

**Crozet Community Advisory Council – Special Meeting – Minutes**  
**Thursday, June 26, 2014 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.**

**CCAC members present:** Meg Holden (Chair), Jennie More (Vice Chair), Phil Best, David Stoner, Mary Gallo, Brenda Plantz, Kim Connolly, Janice Applebach, Beth Bassett, Tom Loach (Planning Commission), Ann Mallek (Board of Supervisors), George Barlow

**CCAC members absent:** Matthew Sposato, Leslie Burns, Kim Guenther

**Public attendees:** Marybeth Cerrone, Paul Grady, Dale Castle, Rob Tabor, Bill Schrader, Lisa Goehler, Jim Duncan, Amy Vu, Tim Tolson, Cliff Fox, Brian Wheeler

CCAC Chair Meg Holden called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m., welcomed our visitors, and noted that the Barnes Lumber property matter was the only item on the agenda for this special meeting.

A. Other matters raised by members:

1. Meg said that the chair of the Rivanna Community Advisory Council contacted her about possibly having the Board of Supervisors provide more time (perhaps ten minutes) at their meetings for CACs to speak. Meg said that she was concerned that if additional time were granted to CACs (which are advisory bodies only), then other groups might ask for more time too. It is also possible under the present system for multiple CAC members to speak at a BOS meeting, and it may be less effective if only one person from a CAC was able to speak. Meg said that Heather Stokes from Places 29 seemed to be in agreement with Meg's thinking on this. John Savage said that when the Crozet Library was being discussed many people were able to speak on the issue and the sheer numbers were effective in making the point to the BOS. Further, comments can be coordinated among speakers to reinforce a point. Meg asked for more discussion. Other members agreed. John Savage moved that sense of this CAC is that the current rule of three minutes per speaker is adequate and gives the speaker enough time to make a point. Barlow seconded, and the CCAC agreed unanimously. Meg will communicate the sense of the CCAC to the other CACs.

2. Jennie More raised a question about communication among the CCAC and particularly the email groups that we have and the purposes for them. There is the Crozet CAC Google group, to which members can post messages, all of which are subject to the Freedom of Information Act. We also have the CCAC-Notify group to which non-members can subscribe and which receives information from the secretary. The County also has a CCAC email list that they use to disseminate information. Jennie said that there is a public link on the CCAC Google group and that anyone can click on this to view all the correspondence, including draft resolutions, minutes, etc. So items sent to the CCAC Google group will be posted there and are open to the public. Jennie asked the group whether we should have a more private group for housekeeping matters, and have the public group too. We do need to pass along as much as possible. Members of the CCAC and visitors discussed the various options to have public and nominally private communications among CCAC members, and perhaps limiting to officers those who could post material to certain groups. Although certainly accessible under FOIA,

should housekeeping information automatically be disseminated publicly? The two existing groups were set up 3-4 years ago and the CCAC-Notify is always public and the archive is searchable. The group is now private until the CCAC decides what to do, but all the content is still there. Ann noted that each member's application to join the CCAC is a public document, which can be reviewed at the County Office Building (but are also in the Board packet for the relevant meeting where the member was elected and so electronically available that way). A lengthy discussion ensued regarding what is better for the CCAC and public. Kim Guenther made a motion to keep all emails publicly accessible, with CCAC-Notify items to be forwarded. Phil Best said that we should simply keep things the way that they are now (that is, with the CrozetCAC group being publicly available). Accordingly no motion was needed to keep the status quo and Kim withdrew her motion. It was recommended that items be sent to the CCAC-Notify group as much as possible.

B. Barnes Lumber Property issues: Meg reported that she and Jennie had a productive meeting with Wayne Cilimberg, Claudette Grant, Dave Benish, and Frank Stoner (of Milestone Partners). At the meeting, a couple of things (parking and VDOT issues, which are not going away but really cannot be solved regardless of who the developer is) were taken off of the table so that they could talk about what is more important. Parking and access are nonetheless being looked at by the County, and will evolve over time. They did not talk about proffers, but did discuss the key issues of residential use (the amount and timing) and green space. In particular, it was noted that the green space is based on the purchase of another piece of property from Mr. Conley. [In these minutes "green" can refer to green space generally, or the public green or commons that is part of the development.] They were supportive of this idea (the property has a wonderful view of the mountains), but pointed out that the CCAC cannot support a plan based on that, and so asked for an alternative. Mr. Stoner sent Meg an image of a possible alternative. The residential use discussion was circular, but Meg said that she noted, as a representative of this body, that the yellow blocks shown on the proposal map are more residential use than the CCAC wanted to see, and that this was a significant issue for the CCAC. Meg said that Mr. Stoner seemed willing to look at other ideas.

