

**Crozet Community Advisory Council – Minutes
Monday, June 9, 2014 from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.**

CCAC Members Present: Meg Holden, Leslie Burns, Tom Loach (Planning Commission), David Stoner, George Barlow, Jennie More, Beth Bassett, Phil Best, Ann Mallek (Board of Supervisors), Mary Gallo

CCAC Members Absent: Kim Guenther, Matt Sposato, Janice Applebach, Brenda Plantz, John Savage

Public Attendees: Claudette Grant, Brian Wheeler, Matt Talhelm, Kelly Strickland, Bill Schrader, Brian Wheeler, Paul Grady, Trevor Henry, Dave Benish

Chair Meg Holden called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Meg noted that because this would be a short meeting, members should write down questions for the end or to discuss later. Meg began by asking Claudette Grant about the status of the County's review. Have the issues raised in the County's previous response to the submittal been addressed? Ms. Grant said that when we had last met in April she had sent the County's response to the applicant, Milestone Partners, and pointed out a number of issues, particularly as to the percentage of residential and employment/commercial uses on the site. In May, Milestone responded to the County's comments and those responses have been sent to the CCAC. In those responses, the applicant said that it expects to have residential uses in blocks 6, 7 and 8 and expanded mixed use residential in block 7. Little more detail was given. Another issue raised by the County was the community green, which is also in the Crozet Master Plan.

The applicant has proffered that 15% of the property will be allocated to a green or open space and 5% of that area would be allocated to the public green. There was some confusion whether this was intended to mean one-third or 5% of the 15% (the consensus being that it is one-third of the 15% or 5% of the entire area). Members also questioned whether this area would be "civic" space or open space. Although there appears to be a "green" area shown on the applicant's map, it is not clear if this is meant to be all of the green or open space, or whether there will be a community space (would or should that include areas for outdoor dining used by individual businesses?). None of this is shown on the map. Members indicated that they are still very interested in the public space as originally drawn, in the intersection in the road. Ms. Grant said that that is still a possibility, in addition to other open areas. The green space shown on the plan appears to be a stormwater area and the question was raised whether this could count toward the 15%. If the green area near the residential areas comprises 10% (i.e., two-thirds) of the open space, then the rest is in other blocks. Ms. Grant said that the applicant stated that at least 5% would be in Blocks 1-5.

Meg said that she was still not clear whether public spaces, such as for outdoor dining space, would be part of the "green" space and who would maintain it. Also, Leslie noted that the green area on the map, if used for stormwater management, would be not entirely usable as public space. Dave pointed out that there is no plaza in this plan, as had been depicted in an earlier version. He then asked Ms. Grant how much detail the CCAC should ask for. Ms. Grant said

that this can be handled in different ways and that sometimes the County asks for considerable detail, but in this case the County asked the applicant to back off the detail because at the site plan stage, many aspects can change, necessitating subsequent amendments. Tom said that he wanted more specificity to get more of a sense of the form of the development. He was also concerned that there was a backing off from mixed use and so he would like to see representative diagrams for forms that the developer could do. What would the commercial space look like? Kim C. said that we should make a statement to the Planning Commission as to our expectation. She thought it important to say that we need an area where people can gather, such as a plaza area in the commercial section. Perhaps we need not see exactly where it would be, but we clearly want that. Meg said that we need more confidence that this aspect of the project is going to happen. Ms. Grant said there are elements the County wants to see, especially the locations of the road and green space. The proffer does state generally that one-third of the open space (5% of the property) will be in the commercial block, but how will that be broken up?

Dave Benish pointed out that the zoning for the Downtown Crozet District (“DCD”) is form based. Certain rules, such as setbacks, are established by the zoning ordinance, but we do want the applicant to identify the key features recommended by the comprehensive plan because these are not defined by the zoning ordinance. Meg noted that the breakout of the commercial/residential space is not clear enough. Jennie asked about the ability to convert commercial to residential space. Mr. Benish said that the DCD is clear about residential uses on the second story, commercial on the first, but that the Special Use Permit process would allow for residential use on the first level. It was noted that there is a proffer that is a bit confusing, but says that 51% of the units in Blocks 4 and 5 will be the way the DCD requires (i.e., commercial on the first floor and residential above). Accordingly, 49% of the buildings in that block could be residential on the ground floor. Kim said that this means that all of Block 4 could be all-residential, and then have mixed use on the other side of road. Ms. Grant agreed, noting that this proffer could be divided any way that that the applicant wants. Kim asked whether the first floor could be changed later, and Ms. Grant replied that the applicant has not provided that much detail, but the design would be convertible.

