

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes July 13, 2021**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, July 13, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Julian Bivins, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Rick Randolph; Daniel Bailey; Corey Clayborne; Jennie More; Tim Keller; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: none.

Other officials present were Megan Nedostup; Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Bivins said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." He said opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting will be posted at www.albemarle.org on the Community County Calendar when available.

After Ms. Shaffer called the roll, Mr. Bivins established a quorum and called the meeting to order.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

There was no consent agenda.

Presentation: Southwood Phase 1 Update

Ms. Megan Nedostup reported that staff had a joint presentation with Habitat for Humanity, and she presented an overview of what they would be presenting, including a brief history, site plan progress, and an update on the performance agreement. She stated that Southwood is located to the south of the City of Charlottesville off of Old Lynchburg Road, noting the area on a map presented.

Ms. Nedostup stated that Habitat had acquired the property in 2007, and there were 1,500 residents in 341 mobile homes; in 2016, the County partnered with Habitat through a Board resolution, and for FY17-19, the Board included the Southwood project under "revitalizing urban neighborhoods" in their strategic plan initiatives. She stated that in 2018, the Board adopted an action plan and appropriated \$675,000 to assist with the rezoning application. She said that in 2019, a performance agreement that included \$1.5 million for construction of 75 affordable units and \$300,000 for 80 or more Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) units, and \$1.4 million over 10 years in tax rebates.

Ms. Nedostup said that in 2019, a Phase One rezoning was approved. She presented the rezoning plan and stated that 450 maximum units were approved in the first phase, which included

a mixture of residential townhomes, multi-family and single-family duplexes, a maximum of 50,000 square feet of non-residential, and 12 blocks including a neighborhood center special area, with blocks 1 and 2 for amenity areas such as trails and open space. She noted that the rezoning was from R-2 to Neighborhood Model designation.

Ms. Nedostup presented the site plan update, noting areas where site plans are under review. She said that Village 2 was underway and was submitted that day, which Habitat would discuss in their presentation. She said that the site plan currently under review was for blocks 11 and 12, which is where the LIHTC apartments would be located, along with 121 multi-family units, a 6,500-square-foot amenity space on the corner of Hickory Street, as well as associated parking.

Ms. Nedostup stated that blocks 9-11 were 70 mostly market-rate townhomes, with New Horizon Drive as the new road there. She said that there were 16 affordable townhomes and some pedestrian and amenity spaces such as a playground, recreation, and open space with pedestrian connections to the edge of the trail connection that goes throughout Phase One. She referenced the site plan for Village 1 and stated that it had been approved for the affordable units, with an amendment currently under review for adding in the market-rate units—23 single-family detached, 8 single-family attached townhomes; and 49 total affordable units—3 single-family detached, 18 single-family attached townhomes, 8 duplexes, and 20 multi-family condominiums. She said that there were also a number of open space play areas, amenity spaces, and pedestrian connections within that area of Village 1.

Ms. Nedostup reported that Milestone 1A of the performance agreement included \$100,000 for planning work and applications, which has been completed; Milestone 1B included \$300,000 for 80 LIHTC units, currently in process. She said that Milestone 1C was \$200,000 when Habitat demonstrated secured funding for 57 affordable units, currently in process. She stated that Milestone 1D was for \$300,000 in two parts: a site plan approval for 20 affordable units and demonstrated secured funding for 64 affordable units. She noted that the amendment for the site plan is under review, but Village 1 for the affordable units is the only site plan approved to date. She said that Milestone 1E included \$300,000 for building permits for the 37 affordable units, currently awaiting site plan approval; Milestone 1F included \$600,000 when Habitat demonstrates secured funding for 72 affordable units, currently in process.

Ms. Nedostup noted that in addition to the performance agreement, the County applied on behalf of Habitat and was awarded a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) of \$1 million for 20 affordable units within Southwood. She said that the County was in the final process with Habitat and the Department of Housing and Community Development and hoping to be under contract within the next month or two.

Ms. Lori Schweller of Williams Mullen Law Firm addressed the Commission on behalf of the Greater Charlottesville Habitat for Humanity. Ms. Schweller said that they were very pleased to report on development and construction of Southwood Phase One, as they plan for submission of Phase Two. She stated that their goal today was to share progress, answer questions, and receive guidance to ensure their concerns were being addressed and expectations implemented.

