### Southwood Rezoning Phase I Planning Commission Work Session Summary

June 4, 2019

#### Question 1: What should be the maximum building height allowed per the Code of Development?

- Additional information is needed to evaluate the height within C-5 of Block B:
  - 1. Balloon test should be completed. Recommend it be raised at different heights to show the impact along Old Lynchburg Road and Mosby Mtn.
  - 2. Recommend renderings (3D) and sections should be provided that show how the building(s) would relate to existing Southwood residents, Mosby Mtn, and Old Lynchburg Rd. and that would take into account topography and vegetation. These should be added into the Code of Development.
  - 3. Information on how the structured parking would work in this area with the building and topography.
  - 4. Information on how building height is calculated. (See below for definition of building height from the ordinance)

*Building, height of:* The vertical distance measured from the level of the curb or the established curb grade opposite the middle of the front of the structure to the highest point of the roof if a flat roof; to the deck line of a mansard roof; or the mean height level between the eaves and ridge of a gable, hip or gambrel roof. For buildings set back from the street line, the height shall be measured from the average elevation of the ground surface along the front of the building.

- 5. Information on the programming for the building to determine appropriateness of building height.
- General consensus that 65 feet seems too tall for C-5. Neighborhood Center type scale was recommended- 2-3 stories. Discussion that 4 stories could be considered with a well-designed building.
- Recommend that the applicant consider that Southwood is at the edge of the growth/development area for the building heights and intensity of development.

#### Question 2: Should Old Lynchburg Road be a Framework Street?

• General consensus with Staff recommendation that Old Lynchburg Rd should be a Framework Street and regulations should apply.

# Question 3: Is the proposed recreation substitution request for Block B acceptable? Are sufficient recreational facilities being provided?

- General consensus that additional active recreational areas need to be provided for the residents of Southwood. Additional considerations:
  - 1. Space for older children to play.
  - 2. Southwood residents should be involved in the programming of the recreation.
  - 3. Statements on how these spaces could help with the integration of the "new" residents with the existing Southwood community.

## Question 4: Within the Code of Development and Application Plan that have been submitted, are there aspects that require additional detail, revisions, or clarification?

- In preparation for the Southwood Public Hearing the PC requests the following materials from the applicant and/or staff preferably 2 weeks but at least 1 week prior to the meeting:
  - 1. An overall project conceptual plan (showing the multi-phase project area- including Phase 1 rezoning and the remainder of Southwood) that delineates the approach to maintaining the integrity of the traditional legacy community.
  - 2. The average AMI of the early adopters and the AMI of the other residents (minus early adopters). (While AMI is not broken out in this way, early adopters vs other residents, current AMI data can be found on page 18 of the 'Context and History Document'.)
  - 3. The anti-displacement strategy for all residents, not just the early adopters.
  - 4. A concept plan articulating the overall residential "mix" location strategy for affordable and market rate housing and commercial.
  - 5. An Albemarle County school impact analysis.
  - 6. A transportation analysis of Old Lynchburg Road to the south of Southwood considering its potential long-term (40 years) traffic volume increases due to its connection to Rt 20 and Rt 29 via Plank Road.
- Information on the affordability of the project. How is the affordable housing being provided? What are the commitments for affordability for property/land sold to other developers? What are the requirements and longevity? Are HOA fees factored into the affordability equation?
- More information on the internal ARB
  - 1. What will the role be?
  - 2. What are the expectations?
  - 3. How will disputes be resolved?
- Are there ways in which the new water and sewer system can serve/help the existing Southwood community?
- How will the lifestyle of the residents be translated to the new community. One example: lots of people with tools, bikes, storage areas
- Concern about affordability on a larger scale and how the redevelopment of Southwood makes the entire area more valuable and could raise home prices over the area. Assessments would be raised for all in the area and could create less affordability in other nearby areas.
- Recommendation that the Code of Development be improved. Concerns about format/layout and that it's difficult to understand/not user-friendly.
- Would like to know more about the ability to retain existing trees and the level of retention vs. replacement.
- A memo of changes and how concerns were addressed should be provided for the public hearing.