

Andy Reitelbach

From: Sara Robinson <s.robinson3162@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2022 11:09 AM
To: kelsey@shimp-engineering.com
Cc: Andy Reitelbach; Cameron Langille; William McCauley
Subject: Riverside Village Block 1 amendment

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Greetings, Ms. Schlein

I am Sara Robinson, homeowner at 1623 Riverwalk Xing. My spouse and I are the September Hill Trusts you have in your contact list of residents.

We are one of the early homebuilders here and I have been fortunate to have previously served as President of the Riverside Village Community Homeowners Association as well as a former member of the Pantops CAC.

We have received your letter with the proposed amendment described and your invitation to share comments and questions.

Here are my comments/questions:

1. Is it accurate to assume the change only involves the current non-improved spaces? Not the already-commercial developed spaces at the buildings' ends?
2. What effect, if any, will the development of the residential properties have on the current StormWater Management System? Currently there is a percentage responsibility attached to Block 1 in case of any damage or disruption to the Riverside village Storm Water Management System. This should be discussed prior to any approval to go forward. Likely the current Riverside Village BOD would need some written verification/certification that the system would be able to handle the change.
3. We recognize that the Pandemic and subsequent effects on commercial enterprises has changed commercial investment decisions, especially in the food service industry. Witness the recent, sudden closing of Riverbirch Restaurant (RB).
4. We hope the owner/applicant is making a good-faith effort to bring in another restaurant operation to replace RB. This would be a tremendous attraction for additional residential space as well as fulfilling an original attraction to prospective buyers when Riverside Village was under construction.
5. Are the intended residential units for affordable housing? Is that a requirement?
6. Is the current parking space area sufficient to support all of this?
7. Assuming the amendment is approved, what is the planned timetable?

Thank you for reading this and considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Andy Reitelbach

From: Kelsey Schlein <kelsey@shimp-engineering.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 27, 2022 11:36 PM
To: Sara Robinson
Cc: Cameron Langille; Joe Wrege; William McCauley; Andy Reitelbach
Subject: Re: Riverside Village Block 1 amendment

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Hi Sara,

Thanks for your comments and sorry for not following up sooner. Please see responses below:

1. Is it accurate to assume the change only involves the current non-improved spaces? Not the already-commercial developed spaces at the buildings' ends?

The commercial to residential conversions are proposed for the vacant commercial spaces. The owners are actively trying to place another commercial tenant in the former riverbirch space.

2. What effect, if any, will the development of the residential properties have on the current StormWater Management System? Currently there is a percentage responsibility attached to Block 1 in case of any damage or disruption to the Riverside village Storm Water Management System. This should be discussed prior to any approval to go forward. Likely the current Riverside Village BOD would need some written verification/certification that the system would be able to handle the change.

All renovations are interior; there are no proposed changes that would increase impervious area and impact the swm system.

3. We recognize that the Pandemic and subsequent effects on commercial enterprises has changed commercial investment decisions, especially in the food service industry. Witness the recent, sudden closing of Riverbirch Restaurant (RB).

4. We hope the owner/applicant is making a good-faith effort to bring in another restaurant operation to replace RB. This would be a tremendous attraction for additional residential space as well as fulfilling an original attraction to prospective buyers when Riverside Village was under construction.

The owners are actively trying to secure another tenant for that now vacant space.

5. Are the intended residential units for affordable housing? Is that a requirement?

15% of units within riverside village as a whole are required to be affordable and any new units would be subject to that requirement.

6. Is the current parking space area sufficient to support all of this?

Yes, the parking requirements for commercial tenants are higher than those for residential and so there is sufficient parking to support this conversion.

7. Assuming the amendment is approved, what is the planned timetable?

The owners have been working on preliminary plans for the conversion but would still need to compile a building permit application for submission and approval if the rezoning is approved. This application is still several months out from being scheduled with the Board and then it will take time to finalize the architectural drawings and submit the building permit.

I'm happy to get on a call tomorrow if you want to talk through any of these items further before the meeting.