She said that Habitat CEO and President Dan Rosensweig was present, and she introduced them to Andrew Vinisky, who joined Habitat a year earlier as Chief Construction Officer. She said that Mr. Vinisky has more than 30 years of experience with two of the largest homebuilders in the country as their chief land development officer, handling all aspects of land development—from purchase and sale to contracts through construction. She also introduced Melissa Simms,

Habitat's Land Development Coordinator, and noted that both Ms. Simms and Mr. Vinisky had earned a Master's in Urban and Environmental Planning from UVA.

Ms. Schweller stated that Mr. Rosensweig would provide a visual tour of the development, highlighting the streetscapes, non-residential areas, building massing, parks, and greenspace. She said that he would also update them on the number of affordable units and Habitat's housing efforts; Mr. Vinisky would cover the construction timeline, and she would address next steps.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that the Commission had taken a leap of faith when they recommended the project for approval about two years ago, and this was different because it was organized as a block plan, which created a regulatory framework and flexibility for cohorts of residents to design the various moments within the new development. He said that he wanted to show them what the block plan had produced and then get their feedback.

Mr. Rosensweig presented slides showing the entrance from Old Lynchburg Road, noting the LIHTC buildings with 12-foot first floors so that they can be commercial over the life cycle of the buildings; the main intersection and first intersection with New Horizon is the location of the civic space. He pointed out the section with the townhomes on the right, with the low-intensity residential where Village 1 is located. He said that they would conclude in the central area of Village 1, which has the greatest mix of housing types—everything from single-family detached homes to six-unit condos for seniors to townhomes to flex units.

Mr. Rosensweig noted the location of Five Pillars Park, which had just been awarded a grant from Dick's Sporting Goods and the United States Soccer Federation for a kids' soccer field.

Mr. Rosensweig said that when the development was approved, a code of development was approved that is essentially regulated by blocks, and the area near Hickory was always intended to be the most intensive mixture of uses—from residential to commercial. He stated that the transects scale back as you approach Biscuit Run Park, with differing intensity, and townhomes fronting the path and the street, with some being dual fronted so there are front porches on both sides. He said that with the more low-intensity neighborhood where Village 1 is, the residents came up with edge conditions, which are primarily lots in between the roads—Biscuit Run Park and Lynchburg Road—which set up best for single-family lots, duplexes, and smaller house types. He said that the internal conditions inside the road network have a greater mix of housing typology.

Mr. Rosensweig presented a view of the development from Old Lynchburg Road looking into the development, and all of the buildings step back after the second floor and appear from streetscape to be two or three stories. He pointed out the end of the lot looking backwards, with the road opening up to allow a plaza and café-type space in front of the buildings, with the sidewalk buffered by greenspace. He noted the 6,500-square-foot civic space, which will serve as the heart of the new downtown of Southwood, as well as the 12-foot first floors leading out the plaza. He stated that the initial uses would be largely accessory to the building, such as community centers and property leasing offices, with the hope for a greater mix of uses in the future.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that there had been a lot of concern that the streetscape from the residential village up to the neighborhood special area was a pleasant one that didn't feel cavernous and felt inviting, so they worked with a builder to design two-story townhomes with step-down in the back to tuck parking under, with parking relegated to allow street parking along Horizon. He said that the homes have porches and abundant street trees to make a nice

pedestrian experience.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that the residents promoted the idea of Village 1, governed by a component of the block plan, so Block 5 has internal conditions and the other blocks there have edge conditions. He referenced the appearance of the lower-scale residential neighborhoods and said that it was important to both Habitat and the Commission to not be able to distinguish the affordable units from the market-rate units, so every block contained a mixture of Habitat and market-rate homes. He said that they have coordinated with the market-rate builders to ensure the architecture matches up.

Mr. Rosensweig reported that the first thing that greets visitors and residents as they enter the development is open space, so it feels light and airy and welcoming, with a pocket park fronted by homes. He said that behind the homes, they are piloting two examples of the flex unit structure, which the County enabled through the code of development, and they would be accessory units for some families with home offices and multi-generational housing, and for others would be flexible affordable housing, as takes place internally to trailers currently but would now be an extra rented apartment.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that there were several ideas that drove the residents toward designing the parks as they were. He explained that they wanted them to be networked, fundamentally different because they serve different purposes. He said that there were a number of different pocket parks because there are new families as well as Southwood residents, and they wanted to provide a way to gather informally.

