

An afternoon meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on October 7, 2014, at 5:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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. The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Work Session:** CPA-2013-01. Comprehensive Plan Update/Amendment, to begin with public comments and possible Board direction.

The executive summary forwarded to Board members states that the Planning Commission's recommended Comprehensive Plan has been provided in the draft dated January 23, 2014 and previously provided to the Board of Supervisors. The Comprehensive Plan may be found online here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/Table_of_Contents_Final_1-23-14.pdf.

Recommendations regarding focused topics and information since the Commission's actions have also been identified for the Board's consideration. This work session is the eighth in the series of detailed Comprehensive Plan chapter reviews based on the Board's agreed upon review schedule which can be found here:

<http://www.albemarle.org/department.asp?department=cdd&relpage=17151>

The Board's direction to date has been recorded in Action Memos from Board meetings at which the topic was discussed.

STRATEGIC PLAN ASPIRATIONS:

Development Area: Attract quality employment, commercial, and high density residential uses into development areas by providing services and infrastructure that encourage redevelopment and private investment while protecting the quality of neighborhoods.

Economic Development: Foster an environment that stimulates diversified job creation, capital investments, and tax revenues that support community goals.

Critical Infrastructure: Prioritize, plan and invest in critical infrastructure that responds to past and future changes and improves the capacity to serve community needs.

Natural Resources: Thoughtfully protect and manage Albemarle County's ecosystems and natural resources in both the rural and development areas to safeguard the quality of life of current and future generations

At this meeting, the Board will begin review of Chapter 8: The Development Areas. A link to staff reports and the Planning Commission's discussions on the Development Areas may be found in Attachment A. A link to the Development Areas chapter can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/08_Chapter_Development_Areas_final%201-23-14.pdf

A link to the associated Appendices:

- Neighborhood Model Design Guidance
- Recommended Guidelines for Setbacks, Sidewalks, and Urban Streets
- Land Use Design Guidelines
- Crozet Master Plan (unchanged)
- Places 29 Master Plan (one land use change)
- Pantops Master Plan (two road changes)
- Village of Rivanna Master Plan (map clarification provided)

can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/A.8_Appendix_Development_Area_Final_1-23-14.pdf

In addition, the Appendix includes a new master plan, the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan, which can be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Comp_Plan_2013/Comp_Plan_Round_3/Southern_and_Western_Neighborhoods_Draft_Master_Plan.pdf

The Goals, Objectives, Strategies, Implementation Priorities, Measures of Success, and list of Reference Documents for the Development Areas are found in Attachment B. Attachment C is the same as Reference 8: Capacity Analysis, which has been edited for clarity and corrected for a minor error. (A red-line version of the Capacity Analysis may be found on-line; staff will provide the link to the BOS via email.) A table comparing the existing and recommended Comprehensive Plan recommendations for the Development Areas is provided as Attachment D.

The Development Areas Chapter in the Comprehensive Plan draft has garnered considerable comment from the public. The input mostly has been about the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan, though not exclusively. In the weeks leading to the development of the staff report, new comments have been provided by the Village of Rivanna Community Advisory Council, the Places 29 Advisory Community Advisory Council, and residents of the Southern and Western Neighborhoods.

The focus of the October 7th work session will be on the following:

- promoting density at the higher end of the density range recommended in the Master Plans (pages 8.10 – 8.12)
- keeping the DA boundaries intact until additional area is needed for future populations (pages 8.31 – 8.32)
- having master plans, updating them, and using advisory councils to assist in implementation and updates (pages 8.9 – 8.10) along with the new Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan and minor changes for all of the neighborhoods except for the Community of Crozet.
- promoting development of commercial, industrial, and other non-residential uses within the DA (pages 8.12 – 8.13)

Specific information for the October 7 meeting is provided below:

- **Capacity Analysis for Future Growth** (pages 8.10 – 8.11 and Attachment C)
The capacity analysis for residential development is important in order to understand the land capacity of the designated Development Areas to support future growth. Typically this type of analysis is done every ten years.

