

Albemarle County Planning Commission
March 21, 2017

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, March 21, 2017, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Daphne Spain, Mac Lafferty, Pam Riley, Jennie More, Bruce Dotson and Bill Palmer; University of Virginia Representative.

Other officials present were Scott Clark, Senior Planner; Bill Fritz, Manager of Special Projects; Andrew Gast-Bray, Deputy Director of Community Development/Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and John Blair, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Keller, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

4c. ZMA-2016-00016 Woolen Mills

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville

TAX MAP/PARCEL: 078000000021B0

LOCATION: This property is located at the terminus of East Market Street and Broadway Street. It borders Moores Creek where it joins the Rivanna River. This is the location of the historic Woolen Mills factory.

PROPOSAL: Request to rezone the property from LI, Light Industry to C1, Commercial. The intended uses of the existing buildings include residential development (See Special Use Permit), office space and restaurant space. Other by-right commercial uses would also be permitted. A new building intended for industrial use is also proposed.

PETITION: ZMA201600016 Woolen Mills - Rezoning for 10.4 acres from LI, Light Industry with allows industrial and office uses to C1, Commercial which allows retail sales and service uses and residential by special use permit (15 units/acre).

OVERLAY DISTRICTS: Flood Hazard, Steep Slopes, Airport Impact Area, Entrance Corridor

PROFFERS: Yes

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Community Mixed Use - Community Mixed Use – residential (up to 34 units/acre), community scale retail, service and office uses, places of worship, schools, public and institutional uses. Parks and Green Systems - (parks, playgrounds, play fields, greenways, trails, paths, recreational facilities and equipment, plazas, outdoor sitting areas, natural areas, preservation of stream buffers, floodplains and steep slopes adjacent to rivers and streams)

(Bill Fritz)

AND

4d. ZMA-2016-00021 Woolen Mills

PROPOSAL: Rezoning 1.54 acres of Steep Slopes Overlay District, Preserved Slopes to Steep Slopes Overlay District, Managed Slopes. The Steep Slopes Overlay District is an Overlay District to protect steep slopes. (Bill Fritz)

AND

4c. SP-2016-00027 Woolen Mills

PROPOSAL: Special use permit in the C1, Commercial to allow residential development. R-15 Residential under Section 22.2.2(6) of the Zoning Ordinance. Residential use will consist of 94 multi-family units on 10.4 acres for a total density of 9 units per acre. (Bill Fritz)

AND

4d. SP-2016-00028 Woolen Mills

PROPOSAL: Special use permit under Section 30.3.11 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow engineered structures, including, but not limited to, retaining walls and revetments made of non-natural materials such as concrete which are constructed along channels or watercourses for the purpose of water conveyance or flood control. The Flood Hazard is an overlay to provide safety and protection from flooding. (Bill Fritz)

Mr. Bill Fritz stated that he would provide an overview of the findings and the project particulars, and asked Commissioners to stop him if they had questions.

Mr. Keller noted that the Commission would need to dissect the items prior to voting on them.

Mr. Fritz confirmed that they would need to take four separate actions.

Mr. Keller said they may be asking for clarification points as they proceed.

Mr. Fritz referenced a photo of the property and pointed out the white-roofed or “sawtooth” buildings, and noted the location of the large building onsite and the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority’s composting building and sewage treatment plant to the west. He stated that there is industrial and office use located to the northwest, as well as residential to the north and northeast. Mr. Fritz noted the location of the Rivanna River and Moores Creek, which is located close to the existing buildings. He mentioned that the applicant’s property and those around it are zoned Light Industry, and to the north in the County and the City, the property is zoned for residential development. Mr. Fritz pointed out the sawtooth and factory buildings, as well as parks and open space as shown in the comprehensive plan and community mixed use. He noted the location of neighborhood density and industrial zoning.

Mr. Fritz presented a photo showing the sawtooth building in the foreground and a large factory in the background, stating that the photo was taken from the western side of the property. He said that the buildings include the water tower and other outbuildings, which are historic and contribute to the overall character of the property – with some to be renovated, following the Department of Historic Resources guidelines. Mr. Fritz noted that the applicant has proffered to follow these guidelines and will be using historic tax credits, which means that DHR will also be involved in monitoring the renovation process. He presented a photo taken from the east side of the building, from the parking lot accessed at the end of East Market Street, noting the location of the four-story factory building in the background and loading and entrance courtyard area in the foreground. He pointed out the location of a small building near the parking lot that showed signs of needing restoration and maintenance, stating that restoration of site before deterioration begins is important to ensure that the restoration does not become uneconomical.

