



COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road, North Wing
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-4596

Phone (434) 296-5832

Fax (434) 972-4126

April 16, 2014

Frank R. Stoner
Milestone
300 2nd Street NE
Charlottesville, VA 22902

RE: ZMA201000018/Crozet Square and SP201400001/Barnes Lumber Redevelopment

Dear Frank:

Staff has reviewed your re-submittal for a rezoning from HI Heavy Industrial to DCD Downtown Crozet District and for a special use permit to allow up to 200 residential units of any authorized dwelling type in the DCD district under Section(s) 20B.2F 1, 2, 4, and 5 of zoning ordinance.

For quick reference, the following is a quick synopsis of the big outstanding issues that are complex, but in need of some level of resolution prior to public hearing:

- Commitment to percentage of employment vs. residential uses (CMP goal).
- Community green location and expectation (CMP goal).
- Transportation/TIA
- Phasing Plan needs clarification
- Engineering Comments (stormwater and stream)
- Proffers need technical and substantive revision.
- ACSA/RWSA comments

The details regarding these big issues are further discussed throughout this letter. Staff believes the other outstanding issues described in this letter are issues that can be resolved relatively quickly.

We have several questions and comments, which are listed below: Some of the previous comments remain for contextual reference with the items in red being revised comments. All other staff comments provided have been revised.

ZMA Comments:

Planning

The following comments are provided by Claudette Grant:

- The subject proposed development is located on a large parcel of land in the

Downtown Crozet area that is slated for redevelopment opportunities guided by the Crozet Master Plan (CMP). One of the primary recommendations for Downtown Crozet and in particular for this property in the CMP is that development includes a mixture of office, research and development (R&D), flex uses, retail, and service uses in redevelopment of the lumber yard property.

In review of the plan submitted, there is not a lot of information about the yellow area described as residential. It appears to be approximately half or 50% of the developable area of the subject property. The percentage of total land area in residential use per the CMP for downtown is intended to be a low to moderate density form, while the expectancy for the rest of the developable land area is for a significant portion of the development to provide employment, and other economic opportunities that are typically expected in a downtown area. Thus, per the CMP, residential and light industrial uses are secondary uses for this area. If the residential use is 50% or more of the proposed development this would reflect to some extent a lost opportunity for the non-residential mix of use recommended in the CMP for the downtown Crozet area.

Provide additional information that shows how this development will be a development with residential uses as secondary uses. For example, providing the percentage of land area or square feet for the various proposed uses within the development will help provide a comparison for primary and secondary uses. If the residential uses are the primary uses and not secondary, you need to explain and justify why you wish to make this development a primary residential use development, which is not the recommendation of the CMP for this property.

Proffer 2 has been added to address a commitment for non-residential uses on the ground floor spaces of buildings located within blocks 4 and 5 to be at least fifty-one percent (51%). This proffer also allows flexibility for buildings that include ground floor residential uses within blocks 4 and 5 to be constructed to be adaptable to non-residential uses in the future. However, there is no commitment provided for the percentage of mix of uses for blocks 6, 7 and 8. The separate land use and block densities table is not clear since there is no estimated square footage for commercial or residential provided for block 6. Currently, there is no guarantee that blocks 6, 7, and 8 could not all be developed with only residential uses. How do you plan to provide a full commitment to employment and other economic opportunities as primary uses and residential as a secondary use within this proposed development as recommended above and in the CMP?

- The DCD provides for flexibility and variety of development for retail, service, and civic uses with light industrial and residential uses as secondary uses. The regulations for the DCD are intended to promote a development form and character that is different from typical suburban development allowed by conventional zoning. Because the DCD District in many ways determines the form and character of development, in this particular case, we feel a conceptual plan can be a bubble plan. In addition to showing where the various development uses will be located (as you have shown in the legend with various color descriptions) the bubble plan should show important elements of the project, such as the general location of Main Street, major road connections, and the public green/plaza. As described in the CMP, Main Street includes on-street parking, medians, bike lanes, sidewalks, etc. these are important elements that

should also be noted on the plan (i.e. by showing the expected street cross section). The DCD regulation determines the form of development; therefore, showing details such as specific building locations, parking areas and travelways is a bit premature at this stage of the process and can be confusing since these details can change as you get into the site plan process. For example, identifying general areas for parking is good, but you do not need to show the specific parking lot with layout/design. As you can see by some of the staff comments in this letter, once these details are shown, staff reviews the plans accordingly. A good bubble plan can provide staff with enough general information about the proposed development without getting into a level of detail that may need to change later on.

