

Agenda

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR TUESDAY, April 8, 2025 at 5:30 P.M. Hybrid Meeting

I. Commission Pre-Meeting (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 5:00 p.m.

Location: (NDS Conference Room, 610 East Market Street, Charlottesville, VA 22902)

II. Commission Regular Meeting

Beginning: 5:30 p.m.

Location: (Council Chambers, 605 E. Main Street, Charlottesville, VA 22902 and Electronic/Virtual)

A. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

F. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

1. Minutes – February 25, 2025 – Special Meeting

III. PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING

Beginning: 6:00 p.m.

Continuing: until all public hearings are completed

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing

1. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Funding: Draft Program Year 2025-26 Annual Action Plan.

The Planning Commission will be considering projects to be undertaken as part of the proposed Program Year 2025-26 Annual Action Plan (PY25) for the CDBG and HOME programs. Staff from the Office of Community Solutions (OCS) and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) will be presenting funding recommendations for activities designed to address a wide range of community development goals, including economic and workforce development, public service projects that benefit low- and moderate-income citizens, improvements to public facilities and infrastructure, and fair and affordable housing. The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has not yet informed the City of new funding to be made available for these programs but based on Program Year 2024-25 funding, the City anticipates approximately \$400,000 in HUD funds for CDBG and approximately \$98,000 for HOME. A 30-day period for public comment will commence on May 1 and run through June 1, 2025. The draft Annual Action Plan is also scheduled to be presented at public hearings before City Council on Monday, April 21 and Monday, May 5, 2025. Members of the public are invited to provide written comment on the proposed PY25 Annual Action Plan in writing to CDBG/HOME Taskforce, City of Charlottesville City Hall, P.O. Box 911, Charlottesville, Virginia 22902 or via email to warna@charlottesville.gov.

2. **PL-25-0027 – 401 Ridge St - Special Use Permit** – The applicant, Andrew Jenkins, is requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) pursuant to Sections 34-5.2.1.D. General Public Notice and Hearing Requirements, 34-5.2.14. Special Use Permit, 34-3.2.2 Permitted Use Table, and 34- 3.3.4.C.1.

Commercial Uses of the Development Code of the City of Charlottesville (“Code”) for the following property (“Property”):

Parcel Number: 290132000, 401 Ridge Street, Charlottesville, VA, 22902

The purpose of this SUP is for General Lodging (up to 10 guests) in an R-C zoning district for a Bed and Breakfast. The Bed and Breakfast will have a total of five bedrooms and no exterior changes are being proposed as part of this application. The property is approximately 0.31 acres with road frontage along Ridge Street and side street frontage along Dice Street. The Comprehensive Land Use Map designates this parcel as Medium Intensity Residential. The property is zoned Residential C (R-C) with an Architectural Design Control District overlay. Information pertaining to this application may be viewed online at <https://www.charlottesville.gov/1077/Agendas-Minutes> (available online at least five days prior to the Public Hearing) or obtained from the Department of Neighborhood Development Services, 2nd Floor of City Hall, 610 East Main Street. Persons interested in this SUP request may contact NDS Planner Ben Koby by e-mail (kobyb@charlottesville.gov) or by telephone (434-970-3529).

IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

Beginning: following the hearings

Continuing: until all public hearings and action items are completed

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing (as applicable)

V. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE/ADJOURN

Tuesday May 13, 2025 – 5:00 PM	Pre-Meeting	
Tuesday May 13, 2025 – 5:30 PM	Regular Meeting	<u>Minutes</u> <u>Site Plan</u> –1613 Grove Street Extended

Anticipated Items on Future Agendas

Site Plan –240 Stribling Ave

Subdivision – Seminole/Hillsdale

Entrance Corridor Review - 1185 Seminole Trail

PLEASE NOTE: THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

PLEASE NOTE: We are including suggested time frames on Agenda items. These times are subject to change at any time during the meeting.

Individuals with disabilities who require assistance or special arrangements to participate in the public meeting may call the ADA Coordinator at (434) 970-3185 or submit a request via email to ada@charlottesville.gov. The City of Charlottesville requests that you provide a 48 hour notice so that proper arrangements may be made.

Planning Commission premeeting and regular meetings are held in person and by Zoom webinar. The webinar is broadcast on Comcast Channel 10 and on all the City's streaming platforms including: Facebook, Twitter, and www.charlottesville.gov/streaming. Public hearings and other matters from the public will be heard via the Zoom webinar which requires advanced registration here: www.charlottesville.gov/zoom. You may also participate via telephone and a number is provided with the Zoom registration or by contacting staff at 434-970-3182 to ask for the dial in number for each meeting.

**LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY
1/1/2025 TO 3/31/2025**

- 1. Preliminary Site Plans**
- 2. Development Plan (Major)**
 - a. 1609 Gordon Avenue – January 30, 2025
- 3. Final Site Plans**
 - a. 2117 Ivy Road PUD – January 7, 2025
 - b. 818-820 E Jefferson Street – March 10, 2025
- 4. Site Plan Amendments**
- 5. Subdivision**

Planning Commission Special Meeting

February 25, 2025 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM

Hybrid Meeting – City Council Chambers

Commissioners Present: Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Roettger, Commissioner Yoder, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Joy

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Carrie Rainey, Dannan O’Connell, Matt Alfele, Kellie Brown

Commissioner Schwarz called the Planning Commission Special Meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

1. Matters from the Public

No Public Comments

2. Special Exception – Critical Slope – 1115 St. Charles Court

Staff Report

Dannan O’Connell, City Planner – This is a small request to disturb around 500 square feet of critical slopes around the back of an existing residential parcel to permit some backyard improvements, a patio, retaining wall, and shed. Staff did not have any conditions attached to this and did recommend approval. The only thing that came up in review was from city utilities. There is a private drainage easement in the rear yard. If this does get approved, we will ask for a minor development plan to be submitted. We would review that to make sure the proposed improvements do not encroach too far into that private easement.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I remember a time when a basic critical slope waiver like this would be on the Consent Agenda. I don’t know if we have had a policy change. This application merits Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Roettger – I cannot remember what the foundation for the shed was. This would be Ok. In the future, how it attaches to the ground, like a small case like this, would make a difference. This seems like a small encroachment.

Applicant Presentation

Matt Morrill, Applicant – I don’t have much to add. It is steep in the back of our house. We want to create a small, flat area for us to use. We also have a safety concern of somebody falling back there. I have almost fallen when it was icy. That is also part of the request.

Commission Discussion and Motion

Motion to Approve – Commissioner d’Oronzio – I move to recommend approval of the critical slope special exception for Tax Map and Parcel 48A041B08 as requested, with no reservations or conditions, based on a finding that due to unusual size, topography, shape, location, or other unusual physical conditions, or existing development of a property, the requirements of Section 34-4.10.1 would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the use, reuse or redevelopment of such property or would result in significant degradation of the site or adjacent properties. Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion passes 5-0.

3. Special Exception – Fence – 820 East Jefferson Street

Commissioner Roettger recused herself due a conflict of interest with someone on the project and left Council Chambers.

Staff Report

Carrie Rainey, City Planner – The applicant requests a Special Exception Permit (SEP) to install fencing on a proposed deck in the front and side street yards on 9th Street NE and E Jefferson Street in the NX-10 Node Mixed Use district at 818-820 E Jefferson.

The node mixed use districts are described as moderate- and higher-intensity mixed use, office, and residential buildings intended to accommodate a variety of residential, retail, service, and commercial uses in a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly storefront environment. The Urban Mixed Use Core land use designation is defined as Urban mixed-use districts that support community housing, employment, and commercial development.