Mr. Rosensweig noted a condominium component, stating that about a third of families that participated in the first village were seniors or wanted condos, so they worked with VDO Architects to design condos that appear to be smaller typologies like townhomes from the streetscape. He said with each moment, they wanted to ensure there was a greenspace to do the work for that part of the village, so tucked in between the buildings is a passive-use, senior-oriented park. He said that residents wanted them all to be networked, so a path would lead between the opening in the townhomes across the street into Five Pillars Park.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that there is a concept for more active use, inspired by the neighborhood they built at Sunrise, where a kids' play area is buffered by homes and families have kitchens in the back of their homes so they can watch them. He said that the residents wanted the openings at all three corners of the triangle to be parks that invited people to come in and participate at Five Pillars Park. He stated that this thinking overlayed their park planning for all of Phase One, and the trail system was a network of trails that serpentine through the greenspace and offer numerous openings to get to the parks.

He said that on blocks 9-11, they didn't want to create a vehicular system, so the city blocks are formed by walksheds, with units perpendicular to create internal greenspace that establishes a passageway from trail to sidewalk. He noted that one concern in planning was piecemealing, and that was a very legitimate question and something they grappled with—but the residents created an opportunity to have a block structure similar in Village 2, so the second cohort picked up where they left off and continued that pattern of edge and internal conditions with parks laced throughout.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that some of the questions that came up were how much affordable housing and what percentage would be in that rezoned parcel, and they proffered 15%, which would have been 50 of the 335 total units; they ended up with 207 affordable units, representing

62%. He said that this is about 80 Habitat units for purchase and 6 for rent, which will shift a bit as some families start out renting but eventually purchase. He said that they have partnered with Piedmont Housing Alliance, which had a successful application for LIHTC units.

Mr. Rosensweig said that in the code of development, they have memorialized that at least 51% of the board would be Southwood residents—and the first architecture was vetted and approved by the residents themselves. He stated that with the uniform relocation plan filed with HUD, DHCD, and the County, they had hoped not to move anyone at all and have had to move more than anticipated—but none have been moved offsite. He said that they were working with 25 families and have paid them to move their trailers to a section of the park that's not on septic and to a later phase. He said that some trailers wouldn't move, and over the years, they have purchased a few trailers and restored them, so all 25 of those families would be safely moved by September, with 11 moved thus far.

Mr. Andrew Vinisky reported that Habitat had their site plan approved in the fall, with construction activities beginning in January with Faulconer Construction as lead general contractor. He said that they expect the lots to be completed sometime early this fall, with home construction to be completed in the first section along Horizon and the first five Habitat homes and first four market-rate homes to be delivered early in the summer of 2022.

Ms. Schweller stated that the next steps will be updating the Board of Supervisors in September to get their feedback, and Habitat has been working with staff on Phase Two. She said that they have been advised that an amendment to the existing zoning makes the most sense, so they are preparing a concept plan and new code of development to be submitted in the fall. She stated that the Commission's comments are important to them now as they plan Phase Two, with the Southwood planning and design group meetings guiding them towards an extension of the planning concepts, block pattern, and forms of development presented. Ms. Schweller said that the planning group has confirmed commitment to these concepts and has been focusing on greenspace, open space, and trails for Phase Two.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification that the project would come back before them with Phase Two, as the Commission was not in a position to have a lot of feedback on that phase because they were just seeing what had evolved from their previous conversations.

Ms. Schweller confirmed that they were looking for feedback on Phase One at this point.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was any public comment.

There was none, and the meeting proceeded.

Mr. Randolph stated that he appreciated the presentation and additional detail, but he did not understand if they were being asked to sign off on Phase One why they have seen at least two slides that show the number of units in Village 2—as part of Block A approved by the Board of Supervisors—but the Commission had not received indication as to the number and type of units. He said that they were being asked to comment but had not really had a chance to reflect on Village 2, which is an important part of Phase One.

Mr. Randolph stated that on August 7, 2018, the Board and Commission had a joint meeting at which they reviewed information that showed no less than 41 affordable housing units in a fully redeveloped Southwood. He said that no fewer than 43 are shown in Block A, which refers to

Village 1 and Village 2 in the original site plan submitted by Habitat and approved by the Board and Commission; Block B with block 9-12 had referred to everything else. He said that Village 1 shows 65 affordable housing units alone, so that's a big step up from 43, and his question is how many affordable housing units they will see in Village 2 in Block A.