Staff comment: The Commission initially reviewed the residential capacity analysis in 2011 based on the Land Use Plan components of the Comprehensive Plan that existed at the time, including the 1996 Land Use Plan and the Crozet, Places 29, Pantops and Village of Rivanna Master Plans. In 2013, the Commission looked at revised numbers after finalizing its land use recommendations for the updated Comprehensive Plan, particularly incorporating the proposed Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan. The Commission concluded in both 2011 and 2013 that land use designations within the existing Development Area boundaries provided sufficient land area to accommodate the County's projected residential growth through 2020. For 2030, if all projected residential development took place on currently undeveloped land in the Development Areas, the Development Areas could accommodate new growth at all but the lowest end of the density range. An overview of the Commission's review and findings is provided as Attachment E.

The Commission also reviewed the capacity of the Development Areas to support needs for future employment. They concluded that sufficient land area exists in the Development Areas for future target industries, but land consolidation and infrastructure are needed in some areas. Attachment E includes a review of the Commission's analysis on meeting needs for non-residential growth.

- **Expansion Area Requests** (See staff report dated October 11, 2011, linked in Attachment A)
The Planning Commission considered 13 public requests for expansion of the Development Area boundaries during its review of the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission also acted on the Board's directive for a recommendation to add the Whittington subdivision to the Development Areas. Locations of properties requested for inclusion in the Development Areas are shown on Attachment F.

Staff comment: The Planning Commission reviewed all of the requests, but based on its conclusion that land use designations within the existing Development Area boundaries provided sufficient land area to accommodate projected growth, did not recommend any expansion of the Development Areas with the exception of the Whittington subdivision. More details regarding specific expansion area requests is provided in the following Master Plan discussion.

- **Places 29 Master Plan**(pages A.8.33 – A.8.34)
The Planning Commission reviewed expansion area requests for areas near Polo Grounds Road (see [F.A. Iacetta, S, Fork Land Trust, and Hurt Investment](#) on Attachment F) and west of the Development Area on Barracks Road (see [Ingleridge, Montvue, and Morris](#) on Attachment F). Commissioners also studied a request by staff to designate additional area for employment uses near the National Ground Intelligence (NGIC) site on Boulders Road (see [Wendell Wood](#) on Attachment F). Several potential alternatives were discussed between staff and Wendell Wood, the owner. Some of these proposals were reviewed and endorsed by the Places 29 Community Advisory Council. However, the final proposal was not supported by the Planning Commission due to the extent of the changes requested by the owner. The Commission said that these changes should be studied during the Places 29 Master Plan update, rather than at this time.

The Planning Commission recommended two changes to the Places 29 Plan. The first change would re-designate land zoned for a mobile home park to urban density residential from the current light industrial designation. The second change is to add the locations for new water storage tanks along Airport Road to the Plan. These changes are shown on Attachment G.

Staff comment: Although the Planning Commission did not support his request, at the Board's March 12, 2014 public hearing, Wendell Wood asked the Board for their approval of his request. His proposal is provided on Attachment H.

Also included with Attachment H is an application from Peter Borches for a Comprehensive Plan amendment (CPA) for property located on Berkmar Drive behind Colonial Auto dealership. Mr. Borches made this request to the Planning Commission in April 2014 and the Commission, though supportive, advised Mr. Borches that he should make a formal application for the change, expecting that the new Comprehensive Plan would be adopted within a few months. Due to the Board's extended Comprehensive Plan review, Mr. Borches has chosen to make formal application now. Attachment H contains a staff recommendation to send the application for Commission review at this time.

In addition, the Places 29 Community Advisory Council met on September 22, 2014 and provided comments on the Comprehensive Plan, which are included as Attachment I.

- **Pantops Master Plan** (page A.8.35)
The Commission reviewed requests from two property owners for expansion of the Development Area boundaries (see **Wheeler and Vermillion** on Attachment F). Although, the Commission did not support these requests, they did endorse removal of two streets shown on the Pantops Master Plan Transportation Plan. One of the streets was an extension of an Eastern Connector Route, which is no longer recommended. The other street lined up with State Farm Blvd. on the north side of Route 250 East. The Pantops Community Advisory Council reviewed the requests for changes to the Transportation Plan and recommended that they be approved. Attachment J shows the proposed changes.
- **Recommendations for City-Co. work on Rivanna River in Pantops and Woolen Mills** (page 8.9)
As part of the City and County's Livability Project, the City and County Planning Commissions recommended joint work on a plan for the Rivanna River Corridor in Pantops and in Woolen Mills. The Commission's recommendations are noted in Chapter 1, Background, in this Chapter for the Development Areas, and more fully described on page 11.18 in the Parks and Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems Chapter. The Board of Supervisors has already said it has an interest in pursuing this project jointly with the City.

