

An adjourned meeting and a regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on February 12, 2014, Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The adjourned meeting was held at 4:00 p.m., and was adjourned from February 5, 2014. The regular meeting was held at 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Ms. Jane D. Dittmar, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1, Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar, who announced that due to inclement weather the Board would only consider the Consent Agenda on the meeting tonight, and would postpone all other items until March.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session and Receive Public Comments:** Establishment of Economic Development Program. *Lee Catlin, Assistant to the County Executive for Community and Business Partnerships.*

The following executive summary was provided to Board members:

“On December 4, 2013, the Board directed staff to initiate an information gathering and education process as part of the Board’s consideration of establishing an independent Office of Economic Development, with the following major milestones:

January, 2014 - hold a joint work session with the Economic Development Authority (EDA) to review research results and hear from outside expert(s) on current/future state of economic development best practices, including reasonable expectations/ measures, real estate development and site selection.

- **outcome:** *attendees will gain a working knowledge of what efforts are necessary to achieve robust economic health in a competitive environment and will develop a shared understanding of economic development among key partners, such as the EDA, to establish the philosophical framework that sets direction for the Economic Development Program, including desired measurements/outcomes.*

February, 2014 – hold a work session with public comment to review and revise the proposed Economic Development Program framework, including mission, guiding principles, components and high level goals.

- **outcome:** *Board endorsement of preferred direction/framework for the Program with opportunity for public feedback.*

Late February/early March, 2014 – review detailed cost information for establishing an independent Economic Development Office as part of the budget process and approve Board - supported direction as part of adopting final budget.

- **outcome:** *approved budget for future direction of economic development effort.*

April/May, 2014 – begin the hiring process if Board directs staff to create an Economic Development Office and set initial priorities and outcomes for the future Program.

- **outcome:** *adopted priorities to guide initial work plan.*

This work session is the second milestone in the process described above.

On January 30, 2014, the Board and the Economic Development Authority held a joint work session which included an update on the County’s economic development activities related to the recently completed three year Economic Vitality Action Plan as well as presentations by Brian Shull, Economic Director for the City of Harrisonburg, and Chris Lloyd, Senior Vice President and Director of Infrastructure and Economic Development, McGuire Woods Consulting.

Attendees at the work session had the opportunity to receive information and to participate in discussions regarding the current environment of economic development, emerging areas of growth and opportunity for capital investment and job creation, what components comprise a “best practice” municipal economic development program, the responsibilities of an economic development director, accepted measures of program success, and the importance of being prospect ready to attract desired target industries, including appropriate site and building availability.

This work session is intended to allow Board members to review and discuss in more detail the *Economic Development Program Concept Outline* (Attachment A) in light of information provided during the January 30 work session, including desired high level outcomes, areas of opportunity and challenge, and required resources. A comparison of the economic development programs of peer localities is provided as Attachment B. The public also will have an opportunity to comment on establishing an economic development program as part of the work session. While the final decision to establish an independent economic development office, including a new director position and a new part-time administrative staff position, will be made during the budget process, this work session is an opportunity

for Board members to provide feedback regarding the attached concept outline and the establishment of an economic development office.

Staff estimates that the cost to establish an Economic Development Office to be staffed by a new Director and a new half-time administrative position would be approximately \$160,000 annually in addition to the existing Economic Development Facilitator position. Exact costs for the new office would be determined during the FY 15 budget process, and funding, if approved, would become available on July 1, 2014.

Staff recommends that the Board provide specific direction to staff as to whether the Economic Development Program Concept Outline provides the appropriate framework for establishing an economic development office. The final decision for establishing the office will be made by the Board during the FY 15 budget process.”

Ms. Catlin addressed the Board, stating that as a follow-up to the previous months work session presenting a more global view of economic development, this work session would give them an opportunity to focus specifically on Albemarle and how it should be approached locally. Ms. Catlin said that the outcome of this work session was to seek the Board’s guidance and direction on whether they think the concept as presented provides an appropriate high-level framework for the future direction of the economic development program, and any input on the establishment of an economic development office. She noted that the actual decision on establishing the office would be part of the Board’s upcoming budget work.

Ms. Catlin reported that the economic program was not developed in isolation and was not a stand-alone effort, but was rooted firmly and deliberately in other long-standing County policies and documents that provide an overarching structure and parameters to help ensure it stays within previously established values. She stated that the materials presented to the Board include the County’s vision statement, the Comp Plan economic development policy, the Economic Vitality Action Plan preamble, and the Target Industry Study. Ms. Catlin said that the concept was developed by a strategic plan goal team composed of staff and representatives from partners in the community such as the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development and the Economic Development Authority, as well as a roundtable discussion that included 15-20 community members.

She noted that there is a mission statement in the document that was developed intentionally to be consistent with the other documents, referencing responsible economic development activities that enhance the County’s competitive position and result in quality job creation and career employment opportunities, and increase the tax base and improve quality of life for all citizens, while respecting Albemarle’s natural resources and unique character. Ms. Catlin said that the next item in the concept paper was guiding principles, including economic diversity that reflects a full spectrum of skill levels; respect for heritage and environment to continue supporting quality of life and quality of place; organizational collaboration including the City, the University and other regional partners; entrepreneurship and organic growth from within the existing community; building awareness of local opportunities; educational achievement and partnership that maximizes local educational institutions; leveraging intellectual capital; supporting critical infrastructure – both social and physical; and a results orientation.

Ms. Catlin stated that there has been a lot of work done in these areas already, and this conversation would address ongoing efforts and the challenges and opportunities not pursued because of capacity issues. She said that business retention and expansion is the core of successful economic development, adding that the County already had an “Albemarle First” outreach program with a target of 200 businesses per year – but a total of 1,500 identified targets. Ms. Catlin stated that during the process, staff hopes to identify things that are important for those businesses’ success and can make them a growing venture in the community. She said that in addition to the 1500 identified targets, there are businesses that are at threat for losing jobs or relocating to another area, or are affected by the economy or other external factors – and those subsets of industries may need special attention beyond the target list.

Ms. Catlin said that to anchor target industries in the community, including current expansion prospects, they had talked about business attraction in terms of not only bringing new businesses in but encouraging existing businesses to expand locally. She stated that in the last quarter, economic development staff has had ongoing conversations with nine companies about expansion – at a very serious level – with a potential impact of 214 jobs and \$6.6 million in total investment. Ms. Catlin said that 100% of those companies are considered target industries, and there is a lot of effort and work required to ensure that they stay in the County. She stated that the County has lost jobs due to relocations, downsizings and closures, so part of this effort is to build a pipeline in order to maintain current levels.

