

Draft Rio29 Form Based Code | Summary of Feedback
 2/16/2021 Planning Commission Public Hearing

Source	Comment	Staff Response
Planning Commission 2/16/21	Incorporate more standards related to green building design, especially related to solar design, building orientation, green roofs, walls, and low impact development.	<u>Draft has been revised</u> to allow modifications in Sec. 20C.10 Architectural Design Standards to accommodate green building design. Green building/LID design standards are listed as a high priority future work item.
Planning Commission 2/16/21	Landscaping requirements should include standards for street trees to ensure tree health/survival in urban environments including soil volume requirements, tree well size, and maintenance requirements.	<u>No change at this time.</u> Current draft addresses some of this in Sec.20C.10.D: limits grading, trenching, tunneling within the critical root zone; requires street trees be placed in within appropriately sized grates or tree wells; requires landscape plans be prepared and sealed by landscape architects (or equivalent). Landscaping design guidance is also listed as a medium priority future work item.
Planning Commission 2/16/21	Questions about how transparency standards would apply to structured parking	<u>Draft has been revised</u> in Sec.20.C.9(8) to clarify that parking structures are exempt from transparency requirements.
Planning Commission 2/16/21	Questions about the difference between interim and temporary uses. Why aren't interim uses on the ground story of buildings permitted within the Core?	<u>Draft has been revised</u> in Sec.20C.6.B to clarify the difference between temporary and interim uses.
Planning Commission 2/16/21	Questions about how views and vistas might be addressed in future development projects.	<u>No change at this time.</u> Street network regulating plan is listed as a high priority future work item. Views can be considered in the layout and orientation of streets to preserve sightlines to important vistas.
Planning Commission 2/16/21	Building height maximums might not be sufficient for this area, considering the heights that currently can be built by-right and height allowances, in other parts of the County, such as Crozet	<u>No change at this time.</u> Height standards in current draft are based on extensive public feedback and input from Planning Commission and Board throughout the small area planning and form-based code process.
Planning Commission 2/16/21	To be successful, the Form Based Code is likely to need additional incentives to make redevelopment feasible for property owners as well as investment in public infrastructure to support the vision and future development (such as streets and civic spaces).	<u>This is an implementation item separate from FBC.</u> FBC is only one tool that can be used to implement the vision outlined in the Rio29 Small Area Plan. Additional incentives or public investment are often implemented with success in other localities using form-based code. Staff has heard similar feedback from stakeholders

		and the development community throughout this engagement process.
Public Comment 2/16/21	Support for optionality of the Code but there are some concerns with draft language: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Light Industrial use should be expanded to be by-right in all character areas with design guidelines. 2. There should be more administratively approved special exceptions/modifications with objective measures throughout the draft. 3. ARB involvement should not be at the discretion of staff, but rather the applicant. 4. The all or nothing approach would prohibit large parcels from developing a portion of the site under FBC and a portion under FBC 5. Enhanced incentives are needed; currently not enough benefits to outweigh use of conventional code. 	<u>No change at this time.</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Light Industrial locations and standards were based on extensive public feedback and input from Planning Commission and Board. 2. Current draft allows modifications or special exceptions to all sections except Architectural Design Standards, Civic Space Standards, and Affordable Housing Requirement. 3. ARB would only be involved as applicant appeal if staff is recommending denial 4. Subdivision ordinance is still applicable; long term goal is for entire area to operate under FBC 5. Additional implementation measures can be acted on separate from FBC.
Public Comment 2/16/21	Recognizing the challenge of striking balance between incentives and design regulations; uncertainty that the current draft is in a place to incentivize development. Support for optional overlay and administrative approval; some concerns include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Four stories max building height in Flex is shorter than what can be done by-right 2. Drive-thrus should be a by-right use subject to design guidelines 3. Should not require too much detail on conceptual plan 4. Encourage more flexibility for modifications throughout the code 5. Should not require special use permits for Light Industrial uses 6. Affordable Housing requirement will be challenging to implement 	<u>No change at this time.</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Height standards were based on extensive public feedback and input from Planning Commission and Board. 2. Auto-oriented design standards are identified as a low priority future work item. 3. Conceptual plans are not intended to be engineered site plans. The purpose is to identify general locations of site features listed. 4. Current draft allows modifications or special exceptions to all sections except Sec.20C.10 Architectural Design Standards, Sec.20C.11 Civic Space Standards, and Sec.20C.12 Affordable Housing Requirement. 5. Light Industrial locations and standards were developed based on extensive public feedback and input from Planning Commission and Board.

		6. Affordable housing standards are consistent with current Housing Albemarle Draft.
Public Comment 2/16/2021	Request that the 10.17-acre JC Penney property be designated within the Core Character Area	<u>No change at this time.</u> Character Area locations were based on extensive public feedback and input from Planning Commission and Board.