City Council may grant an applicant a Special Exception Permit (SEP), giving consideration to a number of factors set forth within Zoning Ordinance Section 34-5.2.15.D.

Regarding Criteria 1, whether the proposed modifications will be harmonious with existing and approved patterns of development: the properties in the vicinity of the subject property vary in building setback and front yard use, which includes parking lots and landscaping. Staff finds the proposed improvements are harmonious with the existing patterns of development within the neighborhood. The applicant also received a Certificate of Appropriateness for Corridor Review for the proposed improvements on November 21, 2023, which is included in your attachments.

Regarding Criteria 2, whether the proposed modifications support the goals and strategies of the comprehensive plan: The Future Land Use Plan of the 2021 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property and surrounding properties as Urban Mixed-Use Node, which is urban mixed-use districts that support community housing, employment, and commercial development. The proposed fencing will allow the creation of an outdoor seating area adjacent to and visible from both streets, which will increase activation and pedestrian interest in line with Mixed Use Area Objectives and Goal 3 of the Land Use chapter. In addition, the new seating area supports commercial development by increasing the capacity of the existing restaurant (general food and beverage) use. Staff finds the proposed improvements support the goals and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding Criteria 3, whether the permit is consistent with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice: As the application aligns with the Comprehensive Plan and provides outdoor space and street activation for 9th Street NE and E Jefferson Street, staff finds granting the Special Exception Permit is consistent with good zoning practice and general public welfare.

Staff does not recommend any conditions be placed on this Special Exception Permit. Any proposed modifications to the fence and gate details will be reviewed by staff for consistency with the issued Corridor Review Certificate of Appropriateness.

Applicant Presentation

No Applicant Presentation

Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Was there a zoning determination that these improvements are a fence?

Ms. Rainey –Yes. We talked about it as a group with our previous director. Based on the current definition of fence in our code, we are finding that a lot of these elements fall into that definition.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Are we going to fix that as part of our yearly review?

Ms. Rainey – My understanding is that is on the list for consideration.

Commissioner Schwarz – You did say that Jeff Werner (Preservation Planner) is reviewing this. If they make any changes, he will see that and decide whether it is Ok.

Ms. Rainey – That is correct. If you apply no conditions today, any changes will still need to get that further review by Mr. Werner.

Motion to Approve – Commissioner d’Oronzio – I move to recommend approval of this application for a Special Exception Permit in the NX-10 Node Mixed Use zone at 818-820 E Jefferson Street to permit the installation of fences consistent with the packet drawing and materials provided. Second by Commissioner Yoder. Motion passes 4-0.

Discussion following Second of Motion

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Does the wording of this motion allow fences beyond the one proposed here?

Ms. Rainey – Generally, the resolutions that are produced for Council are specific to that application package. It would be fine to also word a motion today that is specific to the application materials in terms of general locations or other things that might be appropriate.

4. Special Exception – Street Facing Entries – Friendship Court Phase 3(400-426 Garrett Street)

Commissioner Roettger rejoined the Planning Commission for this application.

Staff Report

Carrie Rainey, City Planner – The applicant requests a Special Exception Permit (SEP) to modify street-facing entry spacing requirements along 2nd Street SE and Hinton Avenue for Phase 3 of the Friendship Court, or Kindewood, redevelopment project. Entries are required every 40-ft along 2nd Street SE and every 60-ft along Hinton Avenue unless the permit is granted. The applicant proposes 2 street-facing entries on 2nd Street SE and no street-facing entries on Hinton Avenue.

The corridor districts are described as moderate- and higher-intensity mixed use, office, and residential buildings intended to accommodate a variety of residential, retail, service, and commercial uses in a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly storefront environment.

The Urban Mixed Use Core land use designation is defined as Urban mixed-use districts that support community housing, employment, and commercial development.

As previously mentioned, this request is for Phase 3 of the project, which is shown outlined in red on the left. More specifically, the request is for frontages of Building 12, as shown in red hatching on the right.

City Council may grant an applicant a Special Exception Permit (SEP), giving consideration to a number of factors set forth within Zoning Ordinance Section 34-5.2.15.D.

Regarding Criteria 1, whether the proposed modifications will be harmonious with existing and approved patterns of development: The entire eastern side of the 2nd Street SE block is part of the Friendship Court property and proposed for redevelopment, including Phases 3 and 4. The western side of the block is comprised of 2 large buildings which are generally setback 12-ft to 30-ft from the property line with 2 to 3 entries. Staff believes some existing entries do not meet the requirements of street-facing entries as they lack an entry feature. Proposed Building 12 will provide a similar setback to the 12-ft existing minimum building setback on the western side of the block, as well as 2 street-facing entries with entry features and foundation landscaping as described in the applicant’s narrative and exhibits. While these entries are spaced further apart than existing entries in the block, staff believes the street activation generated by these entries, which will otherwise meet the

requirements and intent of Section 34-2.10.13, is harmonious with the existing patterns of development within the block.

Hinton Avenue is a new public street proposed as part of the Phase 3 project and fronted by 2 buildings, Buildings 10 and 12, and a public park along the southern side of the block. The northern side of the block is proposed to be redeveloped in the future as Phase 4 to the project. Staff finds the proposed removal of the street-facing entry on Hinton Avenue harmonious with the existing patterns of development.

Regarding Criteria 2, whether the proposed modifications support the goals and strategies of the comprehensive plan: The Future Land Use Plan of the 2021 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property and surrounding properties as Urban Mixed-Use Node, which is urban mixed-use districts that support community housing, employment, and commercial development. Several goals in the Comprehensive Plan speak to a desire for appropriately scaled redevelopment and compact street networks that contribute to placemaking, improve the pedestrian experience, and connect residents with amenities and destinations. The project creates a new public street network within the development, breaking down the large block into several smaller blocks and providing access to the new public park created as a part of this project.

The applicant's narrative states the 2nd Street SE frontage along Building 12 will have additional elements to promote street activation and contribute to placemaking including seating nodes setback from the sidewalk with foundation plantings. The Comprehensive Plan also prioritizes the preservation and consideration of streetscape trees and urban tree canopy. The proposed reduction in street-facing entries limits impacts to the root zone of white oak streetscape trees along 2nd Street SE, which provide mature tree canopy and improve the pedestrian experience.

The width of Building 12 along Hinton Avenue Extended (66-ft 6-in.) is slightly wider than the 60-ft minimum building width required to provide a side street-facing entry. However, the building width is still at a pedestrian scale well below the maximum allowed building width of 275-ft. In addition, entries are provided within 40-ft of the Hinton Avenue Extended façade on each adjoining building façade. These entries will generally be visible from Hinton Avenue Extended and contribute to the activation of Hinton Avenue Extended. Staff finds the proposed modification supports the goals and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding Criteria 3, whether the permit is consistent with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice: As the application aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, provides amenities such as outdoor spaces to otherwise activate the street and meet the intent of the street-facing entry requirements per Section 34-2.10.13.A.1, as well as protects existing mature streetscape trees which contribute to urban tree canopy and improve the pedestrian experience, staff finds granting the Special Exception Permit is consistent with good zoning practice and general public welfare.

Staff recommends approval of the Special Exception Permit to modify the street-facing entry requirements for Building 12, identified in the application exhibits dated January 28, 2025, to require no street-facing entry spacing maximums on the 2nd Street SE and Hinton Avenue Extended building façades with the following condition: At least 2 street-facing entries with entry features meeting the requirements of Section 34-2.10.13.B are required on the 2nd Street SE building façade of proposed Building 12.