Regarding new business startups, Ms. Catlin said that the philosophy has been to create an environment that is conducive to the startup and growth of new business ventures. She stated that the County has been developing a single point of contact program that helps new businesses that do not know how to navigate the process, offering training opportunities and drop-in hours, maintaining good relationships with the Charlottesville Business Innovation Council, the U.Va., Office of Innovation and other entities. Ms. Catlin said that staff sees challenges and opportunities that are beyond their current capacity, referencing a map of companies that have spun out of U.Va., and have located in the area over the past several years. She stated that those are all potential high-growth opportunities, but it will take nurturing to get them to the next level. Ms. Catlin said that state and federal financing opportunities can provide cash and support for companies to get to the next level, and helping new ventures grow into successful local businesses is a key opportunity for the County – but only if they have the capacity to do it.

She stated that in looking at just four entrepreneurial resources in the area – the Community Investment Collaborative, U.Va. Commercial Licensures, Start-Up Weekend, and the Center for Innovative Technology – supported 139 start-up companies with technical assistance and/or funding in the last two years.

Ms. Catlin said that they discussed business attraction efforts in depth at their last work session, but currently those are focused primarily on inquiries that come to the County directly or through CVPED or the Virginia Economic Development partnerships. She stated that the County has been a reactive mode up to now, but continues to work on keeping the website as up to date as possible since that is where business attraction is getting first and second levels of sort in terms of economic development. Ms. Catlin said that if data and resources are not easily and readily available, companies will move onto other prospective localities. She stated that businesses are also looking for product development amenities – the locations and spaces desired, and whether they are able to fit into an increasingly compressed timeframe. She stated that prospect readiness is also important, with the information and teams in place and public/private partnerships that help put the County's best face forward, along with outreach to target industries beyond just reacting to solicitations of interest. Ms. Catlin said that cultivation of new market opportunities is also an important aspect of their overall economic development effort, ensuring that the County is positioning itself to be attractive to emerging industries.

Ms. Catlin reported that workforce development is another key component of the economic development initiative, and the County is actively involved in the Piedmont Workforce Network and is engaged with educational partners at the secondary and post-secondary levels. She stated that challenges include building the employment pipelines for a full spectrum of skill levels, evaluating and analyzing target industry information, and growing the talent of tomorrow from a young age. Ms. Catlin said that in looking at pipeline projects in the retail, information, and light assembly and manufacturing sectors, there could be as many as 1,273 jobs that need to be filled with appropriate workers in order for those companies to be successful here.

She stated that agribusiness is another vital facet of the local economy, not only important to economic development overall but a crucial underpinning of the rural economy and resource protection efforts. Ms. Catlin said that the County has been active working with partners such as the Food Hub, the Piedmont Environmental Council, the Monticello Wine Trail and others to expand visibility of local products and agri-tourism venues. She stated that the County also co-sponsors programs like the Agribusiness Marketing Conference and the Monticello Artisan Trail to help business customer base and business profitability for these businesses, and as staff look at some of the opportunities and challenges the continued effort to increase visibility of local products is important. Ms. Catlin said that the startup business ventures that support agriculture are not just resulting in economic benefit, they are supporting the rural area – and there are a number of value-added producers who are taking local products to the next level with manufacturing, production and distribution. She noted that the Monticello Artisan Trail is over 100 small businesses that are linked together and supported, getting business training and increasing profitability because of the efforts that have gone into that program. Ms. Catlin said that the Monticello Wine Trail includes 35 wineries that are doing the same thing, and the potential in that area will continue to grow if it is supported.

She stated that the Economic Development Authority is an important partner, and they are able to do things with funding and finances that the County is not able to do – such as grants and other initiatives, due to their new funding structure through fee collection. Ms. Catlin said that the challenge and opportunity with the EDA is to have the capacity to work with them – considering appropriate funding initiatives, working through the details of those, and ensuring that their budget is accomplishing what the Board would like to see, and to consider other opportunities that the EDA may be well positioned for.

Ms. Catlin stated that staff was proposing a team approach to economic development that cuts across departments, with Community Development playing a continued important role in land use planning and approval process and regulatory reform; refocusing of community and business partnerships to be able to spend more time on marketing, community vitality, and partnership pieces. She said that staff envisions an economic development office that would take on some of the basic core items that form the basis of a solid structure. Ms. Catlin said that staff is seeking the Board's feedback as to whether this concept provides appropriate, high-level framework for the future direction of the County's economic development program as well as the public's response.

The Chair opened the meeting to receive public comments.

Mr. Tom Olivier, President of Advocates for a Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP), said that in the County's first survey of public opinion on planning issues, in 1994, the residents' top priorities were quality public education, public safety, and environmental protection. Mr. Olivier said that economic development was not a top concern, and many surveys since then have produced similar results. He stated that ASAP believes the County should have economic policies and programs – endeavors aimed at meeting the needs of existing residents – and especially support programs designed to provide better opportunities for low-income residents. Mr. Olivier said that compatibility with sustainability should be an inescapable criterion when evaluating development proposals, and without that, programs with destructive long-term implications can be launched at the behest of special interests. He stated that environmentalists have been assured by County staff that burgeoning economic development programs would always honor the guiding principles of the Comp Plan, and they are naturally wary of the shift of staff from Community Development to the fourth floor. Mr. Olivier said that the staff reports are full of presumptions and are “really just cheerleading” for a very heavy hand of County government in the local economy – but no need or justification for the heavy hand has been presented. He stated that what is also missing is analyses of whether the proposal is compatible with sustainability in the rest of the Comp Plan.

He said that ASAP urges the Board to instead divert funds to support high priority areas that have been neglected such as restoring rural area planners and the ACE program.

Ms. Helen Cauthen, President of the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development and Director of the Piedmont Workforce Network, stated that she was there on behalf of jobs and skills for workers, and said that economic development boils down to jobs for citizens. She said that Albemarle County residents deserve the Board's support, and the Economic Development Program is a very important next step after the momentum generated by the Economic Vitality Action Plan. Ms. Cauthen emphasized that as a partnership and CVPED relies on economic development departments – and all seven counties and the City of Charlottesville in the workforce one-stop have an established department. She said that as part of their new key message development, one of the important factors recognized for the whole region is environmental stewardship, and CVPED is there to help attract the kinds of companies the County wants and further support them. Ms. Cauthen said that the Board has had a thoughtful, strategic approach, and this next step just helps continue and build on it.

