples – use realistic scenarios with the draft code to place the words into action. This should be done with different size lots in different neighborhoods. Clarity on the affordability bonus would be helpful. Does the height bonus provided in the code require stepbacks of the additional height? It was noted that may depend on the district and the transition section that will be released in Module 2 will address.

Commissioner Schwarz

His review remains underway. At this point he would like additional information on the lot parameters for sublots. Also, what would happen with setbacks on odd shaped lots?

Commissioner Stolzenberg

He has heard concern from the community about the prohibition of new driveways in the front yard. The idea of small commercial used in residential areas is good and having it be by SUP to start is ideal. The affordable housing provisions need discussion. He does not agree with all units needing to be affordable to obtain the bonus. There are concerns with the height reduction in the R-zones for the current and clarity is needed concerning feet/stories for height.

Commissioner Palmer

Expressed concern that some districts allow for unlimited units. It was clarified that minimum unit size would be addressed with building code requirements. The code notes 5 stories/72 feet as a height. How is that interpreted? It is anticipated that we will get inquiries about why one's property is zoned one way instead of another way.

Commissioner Russell

Would like to discuss the inclusionary zoning policies and it was noted that will be part of the Module two discussions. In addition, the "one pagers" have lots of information that we will want to have discussion. It was noted that this will be included in the Module 2 discussion as well.

Chair Solla-Yates

Expressed concern about the height regulations wanting to make sure that what is put in place is better than the current code. Would like there to be an option for stacked townhomes to become a viable option as part of this code for the community. There should be ways to address sloped sites that allow for development and preservation (example - consider parking under buildings). Would like infill development to match the current context (use of fine grain urbanism). Consideration for daycare uses should be made and it was clarified that there are allowances in most areas of the city that exceed today's allowances.

Commissioner Schwarz

He wanted to talk further about details in the zoning map. It appears there are some category issues one being concerning CX5 and CX8. Understanding on how "key intersections" are identified is needed.

Commissioner Russell

There is encouragement of adaptive reuse of structures but only in R-A. What about consideration for R-B and R-C? What is the reasoning for the current proposal? There needs to be further discussion on the inclusionary zoning. The language for implementing inclusionary zoning language will be in Module 2.

Commissioner Stolzenberg

For R-B and R-C, how would the bonus height allowance work with the inclusionary zoning code requirements? Mr. Freas noted the differences between the bonus height, bonus units and inclusionary zoning. This will be detailed further once the Module 2 materials are available.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:02 PM.