

Notes taken by Jess Wenger as a courtesy to those who could not attend. These notes are my attempt to capture the conversation, but the content should not be taken as hard facts. Any mistakes are my own.

FSNA – 240 Stribling – Flint Hill Community Meeting 2020-01-22

Charlie Armstrong, Southern Development

Keith Lancaster, designer, Dustin Green – design engineer flint hill

Flint Hill –

- PC recommended approval last year, CC denied approval last year. Stated denial due to design, needing more affordable housing
- Planned 50-60 homes, 10 acre site, permanently preserve at least 5 acres
- 15% of any new homes built would be affordable – people who make less than 60% of area median income
- Tree lined sidewalks, central green space, several housing types and styles, clustered to preserve open space rather than spreading housing out over the whole property which has steep slopes, wetlands
- Flint Drive exists as deeded city street but was never built, Keene Ct was existing city street that was never built – subdivided into 13 separate lots that could be built today with no special permission
- Condo buildings and row of townhomes
- 8-10 condos in each building, no more than 2 stories, at end of cul-de-sac
- All townhomes have driveway and garage, minimum 2 parking spaces on the property, several are rear loaded garages
- Parallel parking spaces
- Flint Drive would connect Moseley to Longwood
- Questions
 - Q: What are they doing to address traffic? Concern about cut through traffic on Moseley
 - A: engineering assumption assumes ½ traffic to Longwood, ½ to Moseley
 - Q: Concern about townhouses, students moving in
 - A: put restrictive covenants with no more than 3 unrelated as a maximum, also covenants that require people to use garage to put parking first – will be monitored by a HOA. Typically set up HOA with a professional management company.
 - Q: By right can do 13 houses without asking permission?
 - A: Correct, wouldn't have to preserve steep slopes, open space, etc.
 - Q: 2 spaces per unit, how many spaces for visitors, overflow, guests?
 - A: approximately 30 spaces on street that are not assigned to a lot – visitors would have to use street spaces
 - Q: Stormwater management?
 - A: bioretention
 - Q: Traffic studies been done?
 - A: City recommends what level of traffic study needs to be done
 - Q: What size townhomes? Compared to other recent development?
 - A: similar size to Burnette Commons
 - Q: Connection to park, green space?
 - A: Longwood gave some land to City as park. City goal to connect Azalea to 5th street via

- bike/ped trail. This project could deed an easement to trail to the City along creek, would need to be sensitive to the wetlands
- Q: between steep slopes and easement, does that end possibility for development for the property?
 - A: proffered plan becomes documented zoning for the property, so development will have to follow the proffered plan. Will stay exactly as they plan it – PUD- everyone knows exactly what they're getting, can't change without going through this review process with elected officials again.
 - Q: what will condos look like?
 - A: At least one of the condo buildings will be low income housing designed by Habitat
 - Q: how long take project to be completed once approved
 - A: 18 months to sell out, build out continue approximately 9 months after last unit sold – 2 years reasonable time to expect construction to take place
 - Q: city correspondence indicated trails
 - A: nature walk, doesn't require removing trees, grading, etc. – maintained by foot traffic, low impact
 - Q: as neighbor on Shasta, seeing 13 allowed, and 50-60 proposed – would be unreasonable to ask for something in the middle?
 - A: land cost and development cost are too high to be a viable alternative. Anything different than 13 requires a much more significant process and would require a rezoning. When go to rezone, the political reality is that the city comp plan wants certain things to happen with new development. PC and CC evaluate against the comp plan. Are proposing more units this time because in the last iteration, weren't proposing enough affordable units so have more units overall.

240 Stribling

- 11 acre property near end of Stribling – has been in one family for many years, they tore down the house on the property
- Have looked at by-right subdivision, would yield 48 homes – duplexes in front, single family homes in back
- Want to rezone whole property to R2, reception was lukewarm – 68 units, all duplex – didn't provide enough housing density, enough revenue from selling lots and homes to make impact in affordable housing or pedestrian/traffic improvements on Stribling
- By right – wouldn't have to make affordable housing, traffic improvements
- Went to PC and asked for feedback – do something bigger and more bold or just do by right? PC suggested do something bolder and bigger that fixes city problems to provide affordable housing and traffic improvements
- Existing unofficial trail on south side of property
- Previous plan for rezoning was 68 units, uninspired, cheaper than by-right homes, but minimal affordable housing contributions and minimal Stribling Ave improvements
- New concept – bold, dense
 - Unique cluster of homes with identity of its own
 - Central park with greenway down the middle
 - Provides trail connections, greenway along Moores creek
 - Potential emergency access to Morgan Ct, but no daily traffic
 - Up to 170 units