The conceptual plan is now revised to address some of the staff recommendations per the staff comment letter dated February 26. The following remain outstanding issues that should be addressed: The location for the public green/plaza is no longer depicted on the conceptual plan. The community green is an important element that is recommended in the CMP. Although a proffer provides a commitment of 15% of the land within the property being set aside for green and civic spaces, a general location of the community green is not provided and the 15% is inclusive of a variety of options for green and open space as described in the proffer. While it is not necessary to know the specific details of the community green at this stage in the process, it is recommended that enough information is provided to ensure that the community green will be an appropriate area for the community.

- There are physical constraints regarding how this proposed development will tie in with the Square, in terms of road connections, parking and expectations for the connector road as shown on your plan. Per the comments from VDOT and Engineering (see page 4 and attachment of this letter for comments) provide additional clarification (narrative information) regarding how this proposed development will tie in with the Square and any additional information regarding your vision for this connection. See item 1 in the proffer section on pages 5 and 6 of this letter for a suggested use for the area near the square.

See attached comments from VDOT regarding this issue. This remains an outstanding issue with VDOT.

- To be clear of the intent, a note should be included on the Land Use and Block Density Chart that explains that it is for illustrative purposes only and is not being proffered with the conceptual plan.
- The plan provided shows an adjacent area for development (CSX property) within this proposal that you do not own. It is not recommended that you show development on property you do not own. However, the CSX property is designated for industrial types of uses. Also, the recommendation for the CSX property is an important one in the CMP for the downtown area. As a result, the uses proposed for the CSX property should be included in other portions of your site, particularly for the areas adjacent to the CSX property. We suggest the CSX property either be removed from this plan or if you wish to show it, you can note or delineate this area in a different way on the plan. Regarding the explanation in reference to being successful in negotiating a purchase agreement with CSX, and wanting to add the CSX site to the ZMA and SUP request, there should be a contingency plan in case negotiations for the CSX property take longer than anticipated. If possible, the contingency language should include a provision for

the CSX property that allows the property to be included in this ZMA and SUP requests should these legislative acts get approved, so that an amendment is not needed to include the CSX property at a later date.

- There are concerns with the Main Street road layout as shown. It appears to have on-street parking and a round-about. The Crozet Master Plan (CMP) shows a street section for an Avenue, which includes on-street parking, a median strip, bike lane, sidewalk and a landscape strip. Will the main road shown on the plan be able to accommodate this? If yes, explain how this is planned.

The CMP shows a typical section for an Avenue inclusive of a median strip. The revised street section shown on the conceptual plan does not include a median strip. The street section shown in the 2010 CMP was carried over from the 2004 CMP. There are many downtowns with streets that do not include median strips.

- Will this development be phased? If yes, please describe the phase plan. For example, are there specific blocks or areas that will be developed first? We suggest you use a block approach. It will be easier to follow and easier to reference as you develop proffers. A block approach is helpful for distinction purposes.

A phasing plan is provided in the proffers and in the response letter to staff. The phasing plan in the response letter to staff refers to the extension of Library Avenue from Point B to Point C and to the end of blocks 4 & 5 to Parkside Village. Is it to the end of blocks 4 & 5 or to Parkside Village? The phasing plan in the response letter also describes iii. The extension of library Avenue from point A to Bconstructed on or before issuance of the 26th building permit. It seems this should be phase I

The two phasing plans are not consistent with each other. Which plan do you wish to go by? The phasing plan described in the proffers is somewhat confusing. It is recommended that the phasing of Library Avenue be revised to be clearer. Is it possible to build Library Avenue all the way out in phase I?

- The concept for the community green is not clear. Is it public owned/dedicated, private, or a combination of both? Is the Downtown community green, the proposed plaza area? If yes, is this area intended for general public use or is it intended for use by private entities with restaurants, etc. It could also be an area that includes both types of users, but this is not clear. It seems the community green/plaza should be accessible to the community and not necessarily tied to a particular building or use. With block designations it is easier to reference and provide more possible flexible locations for a community green/plaza. Explain how the proposed plaza area will function as a public space with a road intersection going through the middle of it. It is difficult to visualize how this public space will work. What is the intent of the community green? And how will it function? See previous bullet two above for discussion on the community green.
- Previous plans for this development showed green space in the non-residential areas. This revised plan shows pocket parks primarily in the residential areas. Pocket parks and/or green space can be located in the non-residential portions of the development as well. It is encouraged and recommended in the CMP. Pocket parks are no longer shown on the revised plan. The revised proffer as discussed above in bullet two could possibly address this concern, but there is not enough information provided to be sure of this.
- With regards to parking, you have discussed some of your concerns in previous communications regarding the financial difficulty in providing structured parking

versus providing large amounts of surface parking, therefore, taking up space from potential development. Without knowing the specifics of the uses going into this development, it is somewhat difficult to determine how much parking will actually be needed. In trying to understand your concerns, are you trying to provide parking for a specific potential user? A variety of approaches could be considered: As in Stonefield, there is a larger schemed plan that is approved (i.e. future structured parking), but for a variety of reasons, the developer is not ready to develop to this form, so they are developing based on the current market (surface parking), and hopefully will be able to revisit the large plan when the timing is appropriate. Per the DCD, the details for the number of required parking spaces could come later in the process, unless there is a specific end result you wish to achieve now rather than later. Another approach could be similar to Stonefield in that you make a big picture plan and provide flexibility that allows you to build for the current market and increase what you provide when the appropriate density allows it.

