

Seven corners meeting last evening

From: John Thillmann <jhtcav@aol.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, August 07, 2013 9:29 AM  
To: Gross, Penny  
Subject: Seven corners meeting last evening

Good morning Penny:

Last night we met to review the Staff's compilation of the Charrette results. I think that the meeting went about as well as I had hoped.

I am encouraged that the wilston area 35 acres has a very-very good possibility of actually happening, and in the short term. Mark Silverwood pretty much laid out the redevelopment scenario that he needs for his multi family units at a 3.5 times what he now has (300 du's VHDA financed). This is very-very close to the number that the Charrette proposed--his piece is workable. Jim Edmondson who represents the Chinese company who owns the other affordable project said pretty much the same thing. Unfortunately, neither Devin Corini nor Nathan Bath of Regency were at the meeting so the staff and I will need to get with them ASAP.

You and I should also meet after I have the Regency meeting and have their views, both because the county staff wants to move the County Building mostly off of the current wilston site and in case the regency retail moves onto part of the wilston site . I want to make sure that you are fully aware of it and get your guidance before I let the staff move forward with it as it also involves moving the county building on to a lot of Mark Carriers land and we/I need to get him on board.

The BF Saul site also looks like it may be in play. Vince Burke representing BF Saul presented their take on the shopping center site. Their "rough draft proposal" also uses the basic structure of the Charrette in its layout and even more importantly Vince talked about a phased development (west to east) from the Seven corners part to the Patrick Henry end of their site. This is the first positive statement by Saul that they would be open to actually redeveloping their site in reasonable time frame. Vince and I talked afterwards and we will set up a meeting with the OCR staff to get more details on intensity of development (square footages and numbers of units etc) as we move to the next step of developing plan language.

The Sears site is problematic. Jim McIlvaine indicated that one of his three partners (#1 owners of the ground lease in California, #2 Folger Pratt a mixed use developer, #3 the McIlvaine family) is a problem, and that the office building next to the former County Social Services building (possible school site) is likely not going to in any scenario be a redevelopment possibility as it it

fully occupied with good leases. However, he is open to continue a dialogue and developing a plan that might be focused on a 20+ horizon. He also wants to come in to see you.

So there you have it.

Our next meeting is on September 10th and we will then have a staff proposed land use plan that I hope the land owners and task force will all move forward with--but want you to see before then. We will also have a presentation by the NVTC on the Rt 7 transit options. We will take a position on one or more options to present to the NVTC at their public options meeting on the 18th. If you have any ideas I'd also like any guidance you can give me.

Best,  
John

Best,  
John

Seven corners meeting last evening