Best,

Kelsey

On Fri, Nov 18, 2022 at 11:08 AM Sara Robinson <s.robinson3162@gmail.com> wrote:

Greetings, Ms. Schlein

I am Sara Robinson, homeowner at 1623 Riverwalk Xing. My spouse and I are the September Hill Trusts you have in your contact list of residents.

We are one of the early homebuilders here and I have been fortunate to have previously served as President of the Riverside Village Community Homeowners Association as well as a former member of the Pantops CAC.

We have received your letter with the proposed amendment described and your invitation to share comments and questions.

Here are my comments/questions:

1. Is it accurate to assume the change only involves the current non-improved spaces? Not the already-commercial developed spaces at the buildings' ends?

2. What effect, if any, will the development of the residential properties have on the current StormWater Management System? Currently there is a percentage responsibility attached to Block 1 in case of any damage or disruption to the Riverside village Storm Water Management System. This should be discussed prior to any approval to go forward. Likely the current Riverside Village BOD would need some written verification/certification that the system would be able to handle the change.

3. We recognize that the Pandemic and subsequent effects on commercial enterprises has changed commercial

investment decisions, especially in the food service industry. Witness the recent, sudden closing of Riverbirch Restaurant (RB).

4. We hope the owner/applicant is making a good-faith effort to bring in another restaurant operation to replace RB. This would be a tremendous attraction for additional residential space as well as fulfilling an original attraction to prospective buyers when Riverside Village was under construction.

5. Are the intended residential units for affordable housing? Is that a requirement?

6. Is the current parking space area sufficient to support all of this?

7. Assuming the amendment is approved, what is the planned timetable?

Thank you for reading this and considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sara M. Robinson

--

KELSEY SCHLEIN

Project Manager / Land Planner

Kelsey@Shimp-Engineering.com

Shimp Engineering, P.C.

912 East High St. Charlottesville, VA 22902

434.227.5140 // shimpdesign.com

Andy Reitelbach

From: Freeman Hobs Allan <freemanhobs@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 7:45 AM
To: Andy Reitelbach
Cc: Sandy Tribendis; Pat Phillips; amandafinkl@icloud.com; Ann Thunder; Dick Ruffin; David C. Speedie; E Slater; eslater2@verision.net; amfeiner@aol.com; kurt.siefken@gmail.com; Chuck Lilley; Mary Lilley; Chuck Cheeseman; Janet Cheeseman; Tom Brenner; Taffy Brenner; Joyce Allan; Ellin Mattie; Freeman Hobs Allan; wmccauley@gmail.com
Subject: Please deny Planning Application #ZMA202200010. Kindly confirm receipt of this objection.

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Dear Albemarle County Senior Planner Mr. Reitelbach:

We, the undersigned, object to subject application to “establish residential units in the vacant commercial spaces” at Riverside Village. The promotion of retail shops was so essential to Riverside Village’s development that the street out front of *The Shops* is called Riverside Shops Way. We were promised in writing (and verbally by realtor agent promotion) that the final project would contain this shopping/retail component. These details, see links below, are still pledged online to this day. This retail feature was a specific magnet for most residents of our 45 dwellings. Many of us have made active use of Riverbirch Restaurant and Grit Coffeeshop for several years.

Our national Covid Emergency impacted merchant tenancy at *The Shops*. That obstacle is gone. We stand by our intention to patronize these spaces. In addition to the buying power of our village, we believe Avemoor neighborhood and its adjacent *The Independence* apartments - just across Route 20 - as well as hundreds of pass-by daily users of Darden Towle Park, would become habituated to patronize *The Shops* if the appropriate businesses were recruited there.

The responsibility for this falls on Stony Point Development Group (SPDG), whose publicly announced business model hinges on *community building in high quality, walkable locations with connections to natural amenities, [including] experiential retail*. We request and encourage SBDG to offer 4-month-rent-free or other suitable promotions and begin an active good-faith campaign to motivate retail tenancy at *The Shops*. Some leading ideas:

- Expand the space allocated to Grit, a heavily used example of local demand for appropriate retail;
- convert Riverbirch into a sports bar/pizza combo featuring a fresh salad bar; add a pool table;
- add an ice cream shop, a small bakery, a wine and cheese bistro, or nail salon;
- Specialty sporting goods featuring seasonal merchandise (eg: kayak vests & paddles, float tubes, basic bike repair, sports field gear, pickleball paddles, computer/home office supplies).