Section 20B.4 of the Zoning Ordinance provides some options regarding required parking. Although there are a minimum number of parking spaces required, there is no maximum amount of required parking spaces. In developing this property we suggest you always keep the intent of the DCD in mind. Perhaps you have to initially develop for the current market (surface parking) and phase (structured parking) for the future, goals that are currently hard to reach, but could be easier as the market improves. This is a small downtown, surrounded by a fair amount of existing residential neighborhoods. The CMP envisions residents walking, and biking to the downtown as well. Providing multi-modal opportunities is also encouraged. *It is difficult to fully comment on your parking concerns without having all the details/information regarding your proposal. However, it is not necessary for us to have all the details at this time. Perhaps you are proposing to develop this property at a larger scale than is necessary. The need for 3 times the required parking appears that the commercial buildings proposed might be larger than the DCD intends, since the DCD describes parking for non-residential uses at one (1) space per one thousand (1,000) square feet of net floor area. The County does not currently have plans to provide a parking deck to the Crozet Library. The expectation for public parking at the library is that the parking is available for public use when the library is not in business operation.*

- It should be noted on the revised plan that all roads shown on the plan will be public.

Zoning

See the proffer section of this letter for comments related to zoning matters provided by Francis MacCall.

Engineering and Water Resources

See the attachment for comments related to engineering and water resources, which have been provided by Glenn Brooks. Staff has just received the traffic study for this proposed rezoning via electronic mail on April 15, 2014. Comments regarding the traffic study will not be expected for at least 4 weeks.

VDOT

See the attachment for comments related to transportation issues for the ZMA and SP, which have been provided by Troy Austin. Staff has just received the traffic study for this proposed rezoning via electronic mail on April 15, 2014. Comments regarding the traffic study will not be expected for at least 4 weeks.

Entrance Corridor

The following comments related to the Entrance Corridor Guidelines have been provided by Margaret Maliszewski:

- It is anticipated that the development will be inward oriented. Nevertheless, the elevations of buildings visible from the Three Notch'd Road and Crozet Avenue Entrance Corridors should not have a "back of building" appearance. The ARB will expect fully designed elevations with careful attention to materials, colors, details, proportions and the relative scale of buildings to each other. The applicant may find that a work session with the ARB could provide the needed guidance in this regard.
- Standard Entrance Corridor landscaping will be required and will be reviewed with the site plan. A landscape strip will be needed along the railroad side of the development, free of utilities and easements. Allow for utility-free planting area along all streets, parking areas, cul-de-sacs, hammerheads, etc. Note that the purpose of the Entrance Corridor overlay is to establish buildings that have an appropriate appearance, and to enhance the development with landscaping. It is not the intent of the EC overlay to use landscape screening to hide inappropriately designed development. In response to the applicant's question, there is no plan for TMP: 56A201J124.
- The Crozet Historic District was listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register on 9/20/2012 and in the National Register of Historic Places on 11/28/2012. This comment was originally made in response to a statement in the applicant's materials that the district was "proposed". There are no additional regulations related to the historic district. The designation is confirmation that the historic character of the area is significant, a factor also recognized in the Entrance Corridor overlay.

ASCA/RWSA

See the attachment for comments related to water and sewer services, which have been provided by Alexander Morrison.

Fire/Rescue

The following comments related to Fire/Rescue have been provided by Robbie Gilmer: There are no comments or objections to the rezoning.

Housing

The following comments related to housing/affordable housing have been provided by Ron White:

- We assume compliance with the affordable units would be based on approval of

site plans. The proffer language needs to be tighter than referring to "areas shown in yellow and purple" particularly since there are two purple areas (one dark and one lighter indicating future development). Also, it would be much clearer if the last sentence in proffer 4 stated that "The subsequent owner/builder shall create for-sale units with sales prices not exceeding sixty-five percent (65%) of the Virginia Housing Development Authority's maximum sales prices for first-time homebuyers and for-rent units with gross rents not to exceed Fair Market Rents as published by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development." The current proposal referencing 80% of area median income and PITI is often confusing. The alternative is to just state that the subsequent owner/builder shall create affordable units as described in A and B adding the definition of affordable in each of those sections.