Applicant Presentation

William Abrahamson, Applicant – We have had extensive conversations with NDS staff about this location and how to meet the best needs for the building program of this building and the site. One thing that I wanted to call attention to is the preservation of the street trees. It is a tight site. We have a lot of layers there with the build-to depth that we are trying to manage and keep a healthy root system starting with construction but all the way through. We are trying to sit lightly within that space between the trees and the building.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I was just trying to get a better sense of whether this is a ‘nice to have,’ or ‘a have to have.’ In your letter/application, you say that Virginia Housing would not fund a building with walk-up units.

Mr. Abrahamson – That is not entirely correct. Virginia Housing, which is funding this project, funds walk-ups all the time. The issue is that they want all the units of a certain type and income band to be equitable. Whether you considered a feature or a bug, whether it is a second access, or a security risk, to have 1 or 2 units having this element and the others is not inequitable in their interpretation. That is not a hard rule. In our conversations with their architecture and engineering team, we have had similar comments.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If you were to say that the zoning code requires this, they would say ‘too bad?’

Mr. Abrahamson – No. That is not what we are resting on. That is a part of our discussion with Virginia Housing and making the diverse, fully supported community that we want to have here.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I find it hard to ‘square’ that with this project. It has been largely designed around residents wanting front doors.

Mr. Abrahamson – That is not entirely true. Many of the residents have had conflicting commentaries about the existing two-over-twos that are built now. They want independent entries. Many residents have family members who need additional care or observation, whether they be small children or adults with special needs. Access control from the interior is a real issue. Limiting the number of routes outside of a unit is important. At the same time, we are balancing the location of those units across distribution in terms of floors for accessibility and windows. We are trying to make sure that everybody has access to the same kinds of spaces throughout the building and the site. On Phase 1, where we have 2-over-2s, the residents that chose to move into those, that fits their needs. We need the security and access control of a double-quarter building for this phase.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Even though it would be 2 units out of 87 that would have a door to meet the requirement.

Mr. Abrahamson – That is correct. Recognizing that the hurdles within the building to meet this are not a code issue. It is an issue of the building program. It is about meeting the site with the street trees. It acts as a significant burden of access control that does not fit as well with this type of building. There is reasonable attention to breaking up that face with trees and benches.

Commissioner Roettger – I can understand that from property management, from working with the CRHA, the difference between Crescent Hall, the townhomes, and the different needs. With whoever is managing the property, it is probably easier to have one type of building versus another type of building. If there is reasonable attention to breaking up that face with trees and benches, it would feel more pedestrian. It probably saves some money. I would not want to make those arguments for every project. In this case, with the 2 units, it does seem like a small change to not have those 2 units opening out.

Mr. Abrahamson – Our plan is to activate that façade. We have had multiple discussions with NDS about the blank wall portion of the ordinance. Whether it is hardscape sitting areas that is activated, we have decorative grills as part of the ventilation.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – There would be many alterations to the present conditions that would improve that. That site is very visible because it is at the corner of the Tolstoy light. I get the point. You will be fine with how you activate that wall.

Commissioner Yoder – I have a similar comment. I walk by the Dairy Market. On 10th Street, they have the ground floor units that have doors. I have never seen anyone use it. The presence of a door does not activate the space. For this site, having that glass lobby entrance on the corner there will be a big improvement over what is now there. I am more interested in having a lot of windows so that you are not walking by a blank wall along

2nd Street. I was concerned that if something in the zoning code is problematic for affordable housing and the zoning code is requiring you to do something that runs afoul of affordable housing funding because of inequitable units. That is something else to look at in the zoning code review. It sounds like it is not a definite deal breaker in this case. It is one factor in several factors.

Mr. Abrahamson – It makes our job harder. That is my job. It is best efforts but a little more than the best efforts as far as the funding goes because it is competitive. That is something that they are looking for in scoring these projects. If you have 30 different unit types of different shapes and sizes, they technically might have the same square footage, but are they equitable? Do people know what they are getting into when they come into the community? We are trying to keep things on the same plane.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – You are saying that it directly factors into scoring. I was looking at the score sheet. I could not see anything that specifically spoke to this that you would be docked points on. Could you point to it?

Mr. Abrahamson – I cannot do that right now.

Commissioner Schwarz – You have mentioned the streetscape along 2nd Street, and you are going to promote visual interest. Nothing seems to be defined now. I am wondering how that process will work out between you and staff. Staff will make the determination. It sounds like there needs to be some kind of tradeoff. There are fewer entrances. How do we make this sidewalk more active and inviting? I am concerned that we don't know what we are going to get.

Mr. Abrahamson – That is why we are here tonight, to have that conversation. We have had the conversation with staff. We have a toolbox full of things that can go there. Depending on the comments that we receive tonight, we would gauge the extent of the amenities and how heavily we want to come out into that streetscape there. If there is a range of things from the decorative grills that we are putting into the podium ventilation to plantings or if there is a hardscape sitting area that starts to activate that space. What is the range? What is the best thing for the landscape?

Commissioner Schwarz – Are you looking for feedback from us tonight on that?

Mr. Abrahamson – I think we have a good understanding of what staff is looking for. We built it off conversations around the blank wall portion of the code. We have several strategies we have discussed with them. We have nothing to present.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In the elevations with those dark boxes under the windows, those are the grills you are talking about, not the benches you are talking about. Is there anything in this packet that shows where these bench nooks are?

Mr. Abrahamson – No.

Commissioner Schwarz – Is that something that you might be able to better define before this goes to Council?

Mr. Abrahamson – That is not a problem from my perspective.

Ms. Rainey – The packet is finalized tonight. We could have discussions about items that could be verbally discussed with Council's as opposed to updating our formal materials in the packet. I recognize what Commissioner Schwarz is saying. When staff was reviewing this, we considered conditions to those streetscape activation items. Since we had not yet had drawings finalized and trying to leave some flexibility so that when the details when we get into the root areas and where things need to go, that could be accounted for. We did not recommend any conditions. I certainly would be open to conditions. I would suggest that if the Commission is able to provide any flexibility in terms of that so we are not hitting a major root to meet a criterion that we set out, that would be ideal.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I get the imperative to see this project built. I don't want to put roadblocks in front of it. If we think back to the reasons why this portion of the code exists, it is about pedestrian activation. It is about eyes on the street. It is about defensible space. If there is anywhere in the city where those principles must apply/be applied, it seems like 2nd Street Southeast is the place. There is high pedestrian flow. If we are going to say that those things are not important, we should remove this from the code. It is annoying for people building apartment buildings to put in. That would be one conversation. It is hard to see, based on this site, what a good reasoning for saying that this site should be accepted. I get the trees. Trees are on the street side of the sidewalk. I don't know if I fully buy it. I get the Virginia Housing. You might have some qualms. I don't know if I completely buy that either. If we are saying that there are alternative methods to meet those needs, I could be open to that. We don't see any here. I am open to somebody proposing a condition that would specify that.

Commissioner Schwarz – I do not want to play designer. Since this is a majority affordable housing project, there is some room for some leeway as opposed to a plain brought in project. As part of the Comp Plan, we have some reasons to allow some more flexibility. I am stuck on this one. I am inclined to approve it and trust staff to figure something out. Staff is going to work with the applicant to figure out an appropriate streetscape. With future applications like this, it might be useful to get more information as to what that streetscape might be, even at a flexible level.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Did the BZA have a similar request for the 10th Street affordable housing, and they granted it?