Mr. Fritz reported that the site is located at the end of East Market Street and at the end of Broadway Street, and the only vehicle connection between East Broadway Street is Franklin Street. He said that there are two travelways that connect Broadway and East Market, and the connection on the Woolen Mills property will provide emergency access and pedestrian links – but will not provide vehicular connections between the two streets, due to the narrow area between the buildings and Moores Creek. Mr. Fritz noted that the other connection is closed due to an at-grade railroad crossing. He stated that the applicant has submitted a proffer to address the City’s request for lane markings on City streets, and this project is a bit unique in that it is only accessed from the City. Mr. Fritz said that opportunities providing additional pedestrian access are limited due to existing road conditions on East Market Street and Broadway, and the applicant is proffering to provide area for the continuation of the Rivanna River Trail across the property – including area for a bridge across Moores Creek.

Mr. Fritz pointed out the area of preserved slopes preserved to be modified to managed slopes, and said that the only preserved character they have is that they are large contiguous areas. He said that a field inspection revealed that the slopes are not natural, and large areas of unconsolidated stone are evident, including some areas of erosion. Mr. Fritz stated that if these slopes had been field verified at the time of the adoption of the steep slopes ordinance, staff would have recommended them for managed designation. He reported that the applicant conducted a detailed study of the Rivanna River, which has been accepted by the Army Corps of Engineers, and he referenced a map showing the floodplain location as determined by that study. He said that the applicant is proposing to construct flood control walls that will protect the existing buildings from flooding – most importantly, basements and foundations.

Mr. Fritz referenced images showing the path as mentioned earlier, and he pointed out the location of Moores Creek and the existing factory building. He noted the existing connection between East Market and Broadway, stating that no opportunity for widening of the connection was possible. Mr. Fritz said that this prevented it from being used for vehicular traffic, but it would be used as a pedestrian area. He noted the location of the floodplain area, stating that the applicant proposes to flood proof the existing sawtooth buildings, and pointed out in an artist’s rendition how the courtyard between the buildings will be enclosed by a floodwall. Mr. Fritz said that the artist’s rendition also shows one way the history of the site and area may be placed in publicly accessible areas, which is a proffer the applicant has made. He noted the location of the main factory building, stating that the openings below the first floor will be sealed.

Mr. Fritz summarized his presentation and stated that the application is consistent with the comprehensive plan and allows for the adaptive reuse of a historic resource, and the activity permitted by approval of the various applications will not result in overall impacts greater than what would occur with the current industrial zoning of the property. He stated that this includes the establishment of flood control, which will help to protect and maintain the existing buildings. Mr. Fritz said that based on their findings, staff recommends approval of all four applications, and he offered to answer questions.

Ms. Riley stated that she attended the community meeting and CAC discussion on this, and there is general enthusiasm and support for this project – but there were concerns expressed regarding

Market Street and the parking there. She asked for additional explanation of the applicant's intent.

Mr. Fritz responded that East Market Street is very narrow, with no opportunities for widening or improvement, and at its narrowest point it was hemmed in either by floodplain, railroad, existing buildings – which are also historic, and a cliff that is holding up the railroad. He stated that the property is unusual for most of the rezonings, which usually have raw ground with limited development potential, whereas this site has 120,000 square feet of buildings on the property. He noted that the property is zoned industrial with no proffers and can be used for industrial or office uses. Mr. Fritz stated that there has been a level of traffic on East Market Street already, and the residents are concerned about changing traffic patterns and the potential for increased traffic – and to address that, the applicant has limited access to the East Market side by limiting the available parking in that area, with only 28 parking spaces available. He emphasized that there is no room to do any more, nor is there a way to interconnect the East Market side with the Broadway side, so traffic would not be coming down that road and back up Franklin, or vice versa. Mr. Fritz stated that the main access to the property is through Broadway, and that is where the main parking areas will be, and that is how the traffic has been resolved. He said that this is a change in the traffic pattern that would occur from a potentially truck-dominated industrial use to a car-dominated traffic pattern.

Ms. Spain said that she and many others attended the meeting where this was discussed with City representatives and the developer, and asked if anything had developed since then that was significantly different from what was heard that day.