Proffers

The following comments related to the proffers are provided by Claudette Grant:

1. For your reference, please see the following example for proffer language when a conceptual plan is proffered:

Pursuant to Section 33.3 of the Albemarle County Zoning Ordinance, the Owner hereby voluntarily proffers the conditions listed below which shall be applied to the Property if it is rezoned to the zoning district identified above. These conditions are proffered as a part of the requested rezoning and the Owner acknowledges that the conditions are reasonable.

1. Development and use shall be in general accord with the Plan titled "Sheet 2 of 2" prepared by Roudabush, Gale & Associates, Inc. dated February 1, 2013, and revised July 12, 2013 (hereafter the "Plan"), as determined by the Director of Planning and the Zoning Administrator. To be in general accord with the Plan, the development and use shall reflect the following major elements in the approximate location, number and extent as shown on the Plan:

- a. The Property shall not be divided into more than three (3) lots, including the Residue Lot 1 shown on the Plan.
- b. Existing sidewalk immediately adjacent to the proposed driveways for lots 2 & 3 will be maintained. If the sidewalk mentioned above is damaged during installation of said driveways then it will be repaired so as to provide safe and convenient access as determined by the Zoning Administrator.

Minor modifications to the Plan which do not conflict with the elements above may be made to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

2. For your reference, please see the following example for proffer language dealing with cash in lieu of affordable units:

A. 15% Affordable Requirement. The Owner shall provide a mixture of affordable housing units and cash in lieu of affordable housing units equivalent to fifteen percent (15%) of the total residential dwelling units within the Project (the "15% Affordable Requirement"). The affordable housing mixture shall be comprised as follows:

(i). The Owner shall provide affordable housing dwelling units equal to at least seven and one-half percent (7.5%) of the total residential dwelling units within the Project in the form of for-sale or for-lease affordable dwelling units as described in this paragraph 1 (the "Affordable Dwelling Units" or "Affordable Units"). The Affordable Dwelling Units shall be comprised of one or more of the following unit types: single-family attached housing (townhouses or duplexes), condominiums or single family detached units. The Owner or its successor in interest reserves the right to provide the Affordable Dwelling Units in a variety of ways, utilizing the above mentioned unit types alone or any combination.

(ii) In lieu of each additional affordable dwelling unit that would otherwise be required to meet the remainder of the 15% Affordable Requirement for affordable housing within the Project after the Owner has provided the Affordable Dwelling Units referenced in Paragraph 1(A)(i), the Owner shall make a cash

contribution to Albemarle County for the affordable housing program in the amount of Nineteen Thousand One Hundred Dollars (\$19,100) for each such unit (the "Affordable Housing Cash Proffer") as described herein. For example, if the total number of residential dwelling units within the Project is one hundred nine (109), 16 Affordable Units would be required to meet the 15% requirement. The Owner shall provide eight (8) Affordable Dwelling Units to satisfy the 7.5% requirement of paragraph 1A(i), and One Hundred Fifty-Two Thousand, Eight Hundred Dollars (\$152,800.00) (\$19,100 x 8) to satisfy the requirements of paragraph 1A(ii). Any unit for which the Affordable Housing Cash Proffer is contributed as provided herein shall count as an Affordable Dwelling Unit for purposes of this Paragraph 1, but as a market rate unit for purposes of Paragraph 2.

(iii). If the 15% Affordable Requirement has not already been satisfied as determined by the County pursuant to these proffers prior to the issuance of the building permits for each of buildings C, D, and H shown on the General Development Plan, the Owner shall either demonstrate to the County's satisfaction that at least 15% of the residential dwelling units in such building will be Affordable Dwelling Units, or the Owner shall pay the Affordable Housing Cash Proffer to the County in lieu of each Affordable Dwelling Unit that would otherwise be required to be paid to achieve the 15% Affordable Requirement for the building being permitted. Notwithstanding the foregoing, however, the Owner may "carry-over" or "bank" credits for affordable units in the event previously built buildings within the Project provided more than 15% Affordable Units, or in the event the Owner has paid the Affordable Housing Cash Proffer for an equivalent number of units ("Affordable Credits"). Any such additional Affordable Credits shall be allocated toward the fifteen percent (15%) minimum for the buildings that remain to be constructed of buildings C, D and H as shown on the General Development Plan.