Mr. Jack Marshall addressed the Board, stating that he is a 25-year resident of the County and opposes the allocation of an estimated \$160,000 every year to further increase the County's efforts to attract new businesses. He said that this is on top of the decision a few years earlier to become a paid member of the partnership on economic development and the recent decision to fund an economic development facilitator, adding that this additional embrace of development is unnecessary. Mr. Marshall stated that even after a few years of recession, Albemarle County ranks exceptionally high on nearly any index of economic health, with a variety of commerce ranging from agri-business to high-tech bioscience. He said that there are moves out of the community, which are typical, but because of U.Va. the overall local economy is relatively immune from serious economic downturns. Mr. Marshall stated that if an economic problem exists, it is the issue of inequality – and that raises the question of who will really benefit from the proposed new economic development program. He said that \$160,000 a year will do little to reduce the total number of unemployed and under-employed in the County, or the distance between the affluent and the disadvantaged. Mr. Marshall stated that there would be unacknowledged costs for the community as a whole, and most new businesses will bring in their own staff because the skill sets of local residents looking for work will rarely match the new needs. He cited the experience with GE Fanuc as an example, stating that most of the workers will bring families – and that will require new schools, roads, and other infrastructure. Mr. Marshall said that in surveys citizens consistently voice concern about the pace of growth in the County, and that rate has been a result of natural evolutionary expansion – not growth stimulated by government intervention or corporate welfare. He encouraged the Board to reject this proposal until they were sure of the benefits touted in the sales pitch, and fully aware of the long-term implications.

Mr. John Martin referenced a slide that said “guiding principles involving leverage of intellectual capital in the community” and stated that he decided right away that he is not part of the intellectual capital because he did not know what that meant, but he does now because he Googled it. He said that the economic development proposal is somewhat of a “pie in the sky” write-up from staff and does not provide him what he needs to know as a citizen and taxpayer. Mr. Martin said that he would like to know exactly what a director in this new office of economic development would do all day, and what their responsibilities will be from 9 to 5 every day of the week. He stated that it is all a matter of spending priorities, and the County has incredible demands – solid waste management, internet service to the rural areas, public transportation, the police department, and the CIP. Mr. Martin said that citizens need to know what this office and this director are going to do, and what services they will provide to the community, and then they can evaluate whether there will be a return on investment versus just a subsidy for the business community for things that the Chamber, TJPED, and individual companies can do for themselves.

Mr. Neil Williamson addressed the Board, stating that he appreciates Mr. Martin's comments regarding the specificity of the job but does not think that is a Board function. He stated that they instead empower the County Executive with a charge, and have him make it happen. Mr. Williamson said that the Board is looking at a framework for the economic development office at this point, and businesses are important contributors to the community. He stated that he would hope that through a selective use of an economic development department, they would be able to choose the type of businesses that fit the workforce in a manner that helps fill the jobs with people who are here – but also welcome people who come here from elsewhere. Mr. Williamson said that it is time for the County to step forward and embrace economic development – the right kind of economic development to bring Albemarle County forward.

Ms. Valerie Long said that she is before the Board to strongly support and endorse staff's recommendations for an economic development director. Ms. Long said that she represents a variety of businesses, including those that have been in the community for a long time as well as those that would like to be here. She stated that compared to other jurisdictions in which she works, where there is an economic development director or team to help with that process, Supervisors are missing out on opportunities to support businesses – particularly existing ones that want to expand but lack the knowledge as to how to go about it and how to navigate challenges. Ms. Long said that it is helpful to have a partner who is internal to the County who can serve as an ombudsman, and she would hate to miss the opportunity to support business expansion. She stated that she also feels strongly about the symbiotic relationship between the local business community and the public schools, as employees want to be in a community that has a strong and successful public school system. Ms. Long emphasized that a growing business community can help fund schools in a reliable, ongoing way – and in turn, schools depend on the resources that the local economy provides in terms of training, internships, and future opportunities. She added that economic development and solid environmental policies are in no way mutually exclusive, and both can occur here.

Mr. Rod Gentry addressed the Board, stating that he is a local banker, board chairman of the Piedmont Workforce Network, and a member of the Economic Development Authority. Mr. Gentry said that economic vitality doesn't occur if they stop attracting new businesses to the area, because companies move on. He said that it has become increasingly competitive around the state to attract the best companies – those that produce career-ladder jobs and those that will ensure the future of the area. Mr. Gentry stated that obviously the job description and department particulars would need to be clarified, and it will need to be done within the constraints of what the County has identified as the right things to do for the citizens of the community. He said that one thing that he is sure is the right thing to do is to promote economic vitality, and he applauds all of their efforts going forward. 5:15:10

There being no further comment, the Chair closed the public comments portion of the meeting and the matter was placed before the Board.

Ms. Mallek said that she had some particular questions along the lines of what Mr. Martin had said, and stated that she would like information about what this really means.

Ms. Catlin stated that this has been a process to help the Board understand economic development, and this work session was intended to be a framework discussion at a high level to get a sense of general direction as to whether they think this will work for Albemarle County. She said that further steps would be identifying the goals and objectives of the program and how to measure its success, as well as establishing strategies to measure against the guiding principles – such as educational partnerships, which would require support of internships built into the economic development program. Ms. Catlin stated that before they continue down the path of more discussion, staff would like to know if this framework is generally moving in the right direction and whether these components are in line with the mission and guiding principles.

Mr. Foley said that what was before them essentially defined the scope of what the office would do, and the Board would eventually be involved in establishing specific goals and objectives – but right now staff was seeking input on whether this is a direction they think makes sense. He stated that this was a fairly boilerplate economic development program in terms of major components, and staff needs Board direction on that outline.

Ms. Palmer complimented Ms. Catlin on her work, and asked her how much of her time is currently devoted to economic development.

Ms. Catlin stated that about half her time is spent in this area.

Ms. Palmer asked if she would continue that under this scenario. Ms. Catlin said that many of the things already happening in her office – the marketing, partnerships, connection with U.Va., tourism and agri-business – would probably stay in her office, and she could spend more time on those. She stated that the things they were not doing right now involve complex real estate and financial transactions, product development, prospects, data mining, etc., and those are the types of things a new office would take on.