Mr. Rosensweig said that it is either 21 or 22, but that site plan is just now submitted so until the County approves it or some version of it, they won't know that.

Mr. Randolph said that he appreciated that, as it was good to have a figure.

Mr. Randolph stated that at Southwood's groundbreaking ceremony on September 17, 2020, a *Daily Progress* article indicated that out of a total of 340 units, about 214 would be affordable at different levels of affordability. He said that the 1/25/21 Water Street Studio site plan as shown as Attachment B shows only 65 affordable housing units—with 65 Habitat-constructed units and 121 PHA affordable rental units, for a total of 186 affordable units in Phase One. Mr. Randolph stated that this is far below the 214 target, so adding 21 to 186 still comes in at 207 well below that target.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that there would be a total of 86 Habitat-built units and 121 LIHTC units, for a total of 207 units out of 335 total units in Phase One.

Mr. Randolph said that 121 plus 65 yields 186, with the additional 21 units for Village 2 bringing him to 207. He asked for clarification of those numbers for all of Phase One.

Mr. Rosensweig explained that in Village 1, there were 49 affordable units; in Village 2, there were 21 affordable units. He said that this totals 70, with 16 Habitat units as part of the townhome block along Horizon, for a total of 86 units. He stated that added to the 121 PHA units, that yields 207.

Mr. Randolph said that the majority of affordable units in the site plan are projected to be rental units, 65%, and he asked what percentage of those rental units are currently projected to be for existing Southwood residents.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that it was difficult to know that, but they have been transparent about this all along as they went through the process, and the Commission has emphasized the need for LIHTC and wanted to increase the number of affordable rentals as a result of that. He explained that Habitat had an obligation in the performance agreement to only market that to a LIHTC developer, which led them to partner with the PHA, which was awarded those credits. He reiterated that 121 would be LIHTC units and the remainder would be Habitat units. He said that it was residents' call as to whether they went into the LIHTC units, but Habitat was hoping that the majority of them wanted to be homeowners. He added that for seniors in particular, the LIHTC units would be attractive to them.

Mr. Randolph asked what Habitat would be doing to assist residents so they were not displaced, in the event the units were not functional for their needs.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that Habitat has a Uniform Relocation Act Plan on file with the County, and one step within that is homeownership with various bands of affordability. He said that residents have a choice of something onsite with Southwood, and if they choose to leave there is compensation for that. He stated that the plan is to have capacious and abundant affordable housing, and he hopes that at the end of the day, they will have more than two times than what

they had now—from 0% to 120% AMI. He added that most current Southwood residents are 50% or below.

Mr. Clayborne stated that this is an awesome project and one of the best redevelopment projects he has ever seen, and he hoped they were presenting this at conferences because it is such a good story. He said that his question was about the first-floor spaces, and he asked if childcare would be part of that. He also asked about stormwater management and any large structures they should be aware of, as he had concerns about safety with those if there are children playing nearby.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that they are presently working with the Boys & Girls Club and MACAA for a second phase of LIHTC that will have 1,500 square feet of ground-floor frontage—with 5,000 of that for an early childhood education center and programs like Head Start, and 10,000 to be used as a permanent facility for the Boys & Girls Club.

He said that in partnership with PHA, they worked with multiple partners and investors, as well as residents, to see what commercial space would work in Phase One. He stated that COVID scared away some investors, and for a long time, they were looking at the local Food Hub to be collocated with a shared commercial kitchen and storefront—but that didn't come to pass. He noted that there is about 10,000 square feet of 12-foot high space on the first floor that could be converted if partners materialize.

Mr. Vinisky stated that they recently submitted Village 2, the fourth and final site plan as part of Phase One, and all four site plans will show both above- and below-ground detention facilities. He said that none of them are planned to be extended wet ponds but would be dry ponds throughout the community, and they are not anticipating any situations where children would want to spend much time there.

Ms. Firehock commented that the content was much improved from what they have seen in the past, and she especially appreciates the attention to connectivity throughout the site and ability for people to enjoy recreational trails. She said that some of the renderings are showing trees at age 20 years and a lot of green, which she understood.

Ms. Firehock stated that the desire and intent is to ensure that residents are not displaced but she had a few questions. She asked what percent or total of the original units shown a few years ago were supposed to be occupied by Southwood residents, and how many were committed to existing residents. She said that her second question related to home-based businesses and renting additional space, as she was not certain how many were provided in this phase. Ms. Firehock said that her understanding in touring the site before it had begun redevelopment, a lot of businesses were not in rented additional space.