Tom asked about the loss of Light Industrial space and whether the staff will take a position on the loss of LI here. It was noted that there are blocks that are strictly residential and that will limit the ability to convert these in the future. The 51% mixed use proffer is specific only to Blocks 4 and 5. Under the plan, Blocks 6, 7 and 8 would be allowed to be all residential. It was asked whether the DCD specifies mixed use in this area too, and Ms. Grant said that this area is intended to be first floor commercial too. If the SUP request is turned down, this area would have to have commercial use on the first floor. The applicant has the option in Blocks 4 and 5 to convert the first floor back to commercial, but the proposal is to have all of Blocks 6, 7 and 8 up to 100% residential. Jennie asked what percentage of land could be lost as to commercial uses and about the intent for the property. Phil said that it appears to him that 7 acres (out of about 21 acres) could be all residential. Tom asked if there has been input from Susan Stimart on the viability of the site for commercial and economic development. Is the site itself acceptable for potential commercial/employment uses? Does our economic development staff think this is a good commercial site? The comprehensive plan does support this site for office and retail, and Mr. Benish said that the County believes this use is appropriate. Tom followed up by asking what the market really is for commercial use in Crozet. It was noted that in the comprehensive

plan, every building has an employment purpose, except the residential buffer. But is this change to more residential use an accurate reflection of the market right now? Ann said that Ms. Stimart does send a number of potential commercial users to the property, and has been doing so for years. The east end of the tract, near Parkside, has been unmarketable over the last five years. There has been a call for a traffic study, but that is not available today. Meg noted that there is a balance between what can be done today against what might be realistic tomorrow. Mr. Benish said that it is assumed to be a 20 year plan, and it can be followed now and then balanced somewhat later as this comes to the fore over that timeframe. Meg asked Ms. Grant how this will change the Crozet Master Plan at the end, and how the Plan is being challenged now. She said that we need to look at the commitment to commercial uses versus residential, and the Plan is really focused on commercial uses. Should residential use remain a secondary use?

It was noted that the Plan is a guide and not set in stone and we need to decide how far, if at all, we should move away from the Plan. Leslie asked about this property as a block of land and percentages of it that could be devoted to particular uses. For instance, could the area from Block 7 back (to the east) be mixed use or LI because it is along the railroad tracks? No one wants trucks going through the neighborhood area. Does it make sense to leave that as commercial/mixed use space? Can it be changed back? Jennie noted that there could be some commercial development in Block 7.

Ms. Grant said that the next issue is the transportation and traffic study, which is complete and has been reviewed. Several concerns had been noted, including that traffic signals would be needed on Crozet Avenue.

Ms. Grant also said that there had been a proffer on a phasing plan. This proffer relates primarily to the road, but also pertains to development. The road would start at the easternmost portion and connect to Parkside Village. Would this become the main access for Parkside? There is a phasing plan for the road, and while the order in which it would be built is not stated, it is clear that the residential part will be built first. At first, one would only be to get in from Parkside. It was asked whether transportation issues effectively kill the proposal, as there are issues at Tabor Street and elsewhere. At this point there is no solution, but the phasing plan may address it until more improvements are made, particularly to enhance connectivity.

The engineering staff would like to see a stormwater assessment in order to know the impacts on stormwater and streams. This means that buffers may be needed in the residential area.

Ms. Grant noted some technical and substantive revisions that might be made to the proffers. No public parking is proffered but the DCD itself would provide for parking rules. Ann's understanding was that the applicant is providing parking that is required but that there may be more need. Ann said that that some flexibility is good because there may not be enough demand for commercial parking now, but that could change. The DCD allows those changes to occur in future.

Ms. Grant said that the applicant has been working with the Service Authority regarding water and sewer capacity. She said that there are some sewer capacity concerns in Crozet area and so

the Authority is discussing those with the applicant. If there is not enough capacity, the applicant may have to put in some more capacity. The issue is in transmission capability, not the treatment plant itself.

Tom asked if the applicant could proffer no single family in the residential area and whether he could proffer verticality? Could the CCAC ask for that? In the commercial area, the use must be at least two stories and Tom said that this may create more affordable housing options in Crozet. Tom believes that more specificity in the form is warranted because of loss of the 7 acres of mixed use space.

Kim asks about rental rates for affordable housing. It was explained that these would be capped for 5 years and after that it can go to market rents. It was noted that this was an improvement on the County's requirement, which only caps rent for the first occupant, after which market rates can apply.

Jennie asked Ms. Grant about the process. Ms. Grant said that the next packet will be the staff report, which will be their response to the applicant's May 5 letter. The report is directed to the Planning Commission and will come out in next few days.

Will the applicant pay proffers? Mr. Benish said that the staff will have comments on this issue, because the applicant has stated that the project cannot be done if cash proffers are required. Tom said that he understands that the proffer process might be under study now, and if that is so, perhaps the County can require the applicant to complete the road. The issue is whether the BOS wants to provide some reward for other things that the applicant does, such as in-kind improvements. The applicant has said that it cannot pay cash proffers and hopes that by implementing its plan it can satisfy the requirement. The County is struggling with figuring out the cash proffer policy for the DCD, given the mixed use element. What benefit should be given to the commercial uses in terms of proffers?

The CCAC will take up this topic at its meeting on Monday, June 16 at The Meadows in Crozet. Mr. Stoner has requested to be on the agenda and to make a presentation. It was suggested that members might give him their questions in advance in order to save time and be more efficient. Except for one other matter (a crosswalk issue), the meeting will focus entirely on this topic, and we would like to come up with a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Meg thanked Ms. Grant for taking the time to meet with the CCAC and the meeting adjourned at 3:13 p.m.

George W. Barlow, III
CCAC Secretary