Ms. Palmer asked Ms. Catlin for clarification as to what comprised the estimated 1,200 jobs that would be arriving here. Ms. Catlin stated that there are retail jobs such as those with the new Costco, and also some manufacturing and skilled trade jobs. She said that many of those are entry-level positions that have a skill set that can move people through a career ladder, but having a workforce that meets the needs of employers is a strategic focus that requires support from the locality.

Ms. Palmer asked how staff would help with that. Ms. Catlin explained that it could mean talking to the businesses about their specific needs, identifying skilled workers to transfer into those jobs, etc.

Ms. Mallek said that all of those things are part of what the Piedmont Workforce Network is already doing, and her uncertainty is how the County is going to help with that.

Ms. Catlin stated that an example would be if a company was looking at locating or expanding here, Ms. Stimart would have a conversation with them and they would ask about things like the University and the skills coming out of there, how many engineers they might have, what grants would be available at the state and federal level to support their business. She said that PWN does a lot of testing and skills assessment and interviewing training, but there's another component that is more the County's responsibility – to ensure that the companies understand that there's a skilled and ready workforce here.

Mr. Foley said that the reality of this is that if the Board wants to attract the jobs identified in the Target Industry Study, the environment is competitive – and every other locality is ready to meet with a prospective company and sit down with them and talk about their needs. He stated that if the County doesn't have anybody who is able to do that, businesses will move on – and if they are serious about target industries, growing the job base, creating career ladder jobs, and getting some capital investment that provides return, Ms. Catlin would not be available to do that. Mr. Foley said that there is a fundamental simplicity here, and they must have a minimal effort to meet with those companies, if they do want to attract those industries – and if the Board isn't sure that they do, then that's fundamental.

Ms. Palmer stated that she would like to hear staff's response to Mr. Olivier's comment about the separation of economic development from the rest of planning, and would also like to know what Charlottesville is getting out of their economic development efforts.

Mr. Foley said that organizationally, when they established Susan Stimart's business facilitator position, it was intentionally located in Community Development and supported by the entire Board as a way to begin reaching out to businesses. He said that it was moved into the County Executive's office, as the Board felt that the County's image and relationship with the business community was something critically important to pay attention to. Mr. Foley stated that they have furthered that with specific policies, such as having the Community Development and Planning directors at the table when talking with businesses – but this isn't an indication of them backing away from the importance of environmental protection. He said that this is reflected in their mission statement, and that's why the Target Industry Study ended up where it did. Mr. Foley explained that what staff is proposing is to move it out of the County Executive's office to be an independent department that will fall under the functional area of Community Development in the budget.

Regarding the City's economic development office, Mr. Foley stated that it's hard to get a grip on what efforts have been related specifically to that office, but one of the communities that has a reputation of being sensitive to the environment is Fauquier County. He said that they have an office of four or six people who have made a commitment to economic vitality and the jobs necessary to keep a vibrant community, but work within the framework of environmental protection. Mr. Foley stated that it was difficult to tie the office to all of the revenues in the entire budget, but they would need to have metrics and measures as to how many jobs were generated – and that would be part of the program going forward.

Mr. Sheffield asked Ms. Catlin how closely she had worked with the EDA individual members in coming up with some of this information. Ms. Catlin said that John Lowery was a member of the strategic plan goal team and attended many meetings on this, and he along with other EDA members have been a part of the effort for the last three years.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he didn't have any comments other than he would like for this approach to interact with the EDA, and he would like to see them function like the Planning Commission in terms of their relationship with that specific department. He said that economic development is shifting from real estate to quality of life, and he would like to ensure that their approach is parallel to their planning approaches.

Mr. Boyd stated that this is not something that has just come up to be shoved down their throats, as they've been working on it for three years. He said that there is a specific skill set and level of expertise required that the County doesn't currently have, such as what the speakers from the other localities brought forward at the last work session. Mr. Boyd said that it all boils down to jobs, and with recent information released on free and reduced lunch students it is clear that people need these good, career-ladder jobs. He stated that he isn't one for spending money or big government, but this is a logical next step they need to take and he is in favor of moving forward with this.

Ms. McKeel commented that she agreed with Mr. Sheffield's points and stated that she might be looking at a slightly different hybrid of this. She said that Ms. Catlin needed to be freed up from this effort, and supports someone else to lead this office. Ms. McKeel stated that she was concerned about hiring a part-time person, because it's very difficult to find the skill set needed in a person that's willing to work part-time. She said that there is a need for workforce development in the community, and CATEC would be rolling out their strategic plan the following week – and they can provide the workforce piece along with PVCC.

Ms. Dittmar said that something she learned years ago is that people think of "economic development" as a noun, and that's where they get tripped up because it's really a verb. She stated that they haven't addressed the tax base development as much as they should, as it's not even in the preamble of the staff report. Ms. Dittmar said that the County would be facing severe pressure on the real estate tax this year just from mandates from state and federal government, and that would increase the cost of living here. She stated that they need to be creative and smart about different sources of revenue, and economic development done well can do that. Ms. Dittmar said that at a recent chairs meeting which she and Ms. McKeel attended, one county talked about how they moved their BRAC (base realignment relocation) into an economic development function that looked at federal dollars in their communities. She stated that Albemarle has the NGIC, the JAG School, DIA, the Federal Executive Institute, the National Astronomy Radio Observatory, and a national park. She said that a skilled person would understand what goes into making an economy and how to protect it. Ms. Dittmar stated that another county mentioned that a community would pay the price of having parents working two part-time jobs, because those kids were not being cared for and would likely impact other systems such as social services. She said that she would also like to see tourism mentioned in the economic development department, as it is an important component of the local and regional economy.

Ms. Mallek said that she has watched the work being done on job training at the Workforce Center and One-Stop Center, and that would continue to be an important partnership – but she is also confident that with careful design and oversight they will protect the environment and continue the stewardship of the attributes that draw people to the area. She stated that as long as they are keeping that as the top line, they can do work in a graduated way to help businesses – especially those that are already here and want to expand. Ms. Mallek added that the County would not really be providing jobs, they would be providing an opportunity for jobs to flourish here, and clarifying that would help her answer those concerns raised by her constituents.