Staff comment: The Rivanna River is designated as a State Scenic River from the South Fork Reservoir to the Fluvanna County line. It acts as a border between the City and County in Pantops and also in the Woolen Mills area. Opportunities for improving water quality for this resource were identified by the Rivanna River Basin Commission in 2013 (see Natural Resources Reference Documents); however, the City and County Planning Commissions also identified recreational, economic, and land use benefits for this shared resource. Together the Commissions recommended that developing a plan for the Rivanna River should be a top priority. Page 11.18 of the Parks and Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems Chapter is included as Attachment K. Members of the Commission suggested that this plan be developed with the Pantops Master Plan update. Cross-referencing among Chapters is needed and a description of this project is also needed in the Southern and Western Neighborhood Master Plan. These revisions will be done with the final draft of the Comprehensive Plan.
- **Village of Rivanna including Land Use Plan for Master Plan and water tank addition** (pages 8.4 – 8.5, 8.10 – 8.12, page A.8.37, and pages 25 and 32 of the Village of Rivanna Master Plan)
In 2011, staff identified a need to add a clarifying Land Use Plan map to the Master Plan for consistency with the other Development Area plans. The Village of Rivanna Advisory Council endorsed the addition of this map in 2012. The Planning Commission recommended addition of the Land Use Plan map addition. Also in 2012, the Albemarle County Service Authority began talking to the Advisory Council about the need for a new tank in the Village for water storage.

Staff comment: The additional Land Use Plan map is provided as Attachment L and staff is recommending inclusion of a proposed water tank in the Master Plan. As a result of concerns expressed by the public during the Rivanna Village rezoning, staff also recommends that a history of the Village of Rivanna Development Area be added to the Master Plan narrative. Clarifications of how density calculations relate to the colors on the land use map are also recommended.

The Village of Rivanna Community Advisory Council met on September 15, 2014 and provided comments that are included as Attachment M.

- **Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan and Implementation Table** (pages A.8.41 – A.8.93)
Staff conducted three community meetings to help develop the draft Master Plan between March 8, 2012 and November 29, 2012. The Commission discussed the Master Plan at four different meetings before making their recommendation on July 30, 2013. It reviewed expansion area requests for three areas near the Southern Neighborhoods. They are shown on Attachment F as: **Montague, et. al. – Redfields addition, Wendell Wood-- Somerset Farm**, and **Whittington**. Only the Whittington subdivision was recommended for approval due to the Board's directive to include it as part of the Development Area. The Planning Commission has recommended the Master Plan provided in the Appendix of the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff comment: With the high level of public interest in this master plan as well as the interest of new members of the Board of Supervisors to get further public input, an additional community meeting for the Southern neighborhoods was held on July 24, 2014. Over 100 residents attended that meeting and comments provided by those residents may be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Community_Development/Forms/Southern_Urban_Area/2014_07_24_SouthernNhd_PublicComments.pdf.

The most significant area of input at that meeting related to the County-owned land near the Monticello Fire/Rescue station and Monticello High School. Attachment N provides an additional recommendation for this area.

On September 2, 2014, the owner of the historic mill buildings in the Woolen Mills area requested a CPA to change the (current) designation from Industrial to a different category that allows for a mixture of residential and commercial uses. This request is provided as Attachment O. Although the Board has traditionally not entertained CPA applications within 6 months of the expected adoption of a Comprehensive Plan update, as with the Borches CPA noted earlier, the historic mills owner has chosen to make application now due to the extended Board review of the Comprehensive Plan.

Recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan Draft include recommendations for future capital improvements and operations.

The Board is asked to identify any substantive changes to the recommendations herein presented and concur on those changes, focusing on content rather than wordsmithing. Staff will then make any necessary changes and bring them back to the Board for its approval prior to its public hearing.