Please listen to local residents. We ask SPDG to provide to us *The Shops* promised as a central draw to living here. If time allowed, we are certain a majority of Riverside Village owners’ names can be added to this letter. It is vital that Albemarle Planning and Zoning deny this amendment request.

Respectfully,

Richard and Joyce Allan, Ray and Sandy Tribendis, Ellin Mattie, David Speedie, Kurt Siefkin, Patricia Phillips, Chuck and Mary Lilly, Edwina Slater, Tom and Taffy Brenner, Janet and Charles Cheeseman, Amanda and David Finkl, Arthur Feiner, James & Ann Thunder and Frances Thunder – The Riverhouse, 1425 Trailside Court, Charlottesville VA 22911

“Riverside Village is an urban community designed to inspire belonging and well-being. Walkable streets,... green amenities ... 45 homes, 24 condominiums, and 36,000 sf mixed-use space. “PROPERTY TYPE Mixed-Use, Multi-Family & Single Family; FEATURES: Trailhead Access to Rivanna River..., to Darden Towle Park with boat landing, Hiking and biking trails, ... Pedestrian Mews, [access to] Retail.” Source: www.stonypointdg.com/projects/riverside-village

“*The Shops* at Riverside Village, a three-story project, providing 11, 400 sq. ft. of leasable retail space on the ground floor and 24 luxury residential apartment units above. Tenants will enjoy expansive glass-front retail spaces with ample parking and beautiful landscaping.” Source: www.stonypointdg.com/projects/the-shops-at-riverside-village

Andy Reitelbach

From: Sara Robinson <s.robinson3162@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 1:23 PM
To: Kelsey Schlein
Cc: Cameron Langille; Joe Wrege; William McCauley; Andy Reitelbach
Subject: Re: Riverside Village Block 1 amendment

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Good afternoon, Kelsey:

Thank you so much for your responses and explanations. I really appreciate the time you took. I thought of one plus you all could use in your presentation, based on some inquiries I have received:

Ground floor apartments would appeal particularly to those with physical or age-related challenges.

Best regards,

Sara

On Nov 27, 2022, at 11:36 PM, Kelsey Schlein <kelsey@shimp-engineering.com> wrote:

Hi Sara,

Thanks for your comments and sorry for not following up sooner. Please see responses below:

1. Is it accurate to assume the change only involves the current non-improved spaces? Not the already-commercial developed spaces at the buildings' ends?

The commercial to residential conversions are proposed for the vacant commercial spaces. The owners are actively trying to place another commercial tenant in the former riverbirch space.

2. What effect, if any, will the development of the residential properties have on the current StormWater Management System? Currently there is a percentage responsibility attached to Block 1 in case of any damage or disruption to the Riverside village Storm Water Management System. This should be discussed prior to any approval to go forward. Likely the current Riverside Village BOD would need some written verification/certification that the system would be able to handle the change.

All renovations are interior; there are no proposed changes that would increase impervious area and impact the swm system.

3. We recognize that the Pandemic and subsequent effects on commercial enterprises has changed commercial investment decisions, especially in the food service industry. Witness the recent, sudden closing of Riverbirch Restaurant (RB).

4. We hope the owner/applicant is making a good-faith effort to bring in another restaurant operation to replace RB. This would be a tremendous attraction for additional residential space as well as fulfilling an original attraction to prospective buyers when Riverside Village was under construction.

The owners are actively trying to secure another tenant for that now vacant space.

5. Are the intended residential units for affordable housing? Is that a requirement?

15% of units within riverside village as a whole are required to be affordable and any new units would be subject to that requirement.

6. Is the current parking space area sufficient to support all of this?

Yes, the parking requirements for commercial tenants are higher than those for residential and so there is sufficient parking to support this conversion.

7. Assuming the amendment is approved, what is the planned timetable?

The owners have been working on preliminary plans for the conversion but would still need to compile a building permit application for submission and approval if the rezoning is approved. This application is still several months out from being scheduled with the Board and then it will take time to finalize the architectural drawings and submit the building permit.

