

## De La Vega, Maritza

---

**From:** John Thillmann <jhtcav@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 26, 2014 7:36 AM  
**To:** Mark Silverwood  
**Cc:** Fiebe, Joanne K; Gardner, Marianne; Hagg, Elizabeth A.  
**Subject:** Re: Seven Corners CBC - Comp Plan comments

Mark

My reading of the plan and conversations with Penny on Tuesday after the public comment period leads me to a similar opinion of the sears site...perhaps a modification of the charlotte numbers without office use as that is very unlikely. As to the other comments you made I agree and will pass them along to Marianne, Liz, Joanne and Bernie.

Thanks for the comments.

Best,

JT

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE Smartphone.

----- Original Message -----

From : Mark Silverwood  
Subject : Seven Corners CBC - Comp Plan comments

John:

I think the plan is coming together nicely and that the staff has done a great job with this very complex task. Below are a few comments/clarifications that I would like to see in the plan.

1. The Sears site with the current proposal appears too dense along Rte. 7 and after all comments, perhaps it should remain at the original planned 655,000 SF and not connect to the neighborhood streets.

2. Item 8 of the Redevelopment Option on page 11 needs to clarify that in providing 1:1 replacement of "affordable units" that there are no other layers of Affordable Housing or Workforce Housing Units required in these sub units A-1 and A-2. I have attached a revised Figure 28 - Affordable Housing Table to reflect the percentages required of Sub Units A-1 and A-2 for the various AMI requirements.

3. Figure 26 with notes \*\*. I don't understand how the number of 176,700 SF of retail was arrived at. I also don't understand why there would be a loss of SF as per the indicated notes. Somehow 1,200,000 minus 176,700 leaves only 1,010,000 SF. A loss of 13,300 SF. Clarification of this calculation including assumptions of store depths, etc. would be appreciated. On this same issue I suggest the following language under Sub-Unit A-1 on page 52: "Under the redevelopment option, this sub-unit is planned for a maximum of 1,200,000 square feet of multifamily residential use, with the option to reduce the residential square footage by up to 176,700 square feet in order to create ground floor retail and other commercial uses fronting the spine road that traverses the length of the

sub-unit, should market conditions permit." Also correct the line "As described in Recommendation 9", it should be 8.

4. In the Heritage Resources on page 14, we take great exception to any label of historic significance to the non-descript red brick buildings on Sub Unit A-1. This is completely contradictory to the realignment and grid of streets that the plan is based upon. We will oppose any action to have these buildings listed on any historic inventory.

5. Major Avenues and Avenues. The illustration in Figure 35 - Major Avenue, shows a width of between 96 feet and 108 feet , building to building. Is this the dimension used when the grid of streets were laid out for the plan.

6. Local Street - Cross Section. Some of these streets are shown at the B.F. Saul shopping center. I question the viability of having a raised floor (2.5 - 3.0 ft) where retail may occur in the future given the need for handicapped ramps.

7. Public Art. Given the scope of redevelopment should a dollar figure be given to "art contribution" whether on-site or off-site but in the neighborhood, at \$.30 per new square foot of building.

Call with any questions.  
Best,  
Mark