We have also learned that another landowner has been approved for an apartment building, with approved HUD financing, and that another such building is unlikely to be approved for five years. It would be good to move this use to the Barnes site. In the meeting, reference was made to the Piedmont Housing Alliance project on Blue Ridge Street, which might be moving forward. There are also three others close to the downtown zone. Apparently HUD financing is critical to any such project because they are looking at 80% alternative mortgage instrument (AMI) financing and banks will not make loans for buildings with so many of those. Jennie said that residential use will lead the project so he can build the road, but we know that is a concern. Mr. Stoner had said that it is difficult to get a builder to commit to build these projects unless they contain a certain number of multifamily units. Concern was also expressed about the amount of green space on the other Conley tract (to be purchased later). There is potential to have mixed use buildings on that property too, but this part of the plan needs to be revised so that he is not showing activity on property that he does not own. Mr. Stoner is looking to allocate the green space elsewhere on the Barnes Tract for purposes of the plan, but he will move the green space back to the Conley parcel if he buys it.

The County does not believe that Mr. Stoner's idea to start with residential on the ground floor and later convert to commercial is workable. So, Mr. Stoner wants guidance from the County about what it will support. The County is still concerned about the large residential component to the development and so Milestone will go back to the drawing board to see what they can do to meet the County's concerns. Jennie said that the key VDOT study is not working well for him, and it likely will not be complete anytime soon. It is unlikely that any developer would be able to work this out with VDOT, and so this piece cannot be solved now. Milestone must have comments to the County by July 7 and then the matter goes back to the Planning Commission on August 19. Milestone wanted to get to the August 5 Planning Commission meeting because of financing contingencies in the contract to buy the property, but with this schedule, the it is more likely that they will have to go to the meeting on the 19th. This will put them before the Board of Supervisors in October, which will be a problem for Milestone (Ann thinks their purchase contract expires at the end of September). On the transportation side, Ann said that it is her understanding that the road system as it exists now is adequate for the master plan, but that VDOT is looking 20 years out for improvements to be made. VDOT has done some modeling for the eastern portion. Ann likes idea to remove residential use on Block 4, and noted that residential use will not be allowed by CSX on the parcel that would come from the railroad anyway. Wayne Cilimberg had pushed for Block 5 to be apartments with first floor residential. This space would be refocused with a different image. Mr. Stoner does understand that the west end needs to come first and Ann said that we need consider that. Dave asked about process and what we need to do before the resubmittal on the 7th. Meg says that Mr. Stoner wants to start with the business construction on the west end at the same time as he starts residential work on the east end, and that the primary issue is on the Parkside boundary and the transition there.

Meg read from an e-mail that Leslie had sent shortly before the meeting. Leslie said that if Milestone drafts its plan so reflect what Mr. Stoner presented at the last meeting, she would support that. However, she was concerned that VDOT might not approve the European plaza as depicted in the plan, and if the Conley lot is not available, then Milestone will need to provide an alternative for the public green in the development. Leslie wants Block 7 to be commercial and not residential, and she wants the development to move in the direction of being a downtown. Meg said that they have indeed asked Milestone to come up with alternatives to the green if Leslie's concerns are realized. She said that she thought he was thinking about accommodating this concern by moving the green to the front on the square.

The CCAC then went around the table allowing each member to comment.

Beth Bassett said that she felt positive about the last meeting with Mr. Stoner, but wants more concrete commitments as to what Milestone intends to do. Beth had done some quick calculations and found that 19% of the area would be single family and that needs to be reduced. She is also concerned about the green space on the Conley tract and the traffic issue. Beth said that cash proffers need to be made to support our schools; we are paying higher taxes now, and she feels that proffers need to be used to offset the costs of having a larger population in Crozet. She said that the County should be cautious about proffers, and not take them completely off the table. Perhaps Milestone could come up with less traditional proffers, but direct them to benefit the western feeder schools. She remains optimistic about the plan.

John Savage said that staging of the project would be a concern and that he did not want to see a great deal of residential construction with a minimum of commercial space. John referenced the old Martha Jefferson hospital site as an example of the kind of redevelopment we want in Crozet. It should be staged in a way that the commercial use can be well preserved and set aside so that the whole property does not become too residentially dense. John added that traffic and parking are significant concerns too.