Ms. Rainey – Yes, there was a variance request. There were 2 variances approved at 1010 Wertland. One of them was for street facing entries. I would need to go back and check. They have 2 administrative modification requests. I don't want to misstate which one was which. They recently did achieve 2 variances.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – I am inclined to make a gentle contrast to Commissioner Stolzenberg's concerns referencing the trees. I think it is perfectly reasonable to say that one does not know what one does not know. There are some huge trees along there. When you start moving dirt around, I am certain that they are going to find a challenge that they had no idea was there.

Ms. Rainey – The applicants have met with me and our urban forester on site to talk specifically about these roots. There has been a lot of discussion about root pruning that needs to happen at correct times. There has been a lot of work by the applicant team to ensure that these trees can continue to thrive regardless of what they are doing there. There is some substantial information that the urban forester has been able to provide as well on that piece.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do we know if the urban forester has heard about this request?

Ms. Rainey – I have not spoken directly with him about it until we got some more definite plans about locations where we could get into those details. As the plans continue, he is one of the reviewers on those plan sets as well.

Kevin Flynn, Applicant – One of the things that we investigated with that is the floor elevation for the apartments units is several feet above the sidewalk grade. To get into those units, you need stairs to go up to them, which would be the required grade with fill on top of the roots. It is not great for a retaining wall. We are trying to move all the work outside the root zones and to keep that work as minimal as possible.

Commissioner Roettger – What is the building on West Main Street and Roosevelt? They have the big walls and the ramps. That is at least 2 stories to hide their parking. You do see people sitting towards the train tracks. I am picturing other ways. There is maybe a small trellis with bench placed some place where people might gather that would give more interaction to the streetscape. I am trying to think of other examples. I am not saying that one is the best. Since Charlottesville has such a grade difference, are there strategies to break up that length of the building? I am thinking about our topography. That is sometimes a hard strategy. It is hard to get

around the ramping and stairs. There are maybe some examples we can look at around town and find a good way of doing it.

Mr. Abrahamson – When people occupy a space, especially if it is sloped, that takes interventions. Very few people want to occupy a muddy slope. We plant it. There are ways to do it. It is all levels of intervention. This is one spot on the site where we really want to sit lightly. We can creep up. We can expand a little bit where this is outdoor seating down near the entry because we are already in the ground there. We are already doing work. On the other end, we can expand that a little within reason. We are trying to minimize the hardscape through there.

Commissioner Roettger – It is hard because the other corners are not particularly adding a lot currently to that intersection. There is maybe future room for improvement on the other side of Monticello if that ever happens.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It is not so much at the corner where there is this entrance. It is walking up that block. On the opposite side, you have a lot of entryways. I would say that most of the pedestrian traffic is probably on the east side. I get the idea of having flexibility for staff. I would feel better if there was at least a vague condition that would allow staff to have some authority over this. We could reference benches seating, nooks.

Commissioner Roettger – It sounds like if it is not going to create hardscape, which would hurt the trees.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – If we start putting things in there, we might end up with weird stuff.

Commissioner Yoder – I like the idea of not naming specific interventions but asking for something to activate the streetscape.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – It would be something like Condition B. What is the verb that we use? “Especially mindful to take into consideration.” All these things that are not direct order, you must get fuzzy fast. I don’t think we are quite there to start making decisions about how that is going to look. Are we OK with 2 doors? The rest of it is another conversation.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – It is not something we have any review on at the site plan stage unless we have a condition on the Special Exception.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – Could we stick something in as rough as to insist on having such a review?

Commissioner Schwarz – They have a paragraph with their proposed solution starting with “Building 12 streetscape design.” We could put a condition that quotes that. They are saying that they would design to the principles of the zoning ordinance in Section 2.10.12.b3 (blank wall treatments). The only difference would be that they need to go beyond just the blank wall treatment requirements. That is a long paragraph to stick into motion.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If we were to say features that promote visual interest in the public realm maintain walkability and public safety, which may include mounted decorative screening, hardscape features, and specialized planting or other measures. That is appropriately specific but also vague.

Commission Discussion and Motion

Motion – Commissioner Stolzenberg – I move to recommend approval of this application for a Special Exception Permit in the CX-8 Corridor Mixed Use zone at 400-426 Garrett Street to modify street-facing entry requirements for Building 12, identified on the application materials dated January 28, 2025, to require no street-facing entry spacing maximums on the 2nd Street SE and Hinton Avenue Extended building façades with the following conditions:


- At least two street facing entries with entry features meeting the requirements of Section 34-2.10.13b are required on the 2nd Street Southeast building façade of proposed Building 12.

- **The applicants shall include features to promote visual interest in the public realm and maintain walkability and public safety. These features may include building mounted decorative screening hardscape features and specialized planting or other measures.**
- **These features may include but are not limited too.**

Second by Commissioner d’Oronzio. Motion passes 6-0.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 PM.



City of Charlottesville
To be a place where everyone thrives

Office of Community Solutions
P.O. Box 911
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
p: 434-970-3127
f: 434-970-3359
www.charlottesville.gov

To:	Planning Commission
Re:	Public Hearing for CDBG & HOME Annual Action Plan & Draft Funding Recommendations for Program Year 2025-26 (1st of 1 readings)
Date:	April 8, 2025
Staff Contact(s):	Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst Alex Ikefuna, Director

Issue:

City staff seeks input and guidance from the Planning Commission on the draft Annual Action Plan and funding recommendations for the program year 2025-26 program year Community Development Block Grants (“CDBG”) and HOME Investment Partnerships (“HOME”) programs

Background:

The City of Charlottesville is an Entitlement Community (“EC”) as designated by the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (“HUD”) and, as such, is required to develop on an annual basis an Annual Action Plan (“AAP”) to guide the work of the city’s CDBG and HOME programs. This Plan is required to be presented to the general public, with opportunities for public comment, of which consideration by Planning Commission is an important part.¹

Analysis:

Taskforce members are in the process of carefully reviewing several requests for funding through both the CDBG and HOME programs, as indicated on the attached char entitled ‘Overview of

¹ PDF copies of the applications received during the PY25 funding round can be found through a link on the city’s CDBG & HOME web page at <https://www.charlottesville.gov/678/CDBG-HOME-Programs> or by direct link at <https://www.charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/1097>

CDBG & HOME Funding Requests PY25.’ There is some question at this time about the status of applications from one entity, updated information to be provided to the Commissioners prior to the scheduled date of this public hearing.

It should be noted here that the largest number of applications received for the CDBG program fall under what HUD classifies as ‘Public Services’ programs (requests totaling approximately \$399,236). For some years now, HUD policy institutes what is known as a ‘spending cap’ that limits localities from awarding more than 15% of their annual CDBG allocation to these types of programs. For the current program year 2024-25, that limit was \$65,792.55. Based on the applications received to date, this category alone represents a shortfall in anticipated funding available for Public Services programs of approximately \$333,443.45.

At this time, the city has not been made aware of any funding decisions by HUD for the 2025-26 program year. This poses a significant challenge for the work of the CDBG/HOME Taskforce. So as to be best positioned to act quickly when HUD does make announce new funding allocations, the Taskforce has decided to repeat the practice we adopted last year of establishing funding recommendations based on the received allocations from HUD for the 2024-25 program year. And, again, similarly to last year, the recommendations will be calculated to the most precise decimal value possible. This will be used to calculate dollar values for the slate of funding recommendations, hopefully prior to the scheduled public hearing before City Council on

In conclusion, while the members of the CDBG/HOME Taskforce would have liked to have been in the position of being able to fund each applicant in full, the funding recommendations outlined in the proposed Annual Action Plan represent the Taskforce’s best efforts to invest the limited funds available to them so as to maximize the positive impacts for our community and those residents at the heart of this work.