Mr. Fritz responded that nothing had changed, and this request has been consistent from the time it was originally applied for – and the only thing that has happened is the provision of more information from DHR. He said that the applicant has gone through the phase one application process to renovate the property and maintain its historic character, and has done more work with the fire and rescue division to ensure that adequate fire protection be provided. Mr. Fritz stated that staff has gone into the field and looked at the slopes in detail, which they had not done before, and the Army Corps of Engineers had formally adopted the floodplain study, as the appeal period has lapsed. He reiterated that the nature of the request had not changed.

Ms. Spain asked Mr. Fritz about the role of the City in this.

Mr. Fritz responded that staff talked with the City, and their comments were limited to transportation. He said that they met with their transportation engineer, Duncan Brennan, to discuss how to mitigate the impact in the City. Mr. Fritz said that the applicant has proffered \$10,000 to the City for re-striping the road, and those were the only improvements the City identified. He stated that it was really changing some turn lanes in the City on Meade and Carlton, and he confirmed that this request does not go before the City – as they are just another adjacent property owner.

Mr. Dotson said that in looking at the letter from the City regarding transportation, the second item in that correspondence addresses minimum widths – as the road is down to 12 feet at certain

points after entering in the County, and less than 20 at other points. He asked how that concern had been addressed.

Mr. Fritz responded that the concern was addressed by acknowledging that there is no way to address the existing road conditions and agreeing there was nothing to be done. He said that when the City provided comments, they did not take into account that there is an existing 120,000 SF building there that is generating traffic that cannot be regulated. Mr. Fritz said that as part of the rezoning request, they are trying to balance the impacts of the new zoning versus the old, and while the traffic could be more, it would be of a different character – and this was discussed specifically with the City. He reiterated that there is no answer to it.

Mr. Dotson said that in comparing new to old zoning, the old zoning had no impact because of the building vacancy – and even when it was used for moving and storage, that is a very different and low impact kind of activity. He stated that it was a bit misleading to compare commercial zoning and restaurant uses to the prior use, and comparing it to what it could be under light industry when nobody wants LI is a little confusing.

Mr. Fritz responded that they were aware of that, but with the change in industrial regulations, because it is a preexisting building, it could be used as office and could be renovated using historic tax credits – with supporting commercial uses. He agreed that the more modern usage has been relatively limited compared with the overall capacity for the property.

Mr. Keller said that in the public meeting he attended, there was a lot of discussion about the impact of moving vans on the neighborhood historically, because of the size of the street and the times the vehicles chose to move through it.

Mr. Keller opened the public portion of the meeting for the ZMA and request to rezone the property from LI to CI-commercial.

Brian Roy, developer and manager of Woolen Mills, LLC, addressed the Commission and introduced his attorney, Pete Caramanis, and his civil engineer, Greg Kotarski from the Timmons Group.

Mr. Roy reported that he was last before them on the redevelopment project for Woolen Mills at the joint City/County Planning Commission meeting in October 2016, and said that since that time, FEMA had issued a final letter of map revision that adjusted the floodplain down approximately five feet – so it allows for the rezoning request and also allows for the development to move forward. Mr. Roy said that in December, he received part one approval from DHR that the project can be historically preserved and does qualify for state and federal historic tax credits. He stated that he has been invited to proceed with the part two application, which he is pursuing with his architect, Maynard Ball, and they are getting down to the specifics of what is and isn't allowed under the tax credit program.

Mr. Roy said that based on comments coming out of the October joint meeting and the Woolen Mills neighborhood meeting earlier that month, he completed and submitted a traffic study done by a third-party consulting firm, and a follow-up parking study to confirm there were no

unanticipated or adverse impacts on the redevelopment on the surrounding area. He stated that he feels he has listened to the input from those meetings, as well as from the many stakeholders who have given him suggestions. Mr. Roy noted that the plan before them has been very favorably received, and by the overwhelming majority of the community members in the City and County, as well as those planning staffs. He thanked Mr. Fritz for helping him navigate the process, adding that the collaboration to this point has resulted in a better overall plan for the site – including the proffers that have allowed for increased connectivity to the Rivanna Trail through the site and improvements to City roads in the neighborhood, and ensuring the responsible historic redevelopment of the property.

Mr. Roy stated that the process had been underway for more than two years, when he saw the site and was shocked that such an amazing property existed in the County at the edge of the City. He said that he was further compelled upon learning about the historical value the property had to the City's development, and the role it played in supporting the military and conflicts dating back to the Civil War – sitting on the area's greatest amenity, the Rivanna River. Mr. Roy presented some photos of the site, noting that there have been some significant challenges along the way: dealing with FEMA, navigating the relationship between the City and the County, and access through a tranquil neighborhood, among other challenges. He stated that he feels strongly that this is a thoughtful development that will blend well with the area and offer an attractive destination for individuals wanting to live and work in and near downtown, but also to take advantage of the serene, peaceful setting that exists at the confluence of Rivanna and Moores Creek. Mr. Roy said that this is a unique opportunity for visitors to experience the connection to the Rivanna Trail and learn more about the historical significance of this industrial site. He offered to answer questions.