Phil Best said that he agrees with David Stoner's list of issues. As for the residential-commercial issues, Phil said that if the perimeter is devoted to housing, the homes could all be multiple unit houses and not have four stages of buffer. Phil does not want any single family detached homes in the development; all should be multi-family units. This would allow the same number of housing units in less space. He is also concerned about phasing and wants to be sure the west end near the Square gets completed. On traffic and parking issues, Phil noted that more cars can be parked along the curb if they face in and not be parallel, and so this should be done throughout the property.

Kim Connolly said that she had met with Mr. Stoner last Friday to get clarification on several items. Kim said that Mr. Stoner had asked for more specific suggestions to work on incorporating into the plan. Kim observed that this will be a 10-15 year project, and that while Crozet will grow, it will remain a small town. She does not believe that we can support 400,000 square feet of commercial space in Crozet, and that the area must grow organically. The more attractive the features are, the more the area will grow over the long term. She says that we do need the green and she would like to see a business incubator with County incentives for businesses to locate there. This will draw other businesses. A developer cannot guarantee that businesses will come; it can only make it an attractive place to be. She thought the space might be able to support a collaborative work space for home workers and others that need a meeting space. But, this is a very hard site to develop because of parking and access. So, the CCAC needs to advocate for the railroad underpass on the east end and for the parking structure at least five years down the road, after some commercial development has occurred. Parking lots could work for the time being, and as the project grows, it would be necessary to advocate for other solutions. Kim did not like the idea of a parking deck adjacent to the library. She reminded the Council that the residential areas do include multifamily residences, such as the units above commercial space and other types of multi-family residences. She said that Mr. Stoner does seem to want to construct the residential and commercial spaces simultaneously. Kim agreed with Leslie that the use of Block 7 should change to mixed use residential, or he could put commercial space by the railroad tracks and mixed use closer to the road because people likely will not want to live near the tracks. She also said that two hundred residential units do seem like a lot, and that no other development in Crozet is that large. She would like to see a lower number of residences and a larger community space and green. Kim said that Milestone might consider age restricted units too, for aging in place. This would help to take pressure off of schools, and John agreed that there is demand for this (noting that he now lives in an age-restricted community in Crozet).

Janice Applebach said that phasing is also the key for her, such that the commercial west end is kept in synch with the residential development. She understood Mr. Stoner's point that

other property that is already zoned Downtown Crozet District will not have to pay proffers. But Mr. Conley (the prior owner) had elected not to be zoned DCD. Ann said that it is critical for the County that the connector street be built. Janice agreed that this development will impact the schools. She agreed with Kim C. and John that age-restricted development would be good.

Brenda Plantz said that she comes at this from the point of view of a business owner on the Square. She noted that the plan is short on stormwater management, and likely would impact businesses on the Square. Repairs are problematic on the Square because the businesses do not own the sidewalks in front of them. Speeding through the Square has become a problem now, with the lumber company gone. The Square needs to be fixed as part of this project, and we are still a disconnected town with no green space.

Mary Gallo said that she agrees with the green space concerns. She does want to allow a residential buffer along the boundary, but sees the need for attached homes along there. Mary said that we need to get the right commercial footage in there. She agreed with Susan Stimart's comment that it is difficult to get commercial uses in a development after the residential has been built. We should also think about employment opportunities to come, noting that retail follows rooftops, but we do not want to see just retail in the commercial spaces. Service companies tend to be more interested in the area's work force and not rooftops. Mary thought that it is possible to have a real buffer for the existing neighborhoods without using detached single family. She would also like to know more about the street layout to see the proposed roads and have some idea what the internal movement is. Meg said that the plan she and Jennie saw when they met with Mr. Stoner had more roads than in the plan he had originally presented to the CCAC and so she thought that this would change.

George Barlow agreed that phasing the residential and commercial uses was critical to the build out, and was supportive of detached single family uses along the buffers.

Tom Loach said that the CCAC should think about these issues as potential proffers from the developer. He noted that everyone wants reduced residential use in the plan, and that it was not that long ago that the community fought for a growth target of less than 20,000. The plan for the property is to be a business center for the area. He did agree that age-restricted (over 55) housing makes sense because of what it does for the community. As to proffers, he spoke with Dave Benish, and based on the minimum and maximum numbers of residential units in the site plan, the proffer amount could total between \$1.2 million and \$4 million. If we request proffers in these amounts and County applies them, we could ask for the proffers to be directed to a community project. He could also make proffers on the parking or a park. Tom said that creation of jobs was critical for this site (which had been a source of employment for 80 years), noting that there are often comments at the firehouse about the need for more jobs in the area. Tom said that he does not believe that the current plan meets the letter or spirit of the Downtown District. He wants to see more changes to the plan, but what does the community want?