Mr. Rosensweig replied that they canvassed the neighborhood, and 25 families stepped forward in the spring when the application process began. He mentioned that there were 49 homes in the original village, with 20-25 built each year. He said they were now working with families on the next round of applications in August and September, with the hope and expectation that the first 49 units will be filled. He stated that they presume that of the 86 units they would build as part of the first phase, all or part of them would be Southwood families. He said that was the single greatest purpose of this project, there was a huge desire and need, and it makes sense that families moving out of the later phases into the first phases would free up room for the later phases. He stated that close to 100% of what they build will be for existing Southwood families,

but they can't force anyone to stay in the neighborhood and some will leave.

Mr. Rosensweig emphasized that Habitat was working one on one with them on strategies such as paying them for their trailers, paying them to stay in the park if they go into a later phase, paying expenses for moving the trailers, and hospitality trailers so that families can stay onsite while their trailer is being moved. He said that thus far, not a single family has had to spend a night outside of Southwood, but he was not certain that they could completely avoid having people spend a night or two in a hotel as things progressed.

Mr. Rosensweig said that home-based businesses were another challenges, but the code of development allowed a lot of flexibility for home occupations, and most of the home occupations in Southwood are not particularly intensive—such as party planning. He said that they are piloting a flex-unit concept, and what was presented was a two-story version, but they would also offer a one-story version with other parking; the two-story version presented is because the site is under parked per regulations.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that many residents see businesses as amenities, but many see them as nuisances, and they were intentional about this in working through the design for the first village, as business owners were part of that cohort. He said that was a bit more of a struggle, and there's been a bit of a false economy at Southwood, so people have operated their businesses out of convenience—but they are not conforming or zoned businesses. He emphasized that they have been talking for years about a financial plan, with a full-time business incubator specialist on staff who works one on one with those residents. He said that it is still a work in progress for residents to choose to locate their businesses in the new downtown Southwood.

Ms. Firehock commented that she hoped they would address the stormwater issue seriously, and dry ponds are less effective in cleaning pollutants than wet ponds, and she didn't know if they were trying to use those dry ponds as play areas when it wasn't raining. She said that there are many progressive things they can be doing in this regard, but that's not up for discussion at this meeting.

Ms. Firehock asked if the Monacan Nation would be involved in the park that was using their name.

Mr. Rosensweig confirmed this and said that as part of the environmental review, the Monacan Nation—led by Chief Branham—came forward as an interested party. Mr. Rosensweig said they walked the park with the Chief and another representative of the First Nation, as well as representatives from DHCD and the County to a site that was likely a historic hunting ground. He stated that they have reserved that ground as undevelopable, and it will be Monacan Nations Park. He said that they invited the Monacan Nation to be involved in the design process of Village 2, but they declined because of other obligations such as the water issue in Louisa. He stated that as they get more granular in the park design itself, the Monacan Nation would be reengaged and allowed to be the prime designers of that space.

Ms. Nedostup added that as part of the CDBG funding, the County would help facilitate the process and ensure that the engagement takes place.

Ms. More said that in looking at staff's photos of condos and mention seniors as potential residents, she was wondering about accessible units and asked if staff could speak about that, as well as whether there was a requirement for a certain percentage of accessible units.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that the ground-level condos are fully accessible, and they are building a few custom units with full accessibility features and wider bathrooms for families that already have mobility issues. He said that a number of the project's grants require that they have visitable homes, so as long as the topography allows, they will have a zero-step entry and first-floor living, kitchen, and bath. He stated that lifelong living is built into almost every unit they have.

Ms. More commented that there isn't enough of that around, not necessarily even ADA compliant, and sometimes even one or two steps can create a challenge for people.

Mr. Rosensweig estimated that 76 of the 86 units will have zero-step entry.

Mr. Bailey stated that he thinks this is a fantastic project, and he appreciates the care and thought that's been put into it thus far.

Mr. Carrazana said he echoes what has already been said about the project, and he appreciates what's been presented to give them a feel for the character. He stated that he also likes the different size typology to give it a village feel. He noted that he did have questions about what's being done to accommodate mass transit in and near the village, and he would also like to hear about the range of commercial and what type of response they've been getting with that.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that there are existing transit buses going through the park today, and he anticipates that to continue.