Mr. Dotson said that the letter from City transportation officials suggested that with the restaurant, many people would come to the small lot, find it full, and then go up to Franklin Street and come around – which would generate additional traffic. He said that the City suggested making the smaller lot for employees only, and asked Mr. Roy if he had thoughts on that proposal.

Mr. Roy responded that it would be a possibility, although he was nervous to restrict access to a business that does not yet exist and he was trying to attract to that site. He stated that with a lot of specialty restaurants, as evident with Belmont, people learn where they need to park – and the majority of parking on the site is on the high side off of Broadway and Franklin. He said that he hoped that would become the norm, but it is an option to limit who is able to park in the lower parking lot, and most likely it would be preferred residential parking, employee parking, handicapped parking, etc., and it is not meant to be the main parking area for the restaurant.

Ms. More asked if there would be dedicated parking for the residents within the structure.

Mr. Roy responded that there is meant to be dedicated parking for the residents on the high side of the property, and he did not know if it would be individualized. He added that there is not a lot of opportunity to have flexible parking, as it is limited as it is, and there would likely be incentives for residents who don't have cars – with Zip cars, Uber, etc. to make it more attractive to have less intensive parking.

Ms. Firehock stated that at the joint meeting, she had asked him if there would be any work done to try to use low impact development, permeable pavement, etc. if the property is located up above the floodplain. She said that this is an impact, and asked if there were any efforts to minimize the impacts of the additional pavement on the Rivanna River watershed and along Moores Creek – which is impaired.

Mr. Roy responded that the parking is still a work in progress, and the number of parking spaces the County would require for a site like this is well over 300, which is physically impossible to fit on this site. He said that how the parking is put on the high side of the property so the building is entered at grade on the third floor, and how the parking will work for commercial businesses in the adjacent sawtooth buildings, will need more refinement. Mr. Roy stated that they are next to Moore's Creek and do not want to continue to add problems to it, but that is open for discussion and how they address this would be resolved with the County as they move forward.

Ms. Firehock stated that hopefully a lot of pedestrians will access the site, as it is in a great location, along with smart cars and bicycles – and she hoped they would be as creative as possible with transportation, with improved City/County cooperation on regional transportation and perhaps additional bus routes. She commented that the property is a gem and she is excited that it is being developed, as it takes a lot of guts to take this property on.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Roy if the elevator is a movement option to the restaurant area from the upper to the lower restaurant area.

Mr. Roy confirmed that it was, stating that he did not have the interior layout of the site plan with him.

Mr. Keller said that one of the arguments with the parking was the distance from people in the upper areas to move to the restaurant on the lower level.

Mr. Fritz pointed out the location of East Market Street coming down to the railroad bridge and the 28-space parking lot, as well as the big factory building and the area considered for the restaurant. He explained that the main access to the property is coming down Broadway, with access available through the sawtooth building and the upper building.

Mr. Kotarski said that there is an existing connection that would be enhanced as the main access point to the four-story building, so you would enter the building on the third floor, immediately come into a lobby area with an elevator, take the elevator down to the first floor, and as you would get off the first floor you would be entering into that connection where the restaurant would be – which is a separate connection. He stated that the walking distance from the parking area to the restaurant is not that great.

Mr. Fritz noted that he and other staff had walked it, and it was a logical route as you go through the building.

Mr. Keller said that in some ways, they have made an argument now for concerns from traffic at the lower level, because it is not a significant distance for those parking in the larger parking area – and the smaller parking lot and impact on Market Street would be discussed later. He asked if there were members of the public who wished to speak on this particular portion.

Mr. Roy commented that this approval is really all or none, as anything not approved effectively kills the project.