Ms. Palmer said that her concern is all the pressures on the budget this year, and they are looking at a lot of development currently – with a Community Development department that will soon be completely maxed out. She stated that in the past several years, the County has joined the partnership for economic development, the Chamber of Commerce, has hired Ms. Stimart and has had Ms. Catlin half

time for this effort, and has put \$250,000 in the budget for economic vitality. Ms. Palmer said that she really needed to see more of the revenue side of what's been done, as that would be important in their consideration of whether to fund this for the next year, or after that.

Mr. Boyd said that he has been struggling with some of those same questions also, specifically how they set goals and objectives and how to measure success against them, but what he gleaned from the last presentation was that it's more of a project by project basis. He stated that they really needed to look at it from the basis of which projects would be successful from a tax and employment standpoint, rather than from a holistic perspective. Mr. Boyd emphasized that he concurred with Ms. Catlin that a specific skill set and level of expertise is required – and the County doesn't have that currently.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that at one of her VACo classes about six years ago, there was a joint presentation from the Hanover County superintendent of schools and the head of their chamber of commerce talking about how successful they had been as a county with businesses having partnerships with the school system. Ms. Mallek said that she hoped this office would facilitate that aspect of economic development with those contacts in the businesses community.

Ms. Catlin asked the Board for any final clarifications as to how to proceed.

Ms. Dittmar said that one Supervisor had said that the next round should include some idea of return on investment, and that may come from interviewing benchmark communities.

Mr. Boyd stated that he's already been down that road and has pursued that with staff, and it's very difficult to quantify it without just looking at specific successful projects.

Ms. Mallek said that Mr. Rooker had asked this question at a meeting the previous fall and had asked if it could be measured in terms of investment in staff for this effort versus return.

Mr. Foley stated that the degree of specificity is difficult, but there are metrics they need to put in place and results they can measure that will be more related to numbers of contacts and how many of those resulted in jobs, and how many jobs actually came because of work the office had done with a prospect. He said that the effort they put into working with those prospects makes a difference, but there may not be an absolute tie. Mr. Foley said that there would be metrics designed to measure success as part of this program.

Ms. Dittmar said that in looking at peer communities, their economic development offices would have been slashed during the recession if they couldn't justify their worth.

Ms. Catlin stated that Mr. Christopher Lloyd, who made a presentation at the January 30th joint meeting with the Economic Development Authority, touched on measurement but didn't go into detail about it. He commented that he can provide input as to what a reasonable approach to measuring impact might be.

Ms. Mallek commented that in Fauquier County, three of their six economic development people are rural in focus, and they have worked to weave that sector into the fabric of their economy.

Mr. Sheffield asked what the next steps would be in this effort, prior to the Board considering it as part of the budget.

Mr. Foley said that staff would need to work on metrics, and a job profile for the director of an economic development director.

Agenda Item No. 3. Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 5:56 PM.

Agenda Item No. 4. Call to Order. The meeting was called back to order at 6:00 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 5. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 6. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Mr. Boyd **moved** to cancel all items on the agenda, with the exception of the Consent Agenda, to reschedule all public hearings to March 12, 2014 at 6:00 p.m., and to reschedule all other items to March 5, 2014. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Mr. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 8. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 9a. Recognition: Proclamation Recognizing The Big Read 2014: *True Grit*, by *Charles Portis*.

By the above-recorded vote, this item was rescheduled to March 5, 2014.

Agenda Item No. 10. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 11. Consent Agenda. Mr. Boyd **moved** to approve Items 11.1 through 11.5, and to accept the remaining items on the Consent Agenda for information. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. (Discussions on individual items are included with that agenda item.)

Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Mr. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.

NAYS: None.

Item No. 11.1. The Lofts at Meadowcreek - Resolution Supporting Virginia Development Housing Authority Financing for Mixed-Income Property.

The executive summary states that on December 11, 2013, the Board approved a rezoning for The Lofts at Meadowcreek from R-4 to Neighborhood Model. The proposed development is not in a revitalization area. Bluestone Land, L.L.C. ("Bluestone") has applied to the Virginia Housing Development Authority ("VHDA") for the financing of this multi-family, mixed-income rental housing development. The proposed development is described as follows:

605 Rio Rd East, Charlottesville VA 22901
TMPs 061A0-00-00-01500 and 061A0-00-00-01700 (total 2.80 +/- acres)
Residential community consisting of 65 multi-family urban loft style residential units
ZMA 2013-000001

Bluestone's application to the VHDA for financing this mixed-income development requires that a resolution be adopted by the Board indicating that the Board has determined that including market-rate units in the development would enhance Bluestone's ability to provide affordable units and that "private enterprise and investment are not reasonably expected, without assistance, to produce ... decent, safe and sanitary housing and supporting facilities that will meet the needs of low and moderate income persons and families in the area of the project" and that such a development would create a desirable mix of residents in the area. These determinations are required by Virginia Code § 36-55.30:2.B in order for the Virginia Housing Development Authority to finance the economically mixed project.

After staff review and consideration of information provided by Bluestone (Attachment A), staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution (Attachment B) based on the following:

- Bluestone owns and manages Treesdale Apartments, which are located across Rio Road from the proposed development. Treesdale is funded in part by federal low-income housing tax credits with 100% of the units income-restricted. As noted in Bluestone's letter, applicants at Treesdale frequently have incomes slightly higher than allowed (50% of the area median income or approximately \$40,650 for a family of four) and are denied. The proposed development would provide twenty percent (20%) of its units for households with incomes at or below 80% of the area median income of \$63,900 and twenty percent (20%) of its units for households with incomes up to 120% of the area median income of \$99,120. The remainder of its units would be income-unrestricted. This mix is consistent with the goals of the County's Affordable Housing Policy and Neighborhood Model principles.
- Mr. Park states that he has not found private financing with terms that would allow the proposed mix of units. VHDA's ability to provide 30-year, fixed-rate financing at below-market-rate interest provides long-term certainty for the carrying costs associated with the development.
- The proposed development is not located in a revitalization area as defined by Virginia Code § 36-55.30:2.A.