Ms. Elaine Echols, Principal Planner, stated that this was the Board's fourth or fifth work session on the Comprehensive Plan, adding that the Board was now in Chapter 8, which begins the review of the master plans. She said there would be public comment periods in the first part of the meeting, and again when the Board reconvenes after its break. Ms. Echols said the two major topics pertain to the County's capacity analysis, which relates to three objectives: encouraging and supporting density at the higher end of the range as shown on the master plans; keeping boundaries intact until a decision is made to expand those; and ensuring that growth occurs in the development areas. She stated that there were many people in the audience who had been working on master plans, so the discussion would begin with Places 29, then Pantops, then the Village of Rivanna, end with the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan. Ms. Echols said there were some very high level and deep discussions the Board would need to have, which do not necessarily relate to the capacity analysis or the master plans. She stated that there were individuals as well as Board members who wanted to talk about aspects of the Neighborhood Model, the design guidance in the appendix, redevelopment, infill, neighborhood preservation and public investment, but these topics would require an in-depth conversation and there may not be time for those discussions at this meeting. Ms. Echols said, if the Board did not get to all of that in this meeting, those could be discussed at the November 11 meeting.

The Chair opened the public comment period.

Ms. McKeel announced that, given the number of people signed up to speak, everyone would have two minutes rather than three.

Mr. Richard Wagaman addressed the Board, stating that there was a lot of information to cover so he wanted to highlight two development areas which are at risk: Pantops and the Village of Rivanna. He said both of these development areas feed into the City by Free Bridge. Mr. Wagaman said he sits as an at-large representative to the Citizens' Advisory Committee that would meet to prioritize its views for Virginia's Transportation Secretary. He said it is understandable that the Board would want to put as much density as possible there, but there must be a well-planned transportation network which will get people from where they live to where they work and back. Mr. Wagaman stated that the main intersection needing improvement for those two areas is the I-64 Pantops interchange and, if the Board wants the development plan to succeed, it will need to give serious thought to putting that high on the priority list.

Mr. Pete Caramanis addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of the Scottsville District but was before Supervisors as a representative of Woolen Mills LLC and Brian Roy. Mr. Caramanis said he was specifically addressing the Comp Plan amendment filed by Mr. Roy for the Woolen Mills property. He stated that it was his understanding that the Board would be evaluating how to handle that application in the context of the larger discussion of the Comp Plan. He said he and the applicant would encourage the Board to move that forward to the Planning Commission for a recommendation specifically as it concerns a very unique piece of property with very historic structures located on it and is sited between residential and industrial properties. Mr. Caramanis added that he did not feel the determination made for this property had a huge impact on the broader issues the Board was discussing and, for that reason, encouraged Supervisors to allow it to go to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bryan Roy addressed the Board, stating that he is the contract purchaser of the property in Woolen Mills. He stated that many people are surprised that it is in the County, and are surprised at the size and historic nature of it, which is 10 acres abutting Moore's Creek and the Rivanna River. He said it is an extremely unique property with tremendous historical value and significance going back to the Civil War. He said it has some tremendous challenges from a development perspective – first and foremost to preserve the historic nature of the building and, to do that, it can be at odds with trying to maintain a strictly industrial viewpoint. Mr. Roy stated he is proposing a blend of various uses between residential, a bit of light industrial, and potentially a bit of commercial. He emphasized that he hoped the Board would respect the need for flexibility and expediency so specific plans can come forward. He said, if the nature of the Comprehensive Plan for the County is to preserve historic structures and maintain waterways and pathways, this could not be a better example of those uses.

Ms. Nancy Carpenter addressed the Board, stating that she is a resident of the Scottsville District and is interested in the vision for the next 15-20 years as the higher densities and non-residential uses are established. Ms. Carpenter said walk-ability is important to her, and would like for residents living on Sunset Road, for example, to be able to walk to and from the new shopping center and to be able to safely cross over I-64. She stated that this would help create connectivity within the community, adding that this would be very important because there was a large development going in at Southwood which will need its residents to be connected to potential economic activity in the area. Ms. Carpenter added that it is also important for the County to consider creating higher density surrounding the City which will preserve greenery for future generations to enjoy.