I'm happy to get on a call tomorrow if you want to talk through any of these items further before the meeting.

Best,

Kelsey

On Fri, Nov 18, 2022 at 11:08 AM Sara Robinson <s.robinson3162@gmail.com> wrote:

Greetings, Ms. Schlein

I am Sara Robinson, homeowner at 1623 Riverwalk Xing. My spouse and I are the September Hill Trusts you have in your contact list of residents.

We are one of the early homebuilders here and I have been fortunate to have previously served as President of the Riverside Village Community Homeowners Association as well as a former member of the Pantops CAC.

We have received your letter with the proposed amendment described and your invitation to share comments and questions.

Here are my comments/questions:

1. Is it accurate to assume the change only involves the current non-improved spaces? Not the already-commercial developed spaces at the buildings' ends?
2. What effect, if any, will the development of the residential properties have on the current StormWater Management System? Currently there is a percentage responsibility attached to Block 1 in case of any damage or disruption to the Riverside village Storm Water Management System. This should be discussed prior to any approval to go forward. Likely the current Riverside Village BOD would need some written verification/certification that the system would be able to handle the change.
3. We recognize that the Pandemic and subsequent effects on commercial enterprises has changed commercial investment decisions, especially in the food service industry. Witness the recent, sudden closing of Riverbirch Restaurant (RB).
4. We hope the owner/applicant is making a good-faith effort to bring in another restaurant operation to replace RB. This would be a tremendous attraction for additional residential space as well as fulfilling an original attraction to prospective buyers when Riverside Village was under construction.
5. Are the intended residential units for affordable housing? Is that a requirement?
6. Is the current parking space area sufficient to support all of this?
7. Assuming the amendment is approved, what is the planned timetable?

Thank you for reading this and considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sara M. Robinson

--

KELSEY SCHLEIN
Project Manager / Land Planner
Kelsey@Shimp-Engineering.com

Shimp Engineering, P.C.
912 East High St. Charlottesville, VA 22902
434.227.5140 // shimpdesign.com

SUBJECT: Planning Application #ZMA202200010

Dear Albemarle County Senior Planner Mr. Reitelbach:

We, the undersigned, object to subject application to “establish residential units in the vacant commercial spaces” at Riverside Village. The promotion of retail shops was so essential to Riverside Village’s development that the street out front of *The Shops* is called Riverside Shops Way. We were promised in writing (and verbally by realtor agent promotion) that the final project would contain this shopping/retail component. These details, **see links below**, are still pledged online to this day. This retail feature was a specific magnet for most residents of our 45 dwellings. Many of us have made active use of Riverbirch Restaurant and Grit Coffeeshop for several years.

Our national Covid Emergency impacted merchant tenancy at *The Shops*. That obstacle is gone. We stand by our intention to patronize these spaces. In addition to the buying power of our village, we believe Avemoor neighborhood and its adjacent *The Independence* apartments - just across Route 20 - as well as hundreds of pass-by daily users of Darden Towe Park, would become habituated to patronize *The Shops* if the appropriate businesses were recruited there.

The responsibility for this falls on Stony Point Development Group (SPDG), whose publicly announced business model hinges on *community building in high quality, walkable locations with connections to natural amenities, [including] experiential retail*. We request and encourage SBDG to offer 4-month-rent-free or other suitable promotions and begin an active good-faith campaign to motivate retail tenancy at *The Shops*. Some leading ideas:

- Expand the space allocated to Grit, a heavily used example of local demand for appropriate retail;
- convert Riverbirch into a sports bar/pizza combo featuring a fresh salad bar; add a pool table;
- add an ice cream shop, a small bakery, a wine and cheese bistro, or nail salon;
- Specialty sporting goods featuring seasonal merchandise (eg: kayak vests & paddles, float tubes, basic bike repair, sports field gear, pickleball paddles, computer/home office supplies).

Please listen to local residents. We ask SPDG to provide to us *The Shops* promised as a central draw to living here. If time allowed, we are certain a majority of Riverside Village owners’ names can be added to this letter. It is vital that Albemarle Planning and Zoning deny the subject amendment request.