There is no budget impact related to this executive summary.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution making the determinations requested by Bluestone Land, L.L.C. regarding the project known as The Lofts at Meadowcreek.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution making the determinations requested by Bluestone Land, L.L.C. regarding the project known as The Lofts at Meadowcreek:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Bluestone Land, L.L.C. wishes to develop a multi-family, mixed-income rental housing project and has requested that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors make the determinations required by Virginia Code § 36-55.30:2.B in order for the Virginia Housing Development Authority to finance the economically mixed project (the "Project") described as:

The Lofts at Meadowcreek
605 Rio Rd East, Charlottesville VA 22901
TMPs 061A0-00-00-01500 and 061A0-00-00-01700 (total 2.80 +/- acres)
A residential community consisting of 65 multi-family urban loft style residential units; and

Whereas, the Board approved the rezoning request for the Project on December 11, 2013 (ZMA 2013-000001); and

Whereas, the proposed mixed-income residential project is consistent with the goals of the County's Affordable Housing Policy and the principles of the Neighborhood Model; and

Whereas, the Project is not located in a revitalization area as defined by Virginia Code § 36-55.30:2.A.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors determines that:

(1) the ability to provide residential housing and supporting facilities that serve persons or families of lower or moderate income will be enhanced if a portion of the units in the Project are occupied or held available for occupancy by persons and families who are not of low and moderate income; and

(2) private enterprise and investment are not reasonably expected, without assistance, to produce the construction or rehabilitation of decent, safe and sanitary housing and supporting facilities that will meet the needs of low and moderate income persons and families in the surrounding area of the Project and will induce other persons and families to live within such area and thereby create a desirable economic mix of residents in such area.

Item No. 11.2. Crozet Streetscape Phase II Project - Resolution supporting the temporary closure of Tabor Street (Route 691) during construction of improvement.

The executive summary states that the Downtown Crozet Streetscape Phase II project includes improvements to the vertical alignment and widening of the Tabor Street road section, as well as construction of a storm drainage system and a sidewalk. VDOT has awarded an enhancement grant on this project. The construction of the Tabor Street improvements could commence in late February or early March 2014.

The contractor has requested a complete closure of Tabor Street to traffic between Crozet Avenue and High Street (except for local traffic) for approximately fifteen (15) days during the construction project to allow for road widening and the installation of stormwater facilities. VDOT has granted permission for this detour with specific restrictions and requirements (see Attachment A):

- Tabor Street may be closed and the detour used only on weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., excluding holidays.
- The existing gravel surface of the detour route through the lumber yard must be clearly delineated, graded, and additional stone added as necessary to provide a drivable surface that is acceptable to VDOT.
- The detour route must be maintained as described in item 2 for the duration of the detour usage.
- A Maintenance of Operation (MOT) Plan will be provided to VDOT for review and approval. Said MOT plan must specify signage and placement for the detour.

The road closure has been coordinated with the public school bus routing managers. Complete closure of the road for the time period and hours stated above would expedite the proposed Tabor Street improvements and would result in a safer construction work zone.

If the complete closure were not granted, construction would proceed under a partial closure, as specified in the bid plans. Under a partial closure, construction of the Tabor Street improvements could take as long as five (5) weeks to complete due to the constrained conditions, restricted work hours, and flagmen requirements.

VDOT has determined that the only viable detour route is along High Street, through the lumber yard, to the newly constructed Library Avenue (see Attachment B). VDOT has confirmed that this route is within existing public right-of-way.

Adoption of the attached Resolution (Attachment C) would not directly impact the County's project budget. Additional costs for preparing and maintaining the detour would be offset by the savings in flagmen personnel and construction time.

Staff concurs with the request to close Tabor Street to traffic in order to construct the improvements along that street. Specifically, staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) supporting the closure of Tabor Street (Route 691) for approximately fifteen (15) days with anticipated closure dates of February 24, 2014 through March 14, 2014, weather permitting."

(Discussion: Ms. Mallek reported that she had reached out to the community regarding the Tabor Street closing, and about 100 constituents responded with approval to close it.)

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following Resolution supporting the closure of Tabor Street (Route 691) for approximately fifteen (15) days with anticipated closure dates of February 24, 2014 through March 14, 2014, weather permitting:

**A RESOLUTION SUPPORTING
THE TEMPORARY CLOSURE OF TABOR STREET (ROUTE 691)
DURING CONSTRUCTION PERIOD**

WHEREAS, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors concurs with the contractor's request to temporarily close Tabor Street (Route 691) in Crozet, Virginia during the construction of the Tabor Street improvements; and

WHEREAS, the closure of Tabor Street (Route 691) is proposed for approximately fifteen (15) days to allow for road widening and the installation of stormwater facilities during the months of February 2014 through March 2014; and

WHEREAS, VDOT has reviewed and supports the proposed closure subject to the following conditions:

- Tabor Street may be closed and the detour used only on weekdays between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., excluding holidays.
- The existing gravel surface of the detour route through the lumber yard must be clearly delineated, graded, and additional stone added as necessary to provide a drivable surface that is acceptable to VDOT.
- The detour route must be maintained as described in item 2 for the duration of the detour usage.
- A Maintenance of Operation (MOT) Plan will be provided to VDOT for review and approval. Said MOT plan must specify signage and placement for the detour.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, for purposes of public necessity, convenience and general welfare, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby supports the request to close Tabor Street (Route 691) for approximately fifteen (15) days to allow for road widening and the installation of stormwater facilities during the months of February 2014 through March 2014.

Item No. 11.3. SUB-2013-035. Estes Park Final Plat – Special Exception.

The executive summary states that Estes Park was rezoned to Planned Residential Development (PRD), with an associated application plan and proffers in December, 2012 (ZMA 2012-008). The PRD regulations require that buildings be separated by thirty (30) feet. The application plan which was reviewed by staff and approved by the Board of Supervisors noted a request to reduce the permitted building separation to ten (10) feet. However, the Board did not take express action to waive the 30-foot building separation requirement as required by County Code § 18-8.2(b)(4) when the rezoning was approved. Therefore, this special exception is being requested at this time to authorize the reduction. This special exception is necessary to allow the setbacks requested and approved during the rezoning to be implemented.

The PRD zoning designation for Estes Park makes it subject to not only the regulations applicable to that district, but also the general regulations applicable to all planned development zoning districts in County Code § 18-8.1 et seq. County Code § 18-8.2(b) allows any regulation in a planned development district to be waived or modified. In this case, the subdivider is requesting that the regulation in the PRD district requiring a 30-foot building separation be reduced to ten (10) feet. Because the reduction was not approved in conjunction with ZMA 2012-008, the reduction in the building separation may be accomplished by special exception under County Code §§ 18-33.5 and 18-33.9.