- townhomes (80ft long)- alley, garage, and service access (purple)
 - a few duplexes scattered throughout (purple)
 - 3-story condo buildings (orange) – parking underneath, access from lower sides
- Sidewalks and street trees
- More homes, creative design, trail and central park, provide lower priced homes because more of them and generally smaller
- Significant funding or bike and pedestrian improvements on Stribling – want to fund majority of City’s plan for sidewalks on Stribling, and probably some drainage improvements
 - City would have to build these, as this is a project on an existing city street
- Trying to meet City’s larger goals, but definitely not what Fry’s Spring is used to – haven’t formalized the proposal or application, wanted neighborhood to be first to lay eyes on it
- Questions:
 - Q: what is the city’s R-value?
 - A: 15 units per acre
 - Q: Where is on-street parking?
 - A: All streets have on-street parking and all buildings themselves would have parking underneath
 - Q: Plan to keep trees?
 - A: no plan to save trees in upland area, but majority of significant trees are on steep slopes around the perimeter – along sewer- probably not the ones along Stribling because road will need to be widened to do any sort of pedestrian improvements/street widening along there
 - Q: how to handle all the cars and traffic? Can’t get two cars and a pedestrian on Stribling simultaneously. Shouldn’t have to sell our souls to get an oversized development that the City should have funded.
 - A: agree, but all I know is they haven’t and hoping this could make that happen
 - Q: how many dollars
 - A: depends on density, but in half million plus range for improvements
 - Q: Currently at rush hour the Stribling/JPA intersection is almost unworkable, half millions is not going to get traffic management at these critical intersections. PC ignored all citizen input and just told developer that it’s about tax base and more affordable units. Is disappointed in this plan.
 - Q: Big concern is there hasn’t been responsiveness from city and roads aren’t carrying traffic well with current residents. If not adequate now, what will happen if add 230 more residences to this very small area? Having roads that can accommodate the traffic is a safety issue
 - A: this won’t happen without significant improvements to Stribling
 - Q response; but it’s not just Stribling, it’s about access points on JPA Extd, Harris, Etc. – there are only so many ways to get in and out
 - Q: How many affordable units? Habitat?
 - A: 25-26 units, not certain about Habitat at this point
 - Q: taking land from property owners
 - A: City is the only entity that can take land from private property owners if want to widen Stribling, sidewalks, etc.
 - Q: This needs to be part of a larger Cville discussion about how we need to grow. Bottlenecks not unique to here. Appreciate thinking outside of the box.

- There might not be any answers to JPA / Stribling intersection.
 - A: Appreciate the comment, City has greater need than is in what is in one particular neighborhood. What market wants isn't always what the city needs. Trying to merge those needs. That is the hard part.
 - Q: Stribling currently ¾ rental, already low to middle income affordable housing. It's a very walking population. Affordable housing already happening on Stribling. This might disrupt a very lively community. Truck drivers for building Huntley didn't care about the streets. It's an unsafe street and concern about more trucks and interrupting the existing property. 2nd point – this is one of the few 10+ acre properties along Moores creek not owned by the City. Lack of clean water protection with Huntley. Grading to edge of creek beds caused damage downstream. By maximizing development on every inch of the site, damaging natural resources in the neighborhood
 - A; at closest is 200feet from Moores creek. Stays on top of critical slopes. Important to them that they do things that are sensitive to the surroundings.
 - Q: what is Matt Alfele's role in letting City know what he's hearing
 - A: Site plan is not submitted. Matt is taking notes. Matt is here to hear feedback. More formal role once application submitted.
alfelem@charlottesville.org
 - A: Charlie – Don't inundate Matt with emails now, there will be another community meeting when there is a formal plan. Unless there's a by-right site plan which is sometimes just held at NDS. But if it's a formal rezoning will come back to FSNA.
- Q: Retention pond behind Moseley – had developer put fence around it, had to call city numerous times to get silt fence installed during development. Want to make sure environmental requirements are followed
- A: Not proposing long term ponds once grading is done on Moseley – biofilter or underground. Sounds like what you're describing is a sediment trap during construction. No permanent ponds.
- Q: Points to make for group and question
 - Speak to City about variety of stormwater techniques along Stribling, not asking for fancy boulevard with lots of piping.
 - Approximately 180 buildings currently residences on Stribling, proposing to double that now. Don't want to lose that character. Lots of interaction up and down the street
 - Two more developments potential on Stribling
 - Nob Hill – 180 units possibly
 - Granger Farm
 - Whatever this project can do for JPA/Stribling doesn't matter if County side can't be solved. Need leadership from City and County
 - What would YOU do to get the City to talk to the County
- A: Not sure can answer that, not sure if plan for Stribling is a plan or a study. VDOT and county have spent a lot of time analyzing the gravel portion. RR underpass has been impediment to development on Granger property. City and County both do lots of studying and planning of things that don't happen.
- Q: appreciate what Southern Development has done, but it's up to City to do somethings, like sidewalks. If Charlie came back and said we're going to do by-right, can we pressure the City together to make changes?

- A: happy to lend voice to conversation
- Q: Has Southern Development purchased undeveloped parcels on Morgan Ct
- A: never came to terms on the ones on Morgan Ct at the end. Did buy some near the top of Morgan Ct.
- Q: would like to know if City will address roads before development starts
- Neighborhood has made it clear they want the City to address Stribling
- Q: have you gone to City Schools to ask if there's capacity in local schools?
- A: have come to the neighborhood first. Also requires a lot of coordination and thought and would be a few years out.
- Seek out Will if live on Stribling