Financial Impact:

As the funds proposed to be awarded are federal funds allocated to the city by HUD to support community-benefit activities, and, as such, do not draw from the city’s General Fund, no adverse impacts to the City’s budget are anticipated. Rather, use of these funds as recommended here will instead serve to address an important and pressing community need(s) while at the same time supporting the city’s eligibility for allocations of entitlement funds in future years.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the members of the Planning Commission approve the funding recommendations and draft Annual Action Plan as presented here today.

Once feedback is received from the general public during the Public Comment period and from the members of the city’s Planning Commission and incorporated into the AAP, at least two (2) public hearings will be conducted before the Charlottesville City Council and one (1) public hearing before the Commissioners of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (“TJPDC”), with the recommendation of staff to approve the PY25 Annual Action Plan and to authorize city and TJPDC staff to implement the activities outlined in the funding recommendations presented here.

Recommended Motion:

“I move that the Planning Commission approve the program year 2025-26 CDBG & HOME Annual Action Plan presented here before us today and to recommend that staff present this plan to the City Council for public review as scheduled.”

Attachments:

- Overview of CDBG & HOME Funding Requests PY25*
- Draft CDBG & HOME Funding Recommendations PY25
- CDBG-HOME Taskforce PY25 Reviewer Evaluation Criteria
- Council Priorities PY25 CDBG & HOME (#R-24-115), adopted Sept. 3, 2024

SUMMARY OF CDBG & HOME REQUESTS FOR FUNDING PY25 **DRAFT**

Anticipated PY25 Funding from HUD*

Anticipated PY25 for CDBG	\$ 438,617.00
Anticipated PY25 for HOME	\$ 83,016.66

Subtotal Available to Commit: \$521,633.66

Programmatic Funding & Setasides

CDBG Planning & Admin	\$ 87,723.40
Public Services Cap @ 15%	\$ 65,792.55
Council Priority: Public Facilities & Imprv.	\$ 89,896.51
Council Priority: Economic Dev.	\$ 89,896.51
HOME Program Local Match @ 25% (CAHF)*	\$ 20,754.17

CDBG Economic Development

Request \$

CIC Entrepreneur Programs	\$ 25,000
---------------------------	-----------

Subtotal requests CDBG Econ Dev: \$25,000

CDBG Public Facilities & Infrastructure Improvements

Request \$

Arc of the Piedmont Shower Replacement at Shamrock Group Home	\$ 20,500
---	-----------

Subtotal requests CDBG Public Facilities: \$20,500

CDBG Public Service Programs

Request \$

CRHA Economic Opportunity Program (Phase II)	\$ 90,600
IRC Charlottesville Financial Capabilities	\$ 46,636
PHA Financial Opportunity Center	\$ 30,000
LVCA Beginning Workforce Development	\$ 50,000
PACEM Shelter Transportation	\$ 60,000
PHA Financial Opportunity Center (FOC) Credit Club	\$ 30,000
PHAR Resident-Involved Redevelopment	\$ 42,000
The Haven Coordination of Community Service Providers	\$ 50,000

Subtotal requests CDBG Social Programs: \$399,236

CDBG Affordable Housing

Request \$

CRHA Eviction Diversion Program	\$ 50,000
---------------------------------	-----------

Subtotal requests CDBG Affordable Housing: \$50,000

HOME Investment Partnerships

Request \$

AHIP Charlottesville Critical Home Rehab**	\$ 140,000
CRHA 5th Street AH	\$ 144,500
CRHA Downtown AH	\$ 175,000
PHA 905 Rives St. Townhomes AH	\$ 89,688

Subtotal requests HOME: \$549,188

* Estimated based on PY24 HUD allocations

SUMMARY OF CDBG & HOME REQUESTS FOR FUNDING PY25 **DRAFT**

Anticipated PY25 Funding from HUD*

Anticipated PY25 for CDBG	\$ 438,617.00
Anticipated PY25 for HOME	\$ 83,016.66

Subtotal Available to Commit: \$521,633.66

Programmatic Funding & Setasides

CDBG Planning & Admin	\$ 87,723.40
Public Services Cap @ 15%	\$ 65,792.55
Council Priority: Public Facilities & Imprv.	\$ 89,896.51
Council Priority: Economic Dev.	\$ 89,896.51
HOME Program Local Match @ 25% (CAHF)*	\$ 20,754.17

CDBG Economic Development

Recommendation \$

CIC Entrepreneur Programs	\$ 25,000
LVCA Beginning Workforce Development	\$ 50,000

Subtotal CDBG recommendations, Econ Dev: \$75,000

CDBG Public Facilities & Infrastructure Improvements

Recommendation \$

Arc of the Piedmont Shower Replacement at Shamrock Group	\$ 20,500
--	-----------

Subtotal CDBG recommendations, Public Facilities: \$20,500

CDBG Public Services Activities

Recommendation \$

CRHA Economic Opportunity Program (Phase II)	\$ -
CRHA Eviction Diversion Program	\$ -
IRC Charlottesville Financial Capabilities	\$ -
PACEM Shelter Transportation	\$ -
PHA Financial Opportunity Center (FOC) Credit Club	\$ 21,342
PHAR Resident-Involved Redevelopment	\$ 22,619
The Haven Coordination of Community Service Providers	\$ 21,832

Subtotal CDBG recommendations, Public Services: \$65,793

CDBG Affordable Housing

Recommendation \$

AHIP Charlottesville Critical Home Rehab	\$ 140,000
--	------------

Subtotal CDBG recommendations, Affordable Housing: \$140,000

HOME Investment Partnerships

Recommendation \$

CRHA 5th Street AH	\$ -
CRHA Downtown AH	\$ -
PHA 905 Rives St. Townhomes AH	\$ 83,017

Subtotal requests HOME: \$83,017

* Estimated based on PY24 HUD allocations

revised 3/31 based on HUD guidance



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
September 3, 2024
CERTIFICATIONS

Juandiego R. Wade, Mayor
Brian R. Pinkston, Vice Mayor
Natalie Oschrein
Michael K. Payne
J. Lloyd Snook, III
Kyna Thomas, Clerk

4:00 PM OPENING SESSION

Call to Order/Roll Call

Agenda Approval APPROVED 5-0 (PINKSTON/PAYNE)

Reports

1. Report: UVa Student Research: The Memory Project
2. Report: Downtown Mall Tree Management Plan

5:30 PM CLOSED MEETING

Vote to meet in closed meeting APPROVED 5-0 (PINKSTON/SNOOK)

Vote to certify closed meeting APPROVED 5-0 (PINKSTON/SNOOK)

6:30 PM BUSINESS SESSION

Moment of Silence

Announcements

Recognitions/Proclamations

- Recognition: Charlottesville High School Varsity Boys Tennis and Soccer Teams and Elaina Pierce - State Champions
- Proclamation: International Day of Democracy - September 15
- Proclamation: Sister City Besancon - 80th anniversary of liberation

Community Matters

Consent Agenda* APPROVED 5-0 (SNOOK/PINKSTON)