3. The language in Proffer 1 (b.) referring to VDOT needs to be revised. What are Detail 1 and Detail 2 referring to?
4. The 15% allotted for affordable housing should be based on all the housing provided in the development, not just the housing provided in the special use permit. If you see this differently you should explain this. Residential use is a by-right use within the DCD. However, this is a rezoning request. This property is currently zoned HI, not DCD, and residential uses are allowed by special use permit in the HI district. It is not clear but appears you have separated the areas where affordable housing can take place. Please clarify this, as it could be difficult to enforce. The policy calls for 15% of all residential units in a development, not 15% of certain units. What determines the build out for this development? How do you know when you get to the 15%?
5. Proffer 4 B. (3) the first sentence has a typographical error "then then"
6. The County has a cash proffer policy that addresses impacts to the County's capital improvements pertaining to roads, public safety, libraries, schools and parks that would be impacted by the rezoning. All rezoning requests which intensify development of a property are reviewed for impacts to the public infrastructure. The County policy also requires that the owner of property that is rezoned for residential uses to provide cash proffers equivalent to the proportional value of the public facilities deemed necessary to serve the proposed development on the property. The Board will accept cash proffers for rezoning request that permit residential uses in accordance with the cash proffer policy. The Board may also accept cash, land or in-kind improvements in accordance with County and State law to address the impacts of the rezoning. You have indicated that you are not offering cash proffers for various reasons. The impacts of this proposal are considered. This remains an outstanding issue.

The following comment related to the proffers and zoning concerns have been provided by Francis MacCall:

1. Please verify the 16.64 acres for the rezoning (recorded plats). Our current records has the total for the two parcels being 18.703 not 16.64.
2. Refer to the Conceptual Plan as the Conceptual Plan throughout the proffers. There are some "Concept Plan" and "Barnes Lumber Conceptual Plan" references.

3. Start the proffers with the paragraph that starts as follows" The Conceptual Plan shall refer to that certain..." The second proffer should be what is shown as #1.
4. In Proffer #1 on the statement provided letter "b", it is suggested that the last sentence be worded something like this "This segment of Library Drive shall be completed at the earlier of either prior to the issuance of any final certificate of occupancy for any building in Block1 or prior to the issuance of any final certificate of occupancy for the twenty-sixth (26th) dwelling unit in Blocks 7 and 8." This is subject to County Attorney approval of final language.
5. There appear to be parts of Proffer #2 in the statement provided that should be a condition of the special use permit for the residential units and it seems that portions of proffer #2 could be a proffer. This will need to be vetted with the County Attorney to see what the most appropriate action will be. Staff anticipates the next proffer re-submittal going to the County Attorney for review and will pose this issue at that time.
6. Proffer #3 in the statement provided should remove the reference to Open Space and only have Green Space, civic space etc... It is suggested that the 15% be tracked by designating the same language as is in Proffer #4 regarding the tracking of affordable units with site plans and subdivisions. Knowing that we want this Green and Civic space spread out throughout the development this wording should be revised with how the County would like to see that broken down per area block of group of blocks.
7. Proffer #4 in the statement provided the first sentence should refer to blocks 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 not by the colors since all of the other proffers are referring to blocks.

SP

Planning

The following comments are provided by Claudette Grant:

- Staff will provide conditions for the special use permit.

Action after Receipt of Comment Letter

After you have read this letter, please take one of the actions below:

- (1) Resubmit in response to review comments on a Resubmittal Monday --
Schedule can be found at this address:
[http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/forms_center/departments/Community_Development/forms/schedules/Special Use Permit & Zoning Map Amendments Schedule.pdf](http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/forms_center/departments/Community_Development/forms/schedules/Special_Use_Permit_&_Zoning_Map_Amendments_Schedule.pdf)
- (2) Request indefinite deferral
- (3) Request that a Planning Commission public hearing date be set
- (4) Withdraw your application

If you choose to resubmit, please use the form provided with this letter.

Please feel free to contact me if you wish to meet or need additional information. My email address is cgrant@albemarle.org

Sincerely,



Claudette Grant

Senior Planner, Community Development

Enc: Engineering, VDOT, ACSA/RWSA Comments
Resubmittal Form



County of Albemarle
Department of Community Development

Memorandum

To: Claudette Grant, Senior Planner
From: Glenn Brooks, County Engineer
Date: 18 Jan 2011
Revision 1: 10 Mar 2011
Rev.2: 10 June 2011
Rev.3: 3 Apr 2012
Rev.4: 22 Jan 2014
Rev.5: 25 Mar 2014
Subject: Crozet Square (ZMA201000018)

revision 5;

The revised application plan has been reviewed. The following comments are offered for planning use;

1. The traffic issues are still unresolved, as noted in previous revisions. Without these issues resolved, and the accompanying off-site impacts and mitigation, no road layout can be recommended for approval.
2. A stream assessment has not been performed, as noted in revisions 2 and 1. Without this, the buffer must continue further west, as noted in revision 1 comment 10. The layout in the southeast corner of the site cannot be recommended for approval.
3. It does not appear that adequate planning for stormwater management has been done. More room may be needed even to meet current regulations. See revision 1 comment 3.
4. It is not recommended that the county approve dimensions on road sections with a rezoning. Plans are too preliminary to agree on widths. It is not clear what is meant by a shared travel lane.
5. Proposed proffer 1 references sections and details which were not found. Each of the phases needs to build on the other if they are to proceed in order. Library Avenue, the central connecting road, should be built completely regardless of phases, if it is the intention that phases can be built in any order. This would apply to any other necessary improvements such as off-site transportation improvements, or stormwater management.