Mr. Travis Pietila from the Southern Environmental Law Center addressed the Commission and thanked them for the opportunity to comment. He stated that it was encouraging to see a proposal that reuses these historic buildings and reconnect the community with the Woolen Mills site for the first time in many years. Mr. Pietila said that the SELC also appreciates Mr. Roy taking the time to meet with them on several occasions to walk them through his concept and provide a chance to give feedback. He stated that the site is an important one when it comes to water quality, and is right at the confluence of Moores Creek and the Rivanna River – both of which are impaired due to excessive stormwater runoff. Mr. Pietila said that the redevelopment of this site needed to place a priority on minimizing further stormwater impacts, both during and after construction. He stated that at this time, there are a number of issues that remain in flux with the configuration of the project – such as the fact that the plan attached to the staff report was not being proffered, so the features shown were still conceptual. Mr. Pietila said that it made it difficult to offer much in the way of specific recommendations, but as a general matter, it is important that the site goes the extra mile in protecting water quality, particularly since critical slopes were also at issue.

Mr. Pietila stated that SELC staff would like to offer several ideas of things that could be added to the proffers to help address water quality impacts that are specifically attributable to the project. He said that for the construction phase, it was important to minimize the amount of sediment that gets washed from the site into adjacent waterways, and one way this has been handled in other rezonings in the County that can impact sensitive waters is to proffer the erosion and sediment controls can achieve a sediment removal rate of 80%, which is above the 60% typically achieved by basic regulatory measures. He stated that another technique would be to install additional protections where disturbances will be closest to Moores Creek, similar to what was offered in the Brookhill rezoning. Mr. Pietila said that post construction, the SELC would ask to consider ways that most or all of the stormwater runoff from the site would continue to be captured and treated onsite before it can enter Moores Creek.

Mr. Pietila said that redevelopment and historic preservation are important goals, and this project is a great opportunity for both – but on a sensitive site like this, water quality deserves special attention. He stated that the SELC urges the County to ensure that enforceable water quality protections that go above and beyond the regulatory minimum are incorporated into the project.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller said they would now move onto the discussion of the steep slopes overlay district.

There were no public comments on the overlay district.

Mr. Keller said they would now move onto the special use permit in C-1 Commercial to allow residential development.

There were no public comments on the special use permit.

Mr. Keller said they would now move onto the zoning ordinance modification to allow engineered structures.

There were no public comments on the modification.

Mr. Keller invited Mr. Roy to speak again on the application.

Mr. Dotson stated that the plan has great appeal as a mixed use project, and they are thrilled to have the site come into active use – but they are thinking of it as a mixed-use project, and at least 45% of the space would be job-generating, the special use permit allows for up to 94 dwelling units, and the concept plan is not proffered. He stated that there are no guarantees in the proffers of a mixed-use project and no minimum or maximum range as with the Riverside project, which seems completely open ended.

Mr. Roy stated that two years ago, when he brought this project to the Board of Supervisors, there was a feeling from staff at the time that they wanted the property to remain 100% light industrial – with no residential – as they felt there was a demand for it in this area. He said that through numerous meetings with staff including Susan Stimart and Elaine Echols, he would have preferred more residential as he felt this was a good location for it and he is not convinced there is a market for light industrial in this area. Mr. Roy stated that he feels there is potential for office and other work generators such as home-based businesses and younger professionals who want to be in this area and would like to be in the setting the old mill style of the building will provide. He said that the percentage was derived from a number of meetings with County staff, and they all felt that it allowed flexibility to make sure the building was preserved. Mr. Roy stated that staff would prefer 100% commercial, but residential is definitely limited to 55%.

Mr. Fritz pointed out that the proffer language comes almost directly from the comprehensive plan, and while there is no requirement for residential use, using more than 45% of the property and getting to 70% or 80% – without going to some type of structured parking, this would not be approved. He stated that the parking generation for commercial is so much higher than it is for residential, so unless the applicant wants to leave significant portions of the building unused, staff feels the parking issue is resolved.

Ms. More asked Mr. Roy to speak to water quality protections, particularly during construction.

Mr. Roy responded that part of that is a bit premature given where they are, and he did not even know that the floodplain could be reduced to allow for development until February, and the intention is to turn the building so the front yard is the water, and damaging that in any way runs contrary to the whole preservation component of the project. He stated that he does not yet have specifics on what the parking will look like, or even the total number of parking spaces – and while he did have a waiver request in to the County, he has not received comment yet.

Mr. Fritz noted that the property has to go through a site plan review process, and water quality is part of that review.

Ms. More said that hopefully a commitment to the highest level – if not above and beyond – would happen at the later stages.

Ms. Firehock said that they are not here to ask for proffers, as that is not legal, but she and Commissioner Spain would like to see more of the project as it unfolds and have more engagement in seeing how the applicant will address stormwater – as there are many opportunities on that site. She stated that she has worked on numerous historic building renovations and there are numerous ways to catch stormwater and not release it where it can cause damage.