This special exception requires consideration of the following factors delineated in County Code § 18-8.2(b)(3):

- i. **The waiver is consistent with the intent and purposes of the planned development district under the particular circumstances, and satisfies all other applicable requirements of section 8.**

The intent and purpose of the Planned Residential District includes providing “variety and flexibility in design necessary to implement the various goals and objectives set forth in the comprehensive plan.” Estes Park is located in the development areas, and the comprehensive plan designates this parcel as Urban Density Residential which allows 6-34 units per acre. Estes Park was rezoned at a density of 5 units per acre. By allowing the buildings to be closer than 30 feet, the development can meet the goals of the comprehensive plan by providing a development that is compact and keeping development in areas where the County wants development to occur. Minimum building separation will be 10 feet with architectural features and building overhangs allowed to encroach into the setback no further than one foot.

- ii. **The waiver is consistent with planned development design principles**
The waiver is consistent with those principles for PRD set forth in County Code § 18-19 (Section 19 of the Zoning Ordinance). Granting the waiver will allow the building separation shown on the application plan approved by the Board as part of ZMA 2012-008 to be implemented.
- iii. **The waiver would not adversely affect the public health, safety or general welfare.**
Minimum building separation will be eight feet and this separation was previously reviewed and found acceptable by the reviewing agencies (Building Official, Zoning, Fire and Rescue), provided that acceptable building materials are used (enforced through building permit review) and that an adequate maintenance easement between the buildings is established to allow for maintenance of the building and lots.
- iv. **The public purposes of the original regulation would be satisfied to at least an equivalent degree by the modification.**
This factor does not apply, as the applicant is asking for a waiver and not for the regulation to be modified. However, the public purpose of the PRD will be satisfied to an equivalent degree based upon the finding stated above.

Staff’s opinion is that the waiver satisfies the factors in County Code § 18-8.2(b)(3). If the special exception is approved, the minimum building separation will be 10 feet. This separation was previously reviewed and found acceptable by the reviewing agencies (Zoning, Fire-Rescue, provided that acceptable building materials are used (enforced through building permit review) and that an adequate maintenance easement between the building is established to allow for maintenance of the buildings and lots.

Staff recommends approval of the special exception with the following conditions:

1. **The applicant shall submit a revised subdivision plat that shows an eight (8) foot maintenance easement between structures to allow residents to maintain their units.**
2. **The minimum building separation shall be ten (10) feet with architectural features and building overhangs allowed to encroach into the setback no further than one foot.**

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the special exception with the following conditions:

1. **The applicant shall submit a revised subdivision plat that shows an eight (8) foot maintenance easement between structures to allow residents to maintain their units.**
2. **The minimum building separation shall be ten (10) feet with architectural features and building overhangs allowed to encroach into the setback no further than one foot.**

Item No. 11.4. FY 2014 Budget Amendment and Appropriations.

The executive summary states that the Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total increase to the FY 14 budget due to the appropriation itemized below is \$60,479.00. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of one (1) appropriation as follows:

- One appropriation (#2014080) totaling \$60,479.00 in grant funding related to a Strategic Prevention Framework – State Incentive Grant from the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration’s Center for Substance Abuse Prevention through Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU).

Staff recommends approval of appropriations # #2014080 for a general government grant-funded program as described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #20140080 **\$60,479.00**
 Source: Federal Revenue \$ 60,479.00

This request is to appropriate funding associated with a Strategic Prevention Framework – State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG) grant extension in the amount of \$60,479.00. The purpose of the grant funding is to reduce the number of motor vehicle crashes involving alcohol-impaired drivers between the ages of 15 and 24.

The Strategic Prevention Framework – State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG) grant funds are received from the U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration’s Center for Substance Abuse Prevention through Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU). VCU, as the Prime Awardee, provides these federal grant funds to the County as its Subcontractor.

The County, in its previous capacity as fiscal agent for the Commission on Children and Families (CCF) received the first SPF-SIG Project grant for the time period of February 1, 2012 through January 31, 2013 in the fall of 2011. CCF was dissolved in December 2012, so the second SPF-SIG Project Grant was awarded directly to the County for the time period of February 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014 with an estimated total grant award of \$145,150. VCU wishes to extend the Subcontract Agreement until May 31, 2014. The additional amount of funding to be provided by VCU to the County for the time period of February 1, 2013 through May 31, 2014 is \$60,479.00 for a total of \$205,629 for that time period.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved Appropriation #2014080 for a general government grant-funded program.

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE			
APPROPRIATION SUMMARY			
APP#	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT	DESCRIPTION
2014080	3-1591-33000-333000-330001-1005	60,479.00	GRANT REVENUE-FEDERAL
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-110000-1005	28,750.40	Salaries
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-210000-1005	2,200.00	FICA
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-312210-1005	5,000.00	Professional Services
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-350000-1005	7,488.60	Print & Bind-External
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-360000-1005	13,540.00	Advertising
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-520100-1005	100.00	Postal Services
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-520300-1005	350.00	Telecommunications
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-550000-1005	1,050.00	Travel
2014080	4-1591-53163-454101-600100-1005	2,000.00	Office Supplies
TOTAL		120,958.00	

Item No. 11.5. ZMA-2012-035. Rivanna Village – Resolution to authorize County Executive to sign application for zoning map amendment on behalf of County.

The executive summary states that the project known as Rivanna Village was rezoned to the Neighborhood Model District (NMD) under ZMA 2001-008. That ZMA included Tax Map and Parcel Number 093A1-00-00-00200 (the “Parcel”), a parcel jointly owned by the County and the East Rivanna Volunteer Fire Department (ERVFD). The Parcel is the site of ERVFD’s fire station, and was included as part of ZMA 2001-008 in order to better allow the Village of Rivanna development area to be developed as a whole and, in particular, to better address circulation changes related to the fire station. Neither the proffers, nor any other documents approved in conjunction with ZMA 2001-008, imposed any obligations on the County, the ERVFD, or the Parcel.

The owners of the Rivanna Village project have applied to amend the proffers, the application plan, and the code of development approved in conjunction with ZMA 2001-008 and propose once again to include the Parcel within the rezoning. The pending application does not propose any changes to the Parcel, and the proposed amended proffers and other documents would not impose any obligations on the County, the ERVFD, or the Parcel.