revision 4;

The revised application plan has been reviewed. The following comments are offered for planning use;

1. The traffic issues are still unresolved, as noted in previous revisions. Without these issues resolved, and the accompanying off-site impacts and mitigation, no road layout can be recommended for approval.
2. A stream assessment has not been performed, as noted in revisions 2 and 1. Without this, the buffer must continue further west, as noted in revision 1 comment 10. The layout in the southeast corner of the site cannot be recommended for approval.
3. It does not appear that adequate planning for stormwater management has been done. More room may be needed even to meet current regulations. See revision 1 comment 3.
4. The plan needs to specify which roads are public.
5. The hard right turns for the roads serving the southern blocks, and The Square, do not meet geometric road requirements. These will not be acceptable.
6. T-turnarounds are not recommended. They end up as parking spaces for nearby units.

7. The 5-road intersection roundabout will require splitter islands and tighter dimensions on the southern side to maintain flow and lane widths.
8. It is not clear how the road sections apply when no median is shown on the layout.

revision 3;

This revision consisted only of a letter proposing changes to the rezoning and traffic study. The original traffic study reviewed by VDOT has not incorporated prior comments from VDOT. It is not considered an acceptable study until the VDOT comments are satisfactorily addressed. When those comments are resolved, this proposed letter amending the study and rezoning should address the following points;

- a. The study should be amended and the full study and results provided for VDOT and County review. This letter only included a brief table of results. It is not clear what road connections or other assumptions were used for the partially built phases.
- b. The phases referenced to be developed need to be defined in terms of development areas and blocks on the application plan.
- c. The phases referenced to be developed need to be defined in relation to street and intersection improvements.
- d. The phasing and plans need to be proffered in some manner that is easily enforceable. Using traffic trip data and future studies is not practical. The phases need to be defined in terms of square footage, certificates of occupancy, and areas on the plan.
- e. Physical improvements need to be in place to mitigate impacts from the development before it occurs. The letter proposes a scheme whereby improvements are built only after development and studies prove the impacts are already there.

revision 2;

The revised conceptual plan has been reviewed. As I understand it, only the conceptual plan counts. The sheet titled "application plan" is not actually an application plan, but only an exhibit provided for informational purposes, and irrelevant to zoning enforcement. As such, it has not been reviewed.

The conceptual plan itself appears acceptable, with a few minor concerns;

1. It is not clear the right-of-way would be acceptable with the corner of the railroad property as shown.
2. The islands in the right-in-right-out entrances are not recommended. Only a median really works to limit these movements.
3. Roadway parking on the inside of the curve may be a problem.

We await further information before finalizing review. Specifically, the traffic study and possible mitigating improvements are pending. Also, I have requested a professional assessment of the intermittent stream on the south side of the property to ascertain the extent of the Water Protection Ordinance stream buffer.

revision 1;

The new concept plan for Crozet Square has been reviewed. This plan is much more detailed than the last concept plan, but I am concerned that we have not yet seen a proffered plan. The substantial time and effort spent on possible concepts may be time wasted, if none of it is proffered, whenever we finally

receive the real application. Furthermore, it may be misleading to the public and to elected officials, if the plans they are shown are not to be implemented. So, as with the last submittal, a complete review is not possible until an actual application plan (not just a concept) is provided with the application.