3. Minutes: July 15 regular meeting, August 5 regular meeting, August 19 regular meeting, August 26 and 27 special meetings
4. Resolution: Resolution to Appropriate Virginia Juvenile Community Crime Control Act Grant (VJCCCA) - \$452,704 (2nd reading)
#R-24-113
5. Resolution: CDBG and HOME Investment Partnerships Programs (2nd readings)
 - a. Resolution: Program Year 2023-2024 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Programs (2nd reading)
#R-24-114
 - b. Resolution: Establish Council Priorities for Program Year 2025-2026 (2nd reading)
#R-24-115
6. Ordinance: Ordinance to repeal City Code Sections 18-24(b) and 18-25(f) pursuant to the Ragged Mountain Reservoir Settlement Agreement (2nd reading)
#O-24-116
7. Resolution: Resolution appropriating funds from the 2024 Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) - \$76,840 (1 of 2 readings)
8. Resolution: Resolution for State Pass-Thru Funding for Tonsler League - \$250,000 (1 of 2 readings)

9. Resolution: Resolution to appropriate Fiscal Year 2025 Fire Programs Aid to Locality Funding (Firefund) - \$238,581.00 (1 of 2 readings)
10. Resolution: Resolution to appropriate funds from the Department of Housing and Community Development- Virginia Homeless Solutions Program Grant \$470,805 (1 of 2 readings).
11. Ordinance: Ordinance for Stonehenge Avenue Encroachment Agreement (1 of 2 readings)

City Manager Report

- Report: City Manager Report

Action Items

12. Ordinance/Resolution: Ranked Choice Voting
 - a. Ordinance: Ordinance to Adopt Ranked Choice Voting ("RCV") as the Voting Method for the June 2025 City Council Primary election (2nd reading)
#O-24-117
APPROVED 4-1 (PINKSTON/OSCHRIN; SNOOK opposed)
 - b. Resolution: Resolution to appropriate \$26,460 for Ranked Choice Voting (2nd reading)
#R-24-118
APPROVED 5-0 (PINKSTON/OSCHRIN)
13. Ordinance: Ordinance amending the City Code to extend the Public Safety Supplement Retirement Benefit to EMS-only Employees Enrolled in the Defined Benefit plan (1 of 2 readings)
14. Resolution: Resolution to approve the Seventh Amended Grant Agreement, Charlottesville Supplemental Rental Assistance Program (1 of 2 readings)
15. Resolution: Resolution considering a Sidewalk Waiver Request for 2117 Ivy Road
#R-24-119
APPROVED 5-0 (SNOOK/PINKSTON)

General Business

Community Matters (2)

Adjournment

**Resolution to Establish Council Priorities for the Program Year 2025-2026
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) &
HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Programs**

WHEREAS the City of Charlottesville has been designated as an Entitlement Community by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and as such is a recipient of federal funds through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) & HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) programs, and

WHEREAS the City is a contributing member of the Thomas Jefferson HOME Consortium (TJHC) in partnership with the counties of Albemarle, Fluvanna, Greene, Louisa and Nelson, and through the Consortium shares in the benefits of participation in HUD's HOME program, and

WHEREAS in accordance with the City of Charlottesville's HUD-approved Citizen Participation Plan, the city's CDBG/HOME Task Force composed of residents and community representatives will be called on to review requests for funding of potential CDBG & HOME projects and to make recommendations for funding to Council in the Spring of 2025; now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Charlottesville, Virginia, that the Program Year 2025-2026 CDBG & HOME programs (PY25) shall prioritize to the degree possible:

- A continued emphasis on expanding access to affordable housing opportunities, including but not limited to low-income housing redevelopment; workforce development, including but not limited to efforts to bolster Section 3 training opportunities other economic development activities; microenterprise assistance; access to quality childcare; homeowner rehabilitation and energy-efficiency upgrades; down payment assistance; and improvements to public infrastructure designed to eliminate or reduce barriers to access to public amenities for mobility-impaired residents
- For program year 2025-2026, \$89,896.51 of CDBG Entitlement funds shall be set aside to support Economic Development activities
- For program year 2025-2026, \$89,896.51 of CDBG Entitlement funds shall be set aside to support Public Facilities and Improvement activities, with a special emphasis on activities that will eliminate or reduce barriers to access for mobility-impaired residents
- The CDBG Admin and Planning budget shall be set at 20% of the City's CDBG allocation
- Any other guidelines or directions Council may wish to give in determining how CDBG and HOME funds should be spent

	<u>Aye</u>	<u>No</u>
Oschrin	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Payne	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Pinkston	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Snook	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>
Wade	<u> x </u>	<u> </u>

Approved by Council
September 3, 2024



Kyna Thomas, MMC
Clerk of Council

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
DEPARTMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
STAFF REPORT



PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING
APPLICATION FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT
APPLICATION NUMBER: PL-25-0027
DATE OF HEARING: April 8th, 2025

Project Planner: Ben Koby

Date of Staff Report: March 25, 2025

Applicant: Andrew Jenkins

Applicant's Representative(s): Andrew Jenkins

Current Property Owner: JENKINS, BARBARA S & ALAN D

Application Information

Property Street Address: 401 Ridge St ("Subject Property")

Tax Map & Parcel/Tax Status: 290132000

Total Square Footage/ Acreage Site: Approx. 0.31 acres (13,503.6 square feet)

Comprehensive Plan (Future Land Use Map): Medium Intensity Residential

Current Zoning Classification: R-C (Residential C)


Overlay District: Ridge St Architectural Design Control (ADC) District

Applicant's Request (Summary)

The applicant seeks a Special Use Permit (SUP) in accordance with City Code Section 34-5.2.14 to operate a Bed and Breakfast within the R-C zoning district. Pursuant to Section 34-3.2.2, this use is classified as Commercial and allows up to ten guest rooms with an approved SUP. The applicant proposes five guest rooms without on-site management.


This application does not include any proposed exterior modifications to the property. The site has operated as a Commercial lodging establishment for three years on a non-conforming basis. There is no record of complaints associated with its prior use as commercial lodging.

Vicinity Map



Context Map 1



Context Map 2- Zoning Classifications**Context Map 3- General Land Use Plan, 2021 Comprehensive Plan**

Standard of Review

City Council may grant an applicant a special permit or special use permit, giving consideration to a number of factors set forth within Zoning Ordinance Sec. 34-5.2.14. If Council finds that a proposed use or development will have potentially adverse impacts, and if Council identifies development conditions that could satisfactorily mitigate such impacts, then Council may set forth reasonable conditions within its SUP approval. The role of the Planning Commission is to make an advisory recommendation to the City Council, as to (i) whether or not Council should approve a proposed SUP and if so, (ii) whether there are any reasonable development conditions that could mitigate potentially adverse impacts of the proposed use or development.

Section 34-5.2.14.D of the City's Development Code lists a number of factors that Council will consider in making a decision on a proposed SUP. Below is staff's analysis of those factors, based on the information provided by the applicant. For the applicant's own analysis see Attachment C.

1. Whether the proposed use will be harmonious with existing patterns of use and development within the neighborhood and the zoning district in which it will be developed.

Review:

When analyzing the existing development patterns and land use within the area, it is important to assess the current zoning designations. The Ridge Street Corridor, south of Dice Street, is uniformly zoned R-C, with the parcels primarily consisting of residential properties, apart from the Barrett Early Learning Center at 410 Ridge Street. Towards Elliott Avenue, the zoning transitions to CX-3 (Commercial Mixed Use 3) at the northern corner. Within the CX-3 parcels along Ridge Street, there is an apartment complex and a hotel.