David Stoner has provided a core set of topics to talk about and Meg said that she would like to move through Dave's list of issues, noting that we likely need to meet next Wednesday (July 2). Mr. Stoner is not available next week. Jennie said that she thought we would have more information from Milestone tonight, but Mr. Stoner is out of town, although we understand

that they are working on changes. The deadline for resubmission is July 7 and Meg hoped that he would have something from us by the 5<sup>th</sup>. The County will have to make a staff recommendation based on that but there won't be time to go back to Milestone. Proffers will have to be put together and circulated. If the CCAC meets, it will be on July 2 at the Field School.

Kim said that she would like to get back to him as of tonight, giving him a list of what to concentrate on. Meg said that she would like one more chance to see what he has. Phil asked if we need to do anything, since Milestone knows our concerns. Jennie says that Mr. Stoner asked for more specificity, and Tom said that we could address proffers. Dave agrees. Kim says that Block 7 should be not residential, and changes need to be made to Block 4. Kim asked about proffers for residential and Tom said that a lot of this is up to the developer depending on the form the developer wants to follow. For proffers, Tom said that one potential proffer could be that no cash proffer would be required on any residential above commercial units.

Dave Stoner reviewed the list of issues he had prepared. His view is that it is good to see this type of development, but we struggle with the degree of residential use, which the developer is using to pay for infrastructure. We need some flexibility to allow him to pay for that, but how will we deal with the 200 units? Should this be a different number? Dave is more concerned about detached single family use and where it will be. Dave suggested that we seek to add more limitations on those places where Milestone proffers 51% of the block being first floor residential. This limitation would help the phasing. Lastly, Dave likes Tom's suggestion for proffers, where we would tie uses (such as commercial) to things that benefit the site, such as items that the County would provide. For instance, proffers could be waived on "over 55" housing. Dave does not like the idea of saying that the developer will not pay proffers because it is building a road. Should the proffers go to something in the Capital Improvement Plan? Should he proffer some square footage of green space or plaza? It was noted that the views make Crozet special and so proffers could be used to protect that feature, particularly from the plaza area. Ann said that Mr. Stoner had said this and it is why he wants the Conley tract; Dave feels like the view should be protected across the whole tract. Ann says the west end should clearly take that into consideration. Tom said that he likes Blocks 4 and 5 being commercial and mixed use rather than the proposed site plan that allows convertible residential. Dave said that he wants Milestone to have some first floor residential and that Block 5 would be a better apartment location. Jennie is very worried about having a solid phasing plan and does not think that this property should essentially be a neighborhood. She also wants more specificity about the green space. Ann said that he does have proffers now and the issue is the amount. Tom says that he is OK with negotiating proffers if there is a benefit to the community. Kim agrees with incentivizing certain housing types with proffers.

Meg said that she wants to preserve the community's desires, but also wants to see something happen at this space.

Ann said that people have asked why she does not weigh in on these issues, and she explained that it is because she wants to answer questions and let us know the facts she knows, but she sees her primary role as to listen. She remains concerned about the need to use detached single family on the border as a buffer to the other neighborhoods. She said that stormwater

must be dealt with but the green area may need to move west because of topography. This change may take the place of some buffering of houses, but this would be a compromise; if there is a large enough area to pull improvements back from the property boundary, the neighbors may accept that. Ann understood that when the DCD was adopted, high density development was going to be an issue for adjoining landowners and so it would be necessary to provide buffers for the more dense areas. Not everyone agrees on the benefits of these different forms of development. Phil wants to push harder for Milestone to adhere to the Master Plan. Kim thinks it would be a good idea to waive proffers for units that are residential over commercial and reduce or waive them for age-restricted housing. Ann says that the proffer discussion will happen throughout the summer and she would like to see a recommendation from this group to lead this discussion.

With respect to proffers, several CCAC members preferred the third option on Dave's list of issues, which would require them for detached single family, but we would consider waiving or reducing them for certain uses, such as mixed use residential over commercial, age-restricted housing, and that proffer funds be directed to identified community projects, such as a parking deck or a road link under the railroad. It was also suggested that we incorporate the Square and consider improvements to the Square as an entrance to the project.

It was also thought that we should keep traffic and parking requests simple because these issues are not all within the developer's control and are not unique to Milestone's plan. In particular, VDOT may oppose Milestone's vision for the plaza space and hardscaping there.