1. The geometry of Main Street is much improved with this revision, but the number of entrances may be a difficulty with the VDOT standards, as was indicated by VDOT in preliminary meetings.
2. The road connecting Main Street to The Square should be a public road, as it will connect two public roads.
3. Rather than the complex notes on sheet 3, it would be more clear to provide a proffer to address stormwater management. It appears the intent is to provide stormwater quality treatment above the ordinance requirements, specifically to a 35-50% removal rate on-site. The re-use of water on-site, green roofs, and pervious pavers are also measures beyond ordinance requirements that could be proffered, but some quantitative commitment is needed. I think the applicant will find these measures over-ambitious during final construction plans, so specifying areas or having a proffered plan is essential. Stormwater detention and the pro-rated fee to Lickinghole Basin are required by ordinance, and should not be confused with commitments with the rezoning.
4. This concept revision incorporates the railroad property in the development. It would appear that an interim plan is needed, should the railroad property not be acquired. It is not clear how the circulation will function without this property, and they are not on the application as I understand it.
5. The circulation loop between buildings 13 to 15 utilizes the public road at one end. This needs to be revised. Plans should not include public roads in site parking circulation.
6. The drop-offs on the roadways should maintain minimum radii (12.5') so exiting and entering vehicles can stay within their lane.
7. It is noted that although the typical street sections show planting strips and street trees, most of the plan does not allow for them, instead placing sidewalks flush with the parking lane, or removing sidewalks to run closer to the property lines. Typical sections should be typical.
8. Should the property be subdivided in the future for buildings, or building and parking parcels, it will be difficult to establish which travelways are private streets for purposes of the subdivision ordinance, and how standards apply. It would be helpful to plan for any subdivisions or phasing with the rezoning.
9. The plan should clarify what parts of main-street have already been constructed, and where the applicant's improvements begin. This is also true to The Square.
10. Upon field inspection, it is evident that the stream and buffer actually continue further west. While stormwater management is allowed within the buffer according to the conditions of 17-320B, this plan appears to replace the stream and buffer with a developed landscape. The intent of the ordinance is that these facilities can enhance or help in the preservation of the stream, typically being placed at the edges of the buffer. In the words of the ordinance, "The facilities are designed and constructed so as to minimize impacts to the functional value of the stream buffer and to protect water quality." This also holds true for the walking paths and footbridges. The buildings and parking within the stream buffer

which extends further west will need to be moved, or an exception granted according to Water Protection Ordinance section 17-308.

11. The traffic study is still outstanding. Impacts to the surrounding road network and possible mitigation improvements are critical. Issues that have been raised in preliminary meetings are the proximity of signals at The Square and Meeting Street not meeting VDOT standards, and the amount of traffic to assume from future connections to the east.
12. There is currently an unpermitted stockpile on the site without any erosion control measures. From the topography, this appears to have happened in the past also. This current stockpile needs to be removed, or stabilized and permanently seeded.

Original comments of 18 Jan 2011;

The concept plan for Crozet Square has been reviewed. This is the only document received with the rezoning, so a complete review must wait until more comprehensive documentation is provided with the application. For purposes of discussion, I have provided below a layout of the plan on county mapping (*omitted with revision 1*).

1. The Main Street extension should avoid the hard left and rotation around the green space before continuing through to Hilltop Street. It is recommended that a design more closely adhering to the Crozet Master Plan be used, which calls for bike lanes, pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, street trees, a possible median, fewer access points to parking areas, etc.
2. The documents should clarify which roads are to be public roads.
3. The documents should provide preliminary sizing for stormwater management, and/or indicate what other measures will be used within the development.
4. A traffic study meeting the VDOT 527 guidelines appears to be required. A scoping meeting should be scheduled.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1601 Orange Road
Culpeper, Virginia 22701

Charles A. Kilpatrick, P.E.
Commissioner
March 27, 2014

Ms. Claudette Grant
Senior Planner
County of Albemarle
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Re: ZMA-2010-00018 Crozet Square
SP-2014-00001 Barnes Lumber Redevelopment

Dear Ms. Grant:

We have reviewed the rezoning request and special use permit request for Crozet Square/Barnes Lumber Redevelopment as submitted on March 17, 2014 and offer the following comments:

1. There are still concerns with the connection to The Square. The layout shown is essentially a 90° curve with a connection to a potential parking lot rather than a T-intersection. This alignment does not satisfy the minimum radius requirement.
2. It would seem that building the section of Library Avenue from point A to point B earlier in the process would be more of a benefit to the transportation in the area than when it is proposed to be built. There are concerns with the intersection of Crozet Avenue and The Square and High Street is a narrow side street and Library Avenue would better accommodate the increase in traffic in this area.
3. The on-street parking shown on the road cross section between points A and B is likely to create a conflict with the sight distance for the intersection. The parking will not be allowed in this location if it obstructs sight distance.
4. Per VDOT standards, the planting strip shown in the cross sections needs to be a minimum of 6' with the street trees being planted a minimum of 3' behind the back of curb.
5. The response letter indicates that the sewer line cannot be located outside of the paved surface due to the compact urban nature of commercial development. This submittal does not show the sewer line as previous submittals did, so for this review, this item has been addressed. However, manholes located within the paved surface create a long term maintenance issue for VDOT. We will look at this very closely during plan review to identify a design that minimizes maintenance problems for VDOT.
6. Review of the updated TIA should occur prior to the requests being considered by the Planning Commission.

If you need additional information concerning this project, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Troy Austin".