Mr. Roy responded that this was a fair request, and he has met with every interested party over the past two years, and the project will continue to evolve. He stated that a lot of the site development would be is somewhat unclear to affirm significance is because a lot of that is dependent on DHR. They do get to comment on particularly the floodwall, the parking and any new structures that would exist on the site. So we are in that process, but we do not have the answers yet and probably will not for a few more months.

Ms. Firehock said that once she understood what the building envelopes are and where things will be placed, she would like to sit down with him and Timmons and hear more about what they are proposing. She emphasized that there is no disrespect to staff, but this is such an important site in such a critical location on an impaired water and there is no such thing as no-impact development. Ms. Firehock noted that they are adding more imperviousness, and the site is already is impactful. She said that she would like to see a development that the end of it would actually be having less impact than the site currently does right now, which she feels is possible. Ms. Firehock said that they could not address these questions at this meeting, but just want to have the opportunity to do that in an informal setting so that things are not set in stone.

Mr. Roy replied that this is acceptable to him.

Mr. Keller asked if there were other questions before he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bill Emory addressed the Commission and said he is a resident of East Market Street and was commenting on Mr. Roy's various applications and supports the change from LI to C1, changing the preserved sloped to managed slopes, and the other uses that he is calling for there. Mr. Emory stated that the people in Woolen Mills have been talking to Mr. Roy since July 2014 when he first approached neighbors about his intentions for this site. He said that sometimes community engagement feels like it is just like a box that a developer is checking off, but with Mr. Roy's quality of character and quality of his conversation with the neighborhood show that he is not a push over and sometimes says no, but listens and responds. Mr. Emory said that Woolen Mill historically swapped property with Monticello, and people have lived in this area for thousands of years – with a Monacan Village site just upstream on Moores Creek. He stated that for 100 years, the Woolen Mills site became industrial because of the water power and

topography, and now people are moving back in. Mr. Emory stated that residential is a much more suitable use for this use than big box metal industrial, and he hoped the County would look at the land use plan in the decades to come and begin to think whether industrial development of this kind can only be reached through residential neighborhoods. Mr. Emory noted that there were 400 people working at the Woolen Mills at the height of its capacity, and the parking there was less than currently exists – with one of the parking lots formerly a five-story industrial building. He added that if they could do it 50 years ago, they should be able to do it now with less parking.

Mr. Keller invited additional comments from Mr. Roy. There being none, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and action.

Ms. Riley moved to recommend approval of ZMA-2016-16 Woolen Mills with acceptance of the proffers offered by the applicant.

Ms. More seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited discussion. He pointed out that the ZMA touches on the residential percentage, and there has been quite an interest from an economic development standpoint in the County to continue to have an industrial component. Mr. Keller stated that the applicant has assured them that there is that variability, which can be concerning because of the latitude it affords, but also provides a degree of flexibility for a thoughtful developer. He emphasized that it needed to be restated for the record because they have been hearing it from many. Mr. Keller asked if they were ready to take a vote.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller said the ZMA-2016-16 carries and they would now proceed to the motion related to the rezoning.

Ms. Riley moved to recommend approval of ZMA-2016-21 Woolen Mills.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

Mr. Blair asked for clarification on ZMA-2016-21 Woolen Mills.

Mr. Fritz pointed out that ZMA-2016-21 Woolen Mills was the rezoning for the change from preserved slopes to managed slopes.

Mr. Keller corrected his previous comment and said that this pertains to slopes, not the rezoning. He invited discussion and noted that he did wish to revisit the slopes issue, adding that he and Mr. Fritz have spoken about this but do not believe that it affects this particular property. Mr. Keller called for a vote.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller noted that ZMA-2016-21 Woolen Mills carries.

Mr. Keller noted the next request was SP-2016-27, the special use permit in C-1 Commercial to allow residential development.

Ms. Riley moved to recommend approval of SP-2016-27 Woolen Mills with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Lafferty seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited discussion. There being none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller noted that SP-2016-27 Woolen Mills carries.

Mr. Keller stated that the fourth request that is special use permit SP-2016-28 under Section 30.3.11 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow engineered structures.

Mr. Riley moved to recommend approval of SP-2016-28 Woolen Mills with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Lafferty seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited discussion. There being none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller noted that SP-2016-27 Woolen Mills carries and congratulated the applicant and the community for this great potential project, stating that it would be moving onto the Board of Supervisors with unanimous support in each of the four areas.

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)