North of the Subject Property, the zoning is classified as Node Mixed Use (NX-8 and NX-10). Notable establishments in this area include the Food Master convenience store, Noland contractor's office, Twisted Inks tattoo parlor, and the vacant Don's Florist and Gifts property. The Salvation Army, and the Fire Station are further north, but within the proximity of the Subject Property. To the west and east along Dice Street, the zoning transitions into RN-A designations in both directions. These RN-A properties are designated as General Residential (Sensitive Community Areas) on the City's Future Land Use Map but fall outside the Core Neighborhood Corridor overlay zoning districts.

Staff Analysis:

The Subject Property is located within an area characterized by diverse zoning classifications as identified on both the Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map. The Ridge Street Corridor in the immediate vicinity is primarily designated for Urban Mixed Use, Medium Density Residential, and Neighborhood Mixed Use purposes, reflecting its strategic importance in fostering a balanced blend of residential and commercial uses.

Adjacent to this corridor, to the east and west, are established Residential Core Neighborhood A (RN-A) zones, which contribute to the residential fabric of the area. These RN-A neighborhoods provide a transition from the mixed-use nature of the Ridge Street Corridor to more traditional residential settings, ensuring a coherent development pattern.

Given the existing and intended uses within the Ridge Street Corridor, the introduction of a commercial lodging use aligns with the character and functionality of the area. This is particularly evident when considering the northern parcels, which exhibit a mix of commercial and residential uses, demonstrating compatibility with the proposed use. Furthermore, the proposal's limited scope, including the absence of exterior modifications to the existing structure, ensures that the use would integrate seamlessly with the parcels to the south, preserving the visual and spatial continuity of the corridor.

In summary, the proposed commercial lodging use is consistent with the existing patterns of development and zoning designations in the area. Its alignment with the Ridge Street Corridor's intended land use purposes, coupled with its minimal physical impact on the site, supports its appropriateness for the location.

2. Whether the proposed use and associated public facilities will substantially conform to the Comprehensive Plan;

Relevant Regulatory language:

The Comprehensive Plan designates the area along Ridge Street as Medium Intensity Residential which is described to: "Increase opportunities for housing development including affordable housing, along neighborhood corridors, near community amenities, employment centers, and in neighborhoods that are traditionally less affordable." In **Table 2 Land Use Category Descriptions in Residential areas**, details that limited commercial uses will be allowed in all residential districts to be further described in the Zoning Ordinance.

The Development code describes the residential zoning districts as: "A walkable neighborhood environment intended to accommodate a variety of housing options including single-unit homes, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, and small

apartments in General Residential and Medium-Intensity Residential areas designated in the Comprehensive Plan, supporting and within walking distance of neighborhood-serving retail, food, and service uses.” Additionally, the Development Code defines Commercial General Lodging as “uses with individual sleeping or living units that provide overnight accommodations to guests for short-term stays of less than 30 days.” The typical examples listed in the Code include hotel, motel, inn, bed and breakfast, hostel, and extended stay facility.

Streets that Work Plan

The Streets that Work Plans labels Ridge Street, from Main Street to Elliott Avenue as Neighborhood A. Neighborhood A streets have one travel lane in each direction, sidewalks on at least one side, dedicated bicycle facilities and some on-street parking. Adjacent land uses are low and medium-density residential. Also abutting the Subject Property is Dice Street. Dice Street is designated as Local. *Local* streets are found throughout the city and provide immediate access to all types of land uses. Although local streets form the majority of the street network, there is no specific typology associated with them. This is due in part to the many variations in context and right-of-way width, as well as the community’s expressed desire to replicate as nearly as possible the feel of older local streets that do not meet current engineering and fire code standards.

Staff Analysis:

No improvements are being planned for the Subject Property that would necessitate modifications to the current streetscape.

Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan

The Subject Property is located within the Secondary Focus Area as identified in the 2021 Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan. Among the ten Community Vision Goals outlined in the plan, Goal 6 focuses on fostering an inclusive and welcoming community through initiatives such as place-keeping, place-making, and beautification. The proposed Special Use Permit (SUP) has the potential to support the achievement of this goal. As currently proposed, the existing structure on the property will be preserved and repurposed to accommodate a low-impact commercial use. This approach aligns with the intent of the plan and ensures compatibility with the Cherry Avenue Planning Area’s broader objectives.

Staff Analysis:

The Subject Property is situated within the Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan planning area, albeit on its periphery. No alterations or modifications are being proposed for the structure or site as part of this Special Use Permit (SUP) application. Following a comprehensive

review, staff has determined that the SUP aligns with the overarching vision and objectives outlined in the plan.

The decision to preserve the existing residential structure contributes significantly to the plan's "place-keeping" goal, which emphasizes the importance of maintaining the character and identity of the area. By repurposing the property for use as a Bed and Breakfast, its upkeep and continued maintenance are assured, thereby supporting the community's aspirations for enhanced "beautification." This adaptive reuse approach not only upholds the integrity of the existing property but also harmonizes with the long-term planning principles aimed at fostering a vibrant and welcoming environment within the Cherry Avenue Small Area Plan.

Comprehensive Plan Staff Analysis:

The proposed development aligns with the Medium Intensity Residential designation outlined in the future land use map, which emphasizes a balanced approach to residential growth. While this development does not directly contribute to the goal of increasing housing stock or expanding affordable housing options, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan, it does not conflict with these objectives either. Instead, the proposal maintains a neutral stance regarding these priorities.

Importantly, the Medium Intensity Residential designation underscores the necessity of preserving compatibility with existing housing forms and the broader historical and cultural character of the surrounding neighborhood. In this context, the applicant's decision to propose no exterior modifications to the structure demonstrates a thoughtful and deliberate approach, ensuring that the project respects and aligns with the established aesthetic and heritage of the area.

Additionally, the Board of Architectural Review (BAR) thoroughly assessed the Special Use Permit application and reached a unanimous decision, with an 8-0 vote, affirming a "finding of no adverse impact." This outcome not only reflects the BAR's confidence in the proposal's adherence to design and historical considerations but also underscores the project's alignment with community and planning objectives.

Given the proximity of the Subject Property to two sections of Residential Core Neighborhood A (RN-A) districts, it is essential to assess the contextual implications of this proposal. The RN-A zoning district was established to safeguard and promote the historical and cultural significance of Downtown neighborhoods that provide critical workforce housing for job centers such as Charlottesville's Downtown and the University of Virginia.

These neighborhoods hold particular importance within the City, not only for their historical value but also for their affordability and capacity to accommodate a diverse range of households. The district's purpose is rooted in encouraging the development and preservation of moderately priced housing, advancing affordable housing initiatives, respecting the cultural heritage of the neighborhoods, and fostering a convenient, harmonious community environment.

Although the Subject Property is not located within the RN-A zoning district nor designated as part of the Sensitive Community Areas identified by the Comprehensive Plan, its proximity invites consideration of the broader implications of this development. It should be noted that the proposed project does not directly align with the objectives of increasing housing availability or affordability in areas highlighted by the Comprehensive Plan and regulated by RN-A zoning. However, the property's location along a major corridor exempts it from the expectation of fulfilling these goals, as such contributions are neither required nor anticipated under current guidelines. This contextual placement, while outside the immediate priorities of RN-A zones, still warrants thoughtful reflection on its alignment with the overarching principles of the City's planning framework.