Ms. Nedostup stated that they had early conversations with CAT during the rezoning, and at that time, there wasn't a commitment to have the loop in the first phase—but they planned to circle back with that to see if there was a desire to reroute the existing transit to incorporate the loop. She said that perhaps there would be an opportunity to add a stop within Phase One, so they would continue those conversations as things progress and people start living there.

Mr. Carrazana commented that he appreciated that but wondered how they would accommodate that in the new development, as he didn't see any specifics in the information on transit and how it would be made safe and accessible.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that the roads would be built to VDOT standards, and the various sizes of roads would include the ability for buses to loop around fully without having to stop, so it would be as convenient or more than it is today. He said that this is the most-used bus line in the system, and Southwood families use it all the time—so it would be tragic if CAT stopped using that, and Habitat would be doing everything possible to accommodate it. He noted that it typically happens later in the process, and they identify a place where it makes sense to have a bus stop, bench, or covered seating. He said that the first civic space would be appropriate for that, and it's too big of a site for just one stop.

Mr. Carrazana suggested that as they continue to develop the presentation and take it on the road, as Mr. Clayborne had mentioned, and transit should be part of that story.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that he appreciated that point and the feedback. He said that in terms of commercial, they would likely see it more in the second phase than the first phase, and he had mentioned the false economy to Ms. Firehock—but it's been a long process to try to move people forward in that regard. He commented that to him success is less about outside commercial

entities coming in and establishing themselves as part of mixed use, but there's enough commercial and entrepreneurial spirit inside of Southwood that they'd really like to see that happen.

He noted that one of the primary reasons for establishing a form-based code was that in the neighborhood special areas, the form of the building would set them up so that over their life cycle, they can accommodate different uses. Mr. Rosensweig commented that people have been coming to the table a bit more now that they see change happening, and at some point, there must be a "burning platform" to get people to focus, which is starting to take place now.

Mr. Keller thanked the team for the update and said that the design evolution with community involvement has had a significant impact on the greenspace system, reflecting how the project team has taken that to heart. He stated that he had four questions that were essentially building on what his colleagues had said, noting that this is really their case study, and Mr. Rosensweig has also been willing to share what hasn't worked so they can learn from that.

Mr. Keller asked if the lifespan for the commercial buildings was based on the mortgage reduction.

Mr. Rosensweig said that he didn't completely understand the question.

Mr. Keller clarified that he had used the term "life span" of the buildings in talking about the first-floor commercial uses.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that it's complicated, especially by the capital stack that supports LIHTC, which doesn't set up very well or easily for mixed use unless it's brought in at the beginning. He said that they have worked with PHA to discount the land somewhat so that some of the space is reserved as community room, which is the main thing that residents want. He stated that the project team has tried to condominium-size a certain percentage of the commercial space so it can be owned by a central entity with the sole purpose of allowing it to be affordable, rental commercial space for Southwood business.

He noted that this had been a bit waylaid by COVID, and the original potential investors didn't materialize so the best they could do was maintain about 10,000 square feet on the first floor of the first building—so it would be quasi-commercial now and convertible in the future. He commented that he is not sure how that stacks later as LIHTC gets refinanced.

Mr. Keller said that how retail will come back is all up in the air for the next decade.

Mr. Keller indicated that with Stacy Pethia coming onto the County, they have had questions about the amount of AMIs, and Mr. Rosensweig has mentioned numerous times that he thinks the home ownerships are going to the very lowest percentile of the group, because of the Habitat model. He said that this was outstanding, but he would like to see more of a breakdown of the 207 units and where they would fall on the AMI index.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that it would be hard to provide something quotable on the spot, but his staff does have information regarding the breakdown of the 25 families that have applied for the program. He stated that the PHA units are dependent upon how much money they raise, and the more subsidy they can bring into the project, the more they can push the AMI down. He said that they are looking at an average AMI of 60%, which means there will be some cross-subsidies where 80% units are cross-subsidizing 30-35% units—which is their intention. He emphasized

that the more money raised, the less cross-subsidy needed, so there are fewer units at the upper end. He said that all of the 121 units must be below 80% AMI, and the numbers for Habitat's programs over the last few years have been an average 32% of AMI.

He offered to have Ms. Nedostup provide that information.

Mr. Keller said that it was important to see what the breakdown would be for those 207 units.

