

ATTACHMENT E
ZMA201600019 Riverside Village Amendment
Technical Changes Needed

Application Plan:

1. Provide information on design features for the plaza aligned with Road C to distinguish the plaza as a focal point.
2. On the cover sheet:
 - Add the words “Amendment to Block 1” to the title
 - Provide the correct tax map parcel number: TMP 078G0-00-01-000A0
4. On page 4:
 - Provide the correct tax map parcel number: TMP 078G0-00-01-000A0
 - Modify the paragraph, “Consistency with Pantops Master Plan” to say, “Recommended density in the Pantops Master Plan for Riverside Village: 3 – 6 dwellings/acre for properties designated Neighborhood Density Residential use; Proposed density in Block 1: 15 dwellings/acre. Proposed density for entire Riverside Village development with changes to Block 1: 13.5 dwellings/acre. Proposed gross density for Riverside Village PRD, based on original 18.87 acres: 5.5 dwellings/acre.
 - Remove the word, “workforce” in II. Block Characteristics for Block 1.
 - Remove the words, “it is anticipated” from III. Plan of Development, D. Civic Spaces, Block 1.
5. On page 7:
 - Change the front build-to line from 50’ to 25’ for Block 1 for X. Lot and Building Heights Regulations to be consistent with page 4.

Proffers:

1. In addition to other technical changes to be provided by the County Attorney’s office,
 - Use ZMA201600019 as the correct zoning project reference.
 - Use 2.41 acres as the correct acreage.
 - Reference the current application and code of development

Exhibit Showing Conceptual Site Layout for Riverside Village Block 1 dated 8/3/16:

1. It is understood that this exhibit is provided as an illustration for the buildings and amenity areas anticipated along Route 20 for Block 1. However, it is only partially consistent with the Code of Development. It does not show planting area available for the shrubs and flowering ornamental trees that are to be evenly spaced around the patios (plazas). It is not included in the rezoning but be advised that it could not be approved if submitted due to inconsistencies with the Code of Development.
2. This exhibit shows two buildings in Block 1 which differs from the layout reviewed by the ARB in April 2016, which three buildings. The roof plans of the buildings shown on the current conceptual layout suggest buildings that are more massive in appearance than those reviewed by the ARB. A larger footprint will require greater attention to massing and appropriate use of building forms, architectural detailing and scale to establish an appropriate appearance for the Entrance Corridor.