3. Whether the proposed use will have potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, or the community in general, and, if so, whether there are any reasonable conditions of approval that would satisfactorily mitigate such impacts. Potential adverse impacts to be considered include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

a. Traffic or parking congestion;

Staff analysis:

Considering that the commercial lodging has maintained smooth operations for the past three years and offers adequate on-site parking located at the rear of the property, it is reasonable to conclude that granting this approval is unlikely to result in adverse traffic or parking impacts. This combination of proven operational efficiency and parking provisions demonstrates a thoughtful approach to minimizing potential disruptions within the surrounding area.

b. Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, and other factors which adversely affect the natural environment; and

Staff Analysis:

Approval of the SUP will likely not have any adverse impacts on Noise, lights, dust, odor, fumes, vibration, or any other natural environmental impacts.

c. Destruction or encroachment upon conservation or historic districts;

Staff Analysis:

Approval of the SUP will not bring any adverse impacts to areas of conservation, or historic districts. Considering the finding of no adverse impact from the BAR, we can be confident that as long as the structure is upkept and there are no alterations to the exterior.

4. Whether with the conditions the SUP is consistent with public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice

Staff Analysis:

The Ridge Street corridor, particularly in the vicinity of the Subject Property, exhibits a well-established pattern of mixed-use development, where overtly commercial establishments coexist harmoniously with nearby residential uses. This contextual backdrop highlights the area's capacity to integrate small-scale commercial activity without disruption to its character or function. The addition of a commercial lodging establishment in such close proximity to downtown Charlottesville presents a strategic opportunity to enhance the visitor experience, particularly given its location. The property's situation promotes and supports walkability to the downtown area, allowing guests to access local attractions, businesses, and services on foot. This walkability not only aligns with contemporary urban planning principles but also mitigates potential traffic-related concerns, as it reduces reliance on vehicular travel for downtown access.

The proposed commercial lodging at 401 Ridge Street is consistent with the established uses in the surrounding area and adheres to the guiding principles and regulatory frameworks outlined in the City's Comprehensive Plan. The proposal reflects thoughtful consideration of the neighborhood's character and planning goals, ensuring that it complements the existing urban fabric. In light of these factors, approving the Special Use Permit (SUP) for a commercial lodging establishment at the subject property represents sound planning practice, as it reinforces the area's mixed-use identity while addressing both community and visitor needs.

Public Comments Received

The applicant held a public meeting on site of the Subject Property on April 8th. Any comments from that meeting will be shared with the Planning Commission during the Public Hearing and expressed in the report that will go to City Council.

To date staff has not received any comments related to this application.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit of a Commercial General Lodging (up to 10 guest rooms) in the R-C district at 401 Ridge Street with the following condition.

- A. In the event that any Site Modifications, as outlined in the City's Development Code, are made to the Subject Property, compliance with Use Standards under section 34-3.4.4 are required as part of the proposed site changes.

Suggested Motions

1. I move to recommend approval of this application for a Special Use Permit in the Residential C (R-C) zone at 401 Ridge Street to permit a Commercial General Lodging (up to 10 guest rooms) for the use of a Bed and Breakfast with the following condition
 - A. In the event that any Site Modifications, as outlined in the City's Development Code, are made to the Subject Property, compliance with Use Standards under section 34-3.4.4 are required as part of the proposed site changes.
 - B. [Alternative conditions, or additional condition(s) from Planning Commission]

OR,


2. I move to recommend denial of this application for a Special Use Permit in the Residential C (R-C) zone at 401 Ridge Street.

Attachments

- A. Site Plan and Floor Plan
- B. BAR Findings
- C. Applicant Submittal




0 10 20 40
SCALE IN FEET



THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT ON JULY 23, 1998
I SURVEYED THE PROPERTY SHOWN ON THIS
PLAT AND THE TITLE LINES AND WALLS OF
THE BUILDING ARE SHOWN HEREON.
THIS PROPERTY LIES IN ZONE C AND NOT IN
AN AREA DESIGNATED AS ZONE A (100 YEAR
FLOOD HAZARD) AS SHOWN ON FEDERAL FLOOD
RATE INSURANCE MAPS,
EFFECTIVE DATE: JUNE 15, 1979

UTILITIES AND EASEMENTS OTHER THAN
THOSE SHOWN MAY EXIST.

LEGAL REFERENCE
D.B. 705 P. 358




GLOECKNER ENGINEERING\SURVEYING INC.
ENGINEERS - SURVEYORS - LAND PLANNERS
2246 IVY ROAD, SUITE 11
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903

PLAT SHOWING
PHYSICAL SURVEY OF
TMP 29-132
401 RIDGE STREET
CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA
JULY 23, 1998

98-028-00

Downstairs



Upstairs



**Action/Summary Memo
City of Charlottesville
Board of Architectural Review
Work Session
March 18, 2025 5:30 p.m.
In-person in the Neighborhood Development Conference Room**



Note: The primary goal of this session was to provide updates for BAR members regarding on-going projects and applications, as well as to discuss staff workflows for the conduction of board business.

5:30 PM - Work Session began.

A. Matters from Public

Geneve Keller addressed the members to urge vigilance when considering demolition requests.

B. Consent Agenda

Mr. Zehmer asked for a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Schwarz so moved; Mr. Bailey seconded. **Vote: 8-0**

1. Special Use Permit Request - Recommendation to City Council

Planning #PL-25-0027

Commercial Permit #BC-25-0033

401 Ridge Street, Tax Parcel 290132000

Ridge Street ADC District

Owner: Barbara S & Alan D. Jenkins

Applicant: Andrew Jenkins

Request: Special Use Permit to allow commercial general lodging for up to 10 guest rooms. Change of permitted use only. No exterior alterations proposed.

Finding of no adverse impact: Based on the information submitted addressing only the proposed use, with no alterations associated with the SUP being currently proposed to the site or to the exterior of the existing c1891 structure, I move to recommend to City Council the requested Special Use Permit for 401 Ridge Street to allow operation of a B&B will not adversely impact this property or the Ridge Street ADC District. Furthermore, it should be understood that at any later exterior alterations at this property--with or without this SUP--will require BAR review and approval, per Chapter 34, Sections 5.2.6. and/or 5.2.7.

C. Work Session

2. Project Update

BAR # HST24-0047

1000 Wertland Street, TMP 100038000

(1010 Wertland St; 129 10th St NW; Portion of 1105 W. Main St.)

West Main Street ADC District

Owner: UVA Foundation

Applicant: Elizabeth Chapman; Grimm + Parker Architects

Project: Multi-story residential building

Note: Separate two-on-one meetings were held earlier in the day with four BAR members and the development team at the Grimm + Parker office. A brief account of the work session discussion follows:

- The development team summarized the numerous limiting factors and constraints on the project, most importantly impacting unit number and square footage, which is a set parameter.
- In response to feedback from neighborhood meetings, the building's inner courtyard was specifically designed to be a private and safe space for the community; "just for them".
- BAR members expressed they did not see much responsiveness to their design recommendations and comments over the past year of preliminary discussions, specifically in regards to: massing, scale, and materiality.
- The presence of the proposed structure on the Wertland street side remains of particular concern and is generally out of step with the neighborhood and the ADC district guidelines.
- The applicant will return with another design iteration in the coming month(s).

3. Staff Consultation & Questions

Staff Documentation

- ~~a. Hyperlinks & Laserfiche (update)~~
- ~~b. Minutes and Action Memos (dissemination and archiving)~~

4. Application procedures & Workflows

- a. Review of BAR Bylaws. (Agenda item added by staff.)

Discussion of Bylaws: members expressed they were generally content with the document as is, and that it does an outstanding job of summarizing procedures. Several minor revisions and suggestions were discussed to maintain brevity and clarity, but no major action was taken beyond the correction of one incorrect VA Code reference.

5. Certified Local Government Training Requirements

Members fulfilled a portion of their CLG training by attending this work session.

D. Adjourn (7:56 PM)