The County and the ERVFD must sign the rezoning application in order to consent to the Parcel being rezoned as part of ZMA 2012-035. Because the existing and proposed proffer statements expressly exclude the Parcel from the proffers, staff does not anticipate that the County will need to sign any other documents related to ZMA 2012-035.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution (Attachment A) authorizing the County Executive to sign the rezoning application for ZMA 2012-035.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution authorizing the County Executive to sign the rezoning application for ZMA 2012-035:

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE
TO SIGN APPLICATION AND OTHER DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO
ZONING MAP AMENDMENT 2012-00035**

WHEREAS, the parcel identified as Tax Map and Parcel Number 093A1-00-00-00200 (the "Parcel") is co-owned by the County of Albemarle (the "County") and the East Rivanna Volunteer Fire Department, Incorporated; and

WHEREAS, the Parcel is currently zoned Neighborhood Model District (NMD) and is located within a proposed planned development that has been identified as "Rivanna Village," which is the subject of Zoning Map Amendment ("ZMA") 2012-00035; and

WHEREAS, ZMA 2012-00035 proposes to amend the proffers, the application plan, and the code of development applicable to Rivanna Village which were approved and accepted when Rivanna Village was rezoned by the Board to NMD under ZMA 2001-00008; and

WHEREAS, the Board previously authorized the Parcel to be included as part of ZMA 2001-00008 to allow the lands within Rivanna Village to be planned and developed as a whole; and

WHEREAS, the proffers accepted in conjunction with ZMA 2001-00008 imposed no obligations or other requirements on the Parcel and the amended proffers being proposed in conjunction with ZMA 2012-00035 impose no obligations on the Parcel; and

WHEREAS, the amendments to the application plan and the code of development for Rivanna Village proposed in conjunction with ZMA 2012-00035 do not materially pertain to the Parcel and impose no material obligations on the parcel.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in order for the processing and review of ZMA 2012-00035 to proceed with the Parcel included as part of that rezoning, the Board authorizes the County Executive to sign the rezoning application.

Item No. 11.6. Copy of letter dated January 30, 2014 to Roger W. Ray, LS, Roger W. Ray & Assoc., Inc., from Francis H. MacCall, Principal Planner, re: **LOD-2013-00020 – OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCEL OF RECORD & DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Tax Map 58, Parcel 41A (Property of AB Holdings of Charlottesville, LLC) – Scottsville Magisterial District, was received for information.**

Item No. 11.7. Copy of letter dated February 4, 2014 to Mr. Grant M. Bates, Kiwi Consultants, Ltd., from Mr. Ronald L. Higgins, Chief of Zoning/Deputy Zoning Administrator, re: **OFFICIAL DETERMINATION OF PARCELS – Tax Map, Parcel 032A0-01-0A-00800 (Property of Michael W. Worley) – Rio Magisterial District, was received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 12. **SP-2013-00020. Chick-fil-A, Pantops (Sign #120). PROPOSAL:** Drive thru lane for proposed retail building. ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: Highway Commercial (HC); EC Entrance Corridor Overlay. SECTION: 24.2.2(12) Special Use Permit, which allows for drive-in windows serving or associated with permitted uses. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE: Urban Mixed Use – retail, commercial services, office, and a mix of residential types (6.01 – 34 units/acre). LOCATION: Tax Map Parcel 78-55A2, located on northeast side of Route 250 East, across from the intersection with State Farm Boulevard. MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna. *Margaret Maliszewski, Principal Planner.*

By the above-recorded vote, this item was rescheduled to March 12, 2014.

Agenda Item No. 13. **ZMA-2013-00014. North Pointe Neighborhood Investments (Sign #115). PROPOSAL:** Request to amend approved proffers from ZMA200000009 on property zoned Planned Development – Mixed Commercial (PD-MC) zoning district which allows large-scale commercial uses; residential by special use permit (15 units/acre) uses. A maximum of 893 units on approximately 269 acres is approved by special use permit at a gross density of 3.31 units/acre. No new dwellings proposed. ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes. AIRPORT IMPACT AREA: Yes. FLOOD HAZARD OVERLAY: Yes. PROFFERS: Yes. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Urban Mixed Use (in Destination and Community Centers) – retail, residential, commercial, employment, office, institutional, and open space; Urban Density Residential – residential (6.01 – 34 units/ acre); supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses; Neighborhood Density Residential – residential (3 – 6 units/acre) supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools and other small-scale non-residential uses; Privately Owned Open Space; Environmental Features – privately owned recreational amenities and open space; floodplains, steep slopes, wetlands, and other environmental features; and Institutional – civic uses, parks, recreational facilities, and similar uses on County-owned property. LOCATION: North of Proffit Road, east of Route 29 North, west of Pritchett Lane and south of the Rivanna River. TAX MAP/PARCEL: 0320000002000; 03200000020A0; 03200000020A1; 03200000020A2; 03200000020A3; 03200000029I0; 0320000002300; 03200000023A0; 03200000023B0; 03200000023C0; 03200000023D0; 03200000023E0; 03200000023F0; 03200000023G0; 03200000023H0; 03200000023J0; and 03200000022K0. MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna. *Claudette Grant, Senior Planner.*

By the above-recorded vote, this item was rescheduled to March 12, 2014.

Agenda Item No. 14. **CPA-2013-01. Comprehensive Plan Update/Amendment.** To receive comments on the Planning Commission's recommended draft Comprehensive Plan Amendment. *Elaine Echols, Principal Planner.*

By the above-recorded vote, this item was rescheduled for March 12, 2014.

Agenda Item No. 15. Update on InSync Adaptive Traffic Control System.

By the above-recorded vote, this item was rescheduled to March 5, 2014.

Agenda Item No. 16. Boards and Commissions: Vacancies/Appointments.

By the above-recorded vote, this item was rescheduled to March 5, 2014.

Agenda Item No. 17. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 18. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 19. Adjourn to February 19, 2014, 4:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

At 6:08 p.m., Ms. Mallek **moved** to adjourn the meeting to February 19, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion.

Mr. Foley mentioned that the Board may need a closed session to follow up on a regional negotiation, and suggested that it adjourn to 3:00 p.m. instead.

Ms. Dittmar then **amended** the motion to adjourn the meeting to February 19, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Ms. Dittmar, Ms. Mallek, Mr. McKeel, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Sheffield and Mr. Boyd.

NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 06/04/2014
Initials: EWJ