Paul Grady commented that he did not think there should be any single family detached in the development, but he had no problem with 200 units overall (i.e., multifamily, and this includes residences above commercial uses and so it is not that large a number for a parcel this size). He said that the project needs to be walkable. He noted that condominiums could also be used over commercial spaces. Paul recommended incentives for certain activities, such as allowing another floor in return for underground parking, assisted living, or a hotel. He agreed that perpendicular parking is good, especially on Oak Street, and said that we should not be afraid of taller buildings, and to give incentives to do that. He knows of two businesses soon to close, and so it likely will be hard to attract businesses. Tom noted that light industrial is still allowed on the property, which should help.

Tim Tolson passed around Katurah Roell's plan that was put forward in 2010 (and this process is essentially an amendment to his plan). Mr. Roell's proposal has a grid road plan and this makes it workable as a downtown area. Tim said that the CCAC minutes from that time are accessible and you can see what was talked about with downtown zoning for this property. Tom said it was helpful to see this and asked if this makes the uses on the property more marketable.

The Council discussed whether to limit or prohibit detached single family use. Meg wants to limit this use to the area adjacent to Parkside. Rather than limit the number of residences, she recommends allowing this use in a particular area, such as only in the easternmost areas of Blocks 7 and 8. However, this area, and the number of residences there, could be impacted by required stream buffers if required by the stream study. Cliff Fox noted that residential is permitted by right in the DCD if it is above a commercial use, and that the

CCAC should be careful of allowing detached single family residential without considering the long term impact on the community. But how much commercial space can Crozet handle? Cliff said that we have lost 850,000 square feet of commercial space with the loss of Fortune Brands and others. This plan takes a resource that is currently static and makes it one that costs the community, as the residential uses are not likely revert to commercial. That said, Cliff noted that a good example of adaptive reuse is the cold storage facility, which went from commercial to residential.

Dave asked what is enough commercial? Bill Schrader commented that we seem to be trying to help Milestone quite a bit, but last year we refused to fix an issue last year for an individual homeowner. There are many single family homes approved to be built in Crozet; why should we add to these? Meg and Jennie noted that we might not be able to come to agreement on all of this.

We then discussed the special use permit and whether this was something that would be addressed with Milestone. Tom said he had agreed to the zoning text amendment (allowing first floor residential by special use permit) to permit such uses along the buffer, and agrees with Ann that such housing might be appropriate along the buffer. However, Tom does see this as a compromise with the developer and that it likely benefits the developer more than the community. What are the tradeoffs for the single family uses?

Phil said that he is not ready to make a recommendation based on the current plan and that Milestone knows what CCAC wants. Meg remains concerned about more development on Route 250 and in Old Trail; she does not want to lose an opportunity with the Barnes property that will give other areas an advantage. Cliff Fox said that there are issues with the DCD ordinance that need to be fixed legislatively.

Phil said that we prefer that there be no single family detached, but perhaps we could have them along the buffers. This would be the buffer as shown in the master plan. Nonetheless the focus of the property should not be residential. Phil would prefer that first floor residential be located in the buffer.

Cliff said that flexibility is needed in apartment complexes to have residential on the first floor, and that the economics of the project often will not support all commercial on the first floor (two CCAC members confirmed that combination financing is a problem). He also explained that an 80 to 150 unit building, with parking, will require about six acres. The CCAC then engaged in a lengthy discussion as to what it wants for the space and what is realistic. How much should be commercial? It was again pointed out that the plan as proposed varies from the Master Plan and requires some residential construction to fund infrastructure. Ann commented that there are uncertainties with this project. How much flexibility do we want to give?

It was recommended that we report to the applicant that half of the CCAC wants little to no single family detached on the property and that the CCAC wants to see some level of commercial construction on the west side before allowing significant residential construction. If residential use is indeed part of the plan, we should require a written commitment for phasing of commercial construction to happen with residential development. Because there are still

elements of the plan we have not seen, we would like to see more details. The County staff should see these recommendations, but we need to be clear that there were several views expressed.

The CCAC would also like to see more green space than presently allocated, but with the plan we have seen, we do not think it is acceptable to rely on the purchase of the adjacent Conley property for this. The same amount of area should be provided in an adjacent location in case the Conley purchase does not occur. Further, the community green space needs to be usable and not just the detention pond. We would also like to include Dave's point number five on the viewshed, and also mention the hardscape plaza.

A revision to these points will be distributed but members were asked not to discuss this by e-mail. We will plan to meet on July 2 at the Field School.

The meeting adjourned at 10:44 p.m.

George Barlow  
Secretary