He said that when Habitat had originally purchased Southwood, there were 343 mobile homes and about 1,500 residents. He asked Mr. Rosensweig if he could tell them today, and then projected at completion, how many of those residents still remain—or how many units retained family continuity.

Mr. Rosensweig replied that this is a challenging question, but he can speak to the data that exists. He stated that when they first went family by family in 2013 and surveyed them, roughly 90% said they intended to stay. He commented that it was a bit abstract because they didn't know what things were going to look like, but that was one data point. He stated that everyone who is here and participating has a guaranteed right to be there, and they anticipated redevelopment happening faster.

Mr. Rosensweig said that they went back in 2018 and asked the same question, but they did it in a somewhat legally binding way under the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Act. He said that they went door to door again and talked to every family, and they issued a General Information Notice (GIN) to every family that was there, basically informing of them of their rights to stay, etc., and how they would be compensated, as well as options in the new Southwood. He noted that as long as they have a GIN, they are protected.

He said that a lot of housing agencies at that point will close the door and wait for attrition to happen, or the alternative is to issue a move-in notice (MIN) that says they can move in when the redevelopment happens, although it may be several years—but it obligates them to move in when it does happen. He stated that at that point, they are going through the rezoning, so they need to be able to provide density figures. He stated that since 2018, there are 23 families that have MINs, so you could conclude that of the 341 trailers, 23 families have moved in since 2018, and approximately 23 families have moved out.

Mr. Keller stated that it shows the complexity of these kinds of projects, and one of the few areas where Habitat has received criticism has been with Sunrise and the true numbers from the beginning of the trailer court to the end of the development. He said that no one has ever been able to come up with an agreement as to what those were, so he is hoping that they can be more specific with this project.

He said that many of the Commissioners are supporting the increased density Habitat is advocating for, but multiplying out the 207 units, he comes up with 828. Mr. Keller emphasized that at this point, he is seeing them having a net loss of 700 people in terms of affordability. He reiterated that for all of their talk about increasing the number of affordable units, he was concerned about the prospect of a loss—as well as taking units that weren't at the standard they all believe in.

Mr. Rosensweig explained that this is Phase One, so it is 30 acres out of 123—so there are 207 affordable homes on roughly one-fifth of the site. He said that there is an area four to five times

the size of Phase One that will accommodate more affordable housing, so when they come back for the second phase of rezoning, the additional density of affordable housing will be, along with market rate. He stated that they are anticipating an increase in the number of units, and there will certainly be affordable housing, but it's open to opinion as to whether what is on the ground now is "decent" housing. He emphasized that they are creating a significantly greater amount of affordable housing with the two phases.

Mr. Keller said that along the same lines as Mr. Randolph was inquiring about, they continue to hear that answers will be available in the future, and he cannot believe they can be doing this without having those kinds of projects—so the Commission can begin to say, "Wow this is an amazing project because we're going to have 500 or 1,000 more people that have affordable homes than in 2007 with this parcel."

Mr. Rosensweig responded that as part of Phase Two rezoning, they will have a density they will be asking for, and they will be able to project how many units will be affordable.

Mr. Keller said that as they are getting closer to coming in with Phase Two, it would be helpful to have numbers for what Phase One is anticipated to generate.

Mr. Rosensweig replied that there is more certainty as they move through the project, and it will be easier to answer questions in Phase Two.

Mr. Bivins asked about the new Boys & Girls Club in a permanent facility as part of Phase Two.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that he can't speak for another organization, but he could confirm that this was the intent.

Mr. Bivins asked if it was also hoped that MACAA would be relocating its daycare here or opening a second location.

Mr. Rosensweig replied that his sense is that they are trying to grow and disperse the program, so they are meeting families in communities instead of central locations, and Southwood was targeted as one of several places.

Mr. Bivins said that they are starting to see the spreading out of activities for young people, and it is helpful for him to know.

He also stated that when they go before the Supervisors, it would be helpful for them to have information about transit—as the County puts a significant amount towards CAT's budget—and he would suggest that they provide this sooner rather than later.

Mr. Bivins said that it would be advisable to have concrete information for the Board as to accessible housing and affordable housing, so that they have a sense of what this project will provide. He noted that people struggle with affordability across the community, and it would be good to demonstrate how this project will address this. He also encouraged Mr. Rosensweig to meet with economic development staff about how this project can provide a location and jobs, noting that the Governor just put a lot of money in the region to help companies bring things to markets. He commented that it would be great to put some of those incubator businesses in Southwood.