Troy Austin, P.E.
Area Land Use Engineer
Culpeper District

WE KEEP VIRGINIA MOVING

Claudette Grant

From: Alex Morrison [amorrison@serviceauthority.org]
Sent: Monday, April 14, 2014 10:34 AM
To: Claudette Grant
Cc: vfort@rivanna.org
Subject: ZMA2010018: Crozet Square

Claudette,

The ACSA has received the above referenced ZMA resubmittal. The ACSA and RWSA have discussed the application. The following comments represent the reviews by the ACSA and RWSA:

General Information:

- Currently there are capacity limitations in the public wastewater infrastructure serving the Crozet area.
- The ACSA and RWSA are working towards a reduction in I&I within the Crozet public wastewater system.
- The ACSA and RWSA have scheduled the "Crozet FEB Study" to begin in fiscal year 2015.
- The Crozet public wastewater infrastructure will be upgraded, when applicable, through developer participation and/or a special rate district.
- RWSA Capacity Certification will be required for this development. This is a requirement of any development within the Crozet service area. The ACSA will submit the application during review of the final site plan.
- The ACSA does not reserve capacity within the water or wastewater system. Water and wastewater is provided on a first come first serve basis which is designated as the "application for service."
- A valid building permit for the building being served and full payment of the connection fees for the building being served is required to submit an "application for service."

Response Letter (3/17/14):

- Section RWSA and ACSA (a)
 - The ACSA does not reserve water and wastewater capacity. The ACSA cannot confirm water and wastewater capacity for a 10 year build-out. Refer to the information provided under "general information." The ACSA and RWSA are working towards increasing capacity in the Crozet Wastewater infrastructure. This is being accomplished through I&I reduction. In addition, an "FEB Study" will begin during fiscal year 2015. The results of this study will be implemented, when applicable, through developer participation and/or a special rate district.

Application Narratives:

- Water & Sewer
 - The ACSA and RWSA are working towards increasing the capacity within the Crozet Wastewater Infrastructure. This will be accomplished through a schedule determined by the ACSA and RWSA. Certain items required to be constructed will be funded through developer participation and/or a special rate district.
 - Revise the paragraph to better reflect comments provided by the ACSA and RWSA.
- Public Facilities, Services and General Infrastructure
 - The ACSA and RWSA are working towards increasing the capacity within the Crozet Wastewater Infrastructure. This will be accomplished through a schedule determined by the ACSA and RWSA. Certain items required to be constructed will be funded through developer participation and/or a special rate district.
 - Revise the paragraph to better reflect comments provided by the ACSA and RWSA.

The comments provided above are for use by the applicant to revise certain sections pertaining to water and wastewater infrastructure. The applicant should understand the goals of the ACSA and RWSA to increase the capacity

within the Crozet Wastewater Infrastructure. The applicant should also understand that certain items required to meet these goals will be funded through developer participation and/or a special rate district.

Feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns that you may have. Thank you.

Alexander J. Morrison, EIT
Civil Engineer

Albemarle County Service Authority
168 Spotnap Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22911
(O) 434-977-4511 Ext. 116
(F) 434-979-0698

Fee Amount \$

Date Paid

By who?

Receipt #

CL#

By

Resubmittal of information for Special Use Permit or Zoning Map Amendment



PROJECT NUMBER: LMA2010-00018/
SP2014 00001

PROJECT NAME: Croft Square/Barnes Lumber Redevelopment

☒ Resubmittal Fee is Required

☐ Per Request

☐ Resubmittal Fee is Not Required

Claudette Grant

Community Development Project Coordinator

Name of Applicant

Phone Number

Claudette Grant

Signature

4/16/14

Date

Signature

Date

FEES

Resubmittal fees for Special Use Permit -- original Special Use Permit fee of \$1,000	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$500
Resubmittal fees for original Special Use Permit fee of \$2,000	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,000
Resubmittal fees for original Zoning Map Amendment fee of \$2,500	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,250
Resubmittal fees for original Zoning Map Amendment fee of \$3,500	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,750
<input type="checkbox"/> Deferral of scheduled public hearing at applicant's request -- Add'l notice fees will be required	\$180

To be paid after staff review for public notice:

Most applications for Special Use Permits and Zoning Map Amendment require at least one public hearing by the Planning Commission and one public hearing by the Board of Supervisors. Virginia State Code requires that notice for public hearings be made by publishing a legal advertisement in the newspaper and by mailing letters to adjacent property owners. Therefore, at least two fees for public notice are required before a Zoning Map Amendment may be heard by the Board of Supervisors. The total fee for public notice will be provided to the applicant after the final cost is determined and must be paid before the application is heard by a public body.

MAKE CHECKS TO COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE/PAYMENT AT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COUNTER

➤ Preparing and mailing or delivering up to fifty (50) notices	\$200 + actual cost of first-class postage
➤ Preparing and mailing or delivering each notice after fifty (50)	\$1.00 for each additional notice + actual cost of first-class postage
➤ Legal advertisement (published twice in the newspaper for each public hearing)	Actual cost (minimum of \$280 for total of 4 publications)