Respectfully,

Richard and Joyce Allan, Ray and Sandy Tribendis, Ellin Mattie, David Speedie, Kurt Siefkin, Patricia Phillips, Kurt S
Chuck and Mary Lilly, Edwina Slater, Tom and Taffy Brenner, Janet and Charles Cheeseman, Amanda
and David Funkl, Arthur Feiner,
James & Ann Thunder and Frances Thunder – The Riverhouse, 1425 Trailside Court, Charlottesville VA
22911

=====
“Riverside Village is an urban community designed to inspire belonging and well-being. Walkable streets,... green amenities ... 45 homes, 24 condominiums, and 36,000 sf mixed-use space. “PROPERTY TYPE Mixed-Use, Multi-Family & Single Family; FEATURES: Trailhead Access to Rivanna River,... to Darden Towe Park with boat landing, Hiking and biking trails, ... Pedestrian Mews, **Retail**.” Source: www.stonypointdg.com/projects/riverside-village

“*The Shops* at Riverside Village, a three-story project, providing 11, 400 sq. ft. of **leasable retail space** on the ground floor and 24 luxury residential apartment units above. Tenants will enjoy expansive glass-front retail spaces with ample parking and beautiful landscaping.” Source: www.stonypointdg.com/projects/the-shops-at-riverside-village

Andy Reitelbach

From: dickruffin@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2022 8:50 AM
To: Andy Reitelbach
Subject: Re: Question re Riverside Shops

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Thank you. Very helpful.
Dick

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2022, at 8:47 AM, dickruffin@gmail.com wrote:

Dear All,
From below, you'll see that any compromise must be initiated by Stoney Point.
County decision will be yes or no on the current application.
Next access point is Planning Commission, still not scheduled.
Who will speak for us then?
Do we try to get Stoney Point to initiate a compromise?
Who is best positioned to explore this?
Any other ideas?
Dick

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Andy Reitelbach <mreitelbach@albemarle.org>
Date: December 14, 2022 at 6:15:48 PM EST
To: Dick Ruffin <dickruffin@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Question re Riverside Shops

Good afternoon Dick,

Yes, the applicant can ask for a reduction in the commercial area requirements, keeping a certain minimum amount as commercial, rather than a full elimination. However, that request must be made by the property owner. It is not something that County staff can require.

If the applicant does choose to propose a new number for the minimum commercial area, staff would take that request into account and revise our review of the application accordingly.

So such a compromise on the minimum square footage for commercial uses is possible, where the requirement is reduced rather than eliminated; however, ultimately that

request must come from the property owner.

Let me know if you would like more clarification or have any additional questions.

Best regards,
Andy

Andrew Reitelbach
Senior Planner II
Albemarle County

--

areitelbach@albemarle.org
434.296.5832 x3261
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

-----Original Message-----

From: Dick Ruffin <dickruffin@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 10:57 AM
To: Andy Reitelbach <mreitelbach@albemarle.org>
Subject: Question re Riverside Shops

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

Dear Andy,

Thanks for your clear presentation at the PCAC meeting on November 28.

The letter from Mr. Allen et.al., the oral testimonies at the meeting and subsequent letters from residents, make it abundantly clear that the Riverside Village community wishes to keep the 8,000 square foot requirement. They believe, possibly correctly, that once the requirement is removed, it will only be a matter of time before all the shops will be gone.

It is equally clear that the owners want the requirement removed, so they are free to do what is best for the company financially. For now, Grit suits them fine, but that is no guarantee for the future.

My question is: Is there any middle ground? Is there any possibility of reducing, as opposed to eliminating, the requirement?

For example, if the requirement were reduced to one-half of the total available space, allowing half to be converted to residences and half retained for commerce, might that be acceptable to the County? Could that be seen as an example of 'mixed-use development promoting walkability' as envisioned in the Master Plan?

I realize such a decision is not yours to make, but perhaps you can advise whether such a compromise is at least technically and legally feasible.

With best regards,

Dick Ruffin
Chair, PCAC
703-489-6069