Mr. Bivins asked if there would be common areas in the units for things like washing machines and other amenities, stating that it would be helpful for families to have an optimal footprint to give them as much space as possible.

Mr. Bivins congratulated the team for the plan, but he would continue to request sensitivity for the groupings of what is termed affordable housing. He stated that he hoped to see more integration of those forms in Phase Two, Village 2, etc. He commented that the plaza space and 6,500 square feet of public space looks inviting to him. He said that blocks 9-11 look good, but then there are two affordable housing units just smacked together—and it seems that all of the affordable housing units throughout are grouped together. He said that it would be beneficial for units to not be easily recognizable as having a certain AMI.

Mr. Bivins said that he knows there would be a focus on moving school buses through here, as there are a lot of children, so it shouldn't be an issue for CAT to get transit through.

Mr. Bivins encouraged Mr. Rosensweig to have his team have some things more elevated when they address the Board, and also suggested that they share with the Board that the team will be back to the Commission with more details about Phase Two.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Rosensweig to provide a percentage in Phase One of the residents in Southwood who intend to rent PHA housing.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that PHA does not yet have marketing materials out, so people don't know what the units will look like and how much they will cost, and it would just be a guess at this point.

Mr. Randolph said that they had the earlier study of who intended to stay, then the late-2018 study where people committed to locating in the new development, but perhaps there are some who have indicated that they want to move from an owned trailer to rental units.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that they have not heard that overwhelmingly, and they were fairly transparent in the process when the County was asking about LIHTC, and it didn't seem that Southwood residents wanted these. He said that's why they had some units mixed in, and the Habitat-built units are more what the residents desired, and 6 of the 86 they were building would at least start as rentals. He stated that it was hard to estimate LIHTC, because there were eligibility rules and property management rules as to income qualifications. He noted that there were people who did not want to go through that documentation process, which includes year-after-year income data. He said that LIHTC provides a big amenity of value to have that band of affordable housing, but they never felt that a large percentage of that would be Southwood families.

Mr. Randolph emphasized that it would be advantageous to have as much of that empirical information as possible as Phase Two moves forward in the fall. He said that perhaps the information is a year or two away, but the County will be interested in seeing it going forward.

Mr. Rosensweig said that it will be an important data point for the County to have as they implement their housing strategy, because ultimately, it's about where to direct resources—and it needs to be the right direction for the people who live in Albemarle County. He stated that they are having a lot of direct conversations with people who have expressed a desire to move into the first or second phase, and they could possibly design a survey question that provides a ballpark idea. He said that until there are floor plans, that information doesn't stand the test of

time—but they certainly will ask, and he will do his best at the time of rezoning to provide an estimate.

Mr. Bivins asked if he needed anything else from the Commission.

Mr. Rosensweig responded that this was very helpful, and he encouraged the Commissioners to submit questions to his team, and he preferred their role to be active stakeholders versus passive regulators.

Mr. Bivins thanked Mr. Rosensweig and Ms. Nedostup.

Committee Reports

There were none.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – July 7, 2021

Mr. Rapp reported that there had been a busy Board meeting, with discussion on the housing policy and staff having additional work to do on the incentive options for developers. He said that they would be working these out with members of the development community and other stakeholders.

He stated that they discussed the Route 240 and Route 810 Virginia Scenic Byways designation, and they had a public hearing on the special use permit for the St. John Family Life & Fitness Center, which was approved.

Mr. Rapp said that the Commission would review Breezy Hill at its meeting on July 20, 2021.

Mr. Bivins asked if the UVA Architect would present to the Commission on July 20, 2021.

Mr. Rapp responded that she was on the agenda first.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Carrazana to introduce them to the UVA topic.

Mr. Carrazana replied that the architect would certainly appreciate going before the Breezy Hill item, and he said there was a lot happening in the Ivy corridor that she could provide an update for. He said that she would update them on the master plan and the infrastructure activity currently underway. He noted that she would also discuss the stormwater management plan for the site, which was serving as a central piece of the landscape—much like Jefferson.

Mr. Carrazana stated that she would also discuss the Democracy Institute that has been announced.

Old Business/New Business

There were no items.

Items for Follow-Up

There were no items.

Adjournment

At 7:49 p.m., the Commission adjourned to the July 20, 2021, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

(Recorded by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards and transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 08/03/2021
Initials: CSS