Mr. Neil Means addressed the Board, stating that he lives in the Scottsville District in the Village of Rivanna, and is a member of that Community Advisory Council. Regarding the promotion of higher density recommended in the master plans, he said he participated in the lengthy master planning process for the Village of Rivanna and sat through many community meetings, workshops and hearings with numerous other citizens and stakeholders. He said the Council eventually arrived at agreement on density recommendations for various areas, which were included as part of the master plan, and is now part of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Means stated that it is highly inappropriate for the County to now adopt, as a general policy, a redefinition of those density recommendations. He said staff has now provided a new statistical capacity analysis of the projected growth pattern through 2030, and the estimate is that 14,895 additional dwellings would be needed. Mr. Means said, using the density ranges in the master plans at the highest density, there will be 14,352 extra units which are almost twice as many units as necessary and, at the lowest, there will be a shortfall of 853 units. He stated that the conclusion is that future capacity will meet future need if developed at the higher end of permitted densities, not if developed at low density, and he feels that conclusion is misleading, with a more accurate conclusion being, "Yes, if developed at anything above absolute lowest density." Mr. Means said, if development occurs at the highest density, there will be almost 100% more units than needed; at the lowest, there will be less than a 6% shortfall, which is very close and likely within the margin of error of these projections. He stated that the statistical analysis does not justify promoting density at the higher end of the density range, but does justify sticking with the ranges as agreed upon and written in the Plan.

Ms. Pam Riley addressed the Board, stating that she is a resident of the Scottsville District and thanked the Board for its efforts to offer public engagement, especially Chair Dittmar and Supervisor Palmer's forum held in the district over the summer. Ms. Riley said she would like to speak in opposition to the growth boundary expansion for the Somerset property on Route 20, adding that she had participated in almost all of the Southern and Western plan meetings held since 2011. Ms. Riley said county staff has done an excellent job with the plan and agreed with its emphasis on increased density in the growth area, as well as the implementation of the Neighborhood Model. She stated that, in all the meetings she attended, residents consistently opposed expansion of the growth boundary east of Route 20 in an effort to protect the scenic resources of the Monticello view shed and because of concerns related to the potential overwhelming impacts of that Somerset development proposal. Ms. Riley said, in a number of meetings, County staff shared data which demonstrated there was already sufficient residential land zoned and housing permits to meet housing demands for at least the next decade, and felt this was the fundamental rationale which should continue to guide the decision to deny any expansion request at this time. In addition, she said the Southern area residents have raised the points that: Route 20 is a scenic byway and its rural character should be preserved; Monticello is a UNESCO World Heritage Site and is within walking distance on the Monticello Trail; there is already a dense community along the southern end of the area, and plans are moving forward for additional developments like Spring Hill Village, which will lie between Avon Extended and Route 20. She stated that additional residential and commercial density is neither needed nor desired.

Mr. Roger Shickedantz addressed the Board, stating that he is a resident of the Scottsville District and is representing some homeowners in the Southern neighborhood along with Pam Riley and Linda O'Connor. He said they submitted a memo to the Board on September 29 which is being distributed to

Supervisors along with written comments he has provided. Mr. Shickedantz said they generally support the County's desire to promote dense development in the Southern neighborhood, and support the Neighborhood Model as a vehicle to do that. He said their comments reinforce a lot of things that are already in the Comp Plan, strengthen those that apply specifically to their neighborhood, and also capture its unique characteristics. He stated that they welcome higher density and, along with development of the Neighborhood Model, they would like to see human-scale roads compatible with pedestrian and cycling use; parks and green space to serve local residents while protecting wildlife, maintaining biodiversity; a town center with facilities like a library and recreation center that encourage intellectual, physical and spiritual development; and walk-able and interconnected neighborhoods that promote access to schools, retail and nearby places of employment. Mr. Shickedantz said they continue to have concerns about the expansion of light industrial use in a walk-able neighborhood, where they want to have linkages and scale between residential neighborhoods, not just within them. He noted that the large, contiguous parcels shown on the land use master plan would create bigger gaps, not help knit the urban fabric together, and they would like to see infill in existing light industrial areas, rather than expansion of those areas, which would make them part of the full neighborhood fabric.

Ms. Linda O'Connor addressed the Board, stating that she is a resident of the Scottsville District and is president of the Avon Park Community Homeowners Association. Ms. O'Connor said the Board received their position paper, but she wanted to emphasize that there are three schools just from Mill Creek Drive down a very narrow triangle bounded by Avon Extended and Route 20. She said there is no safe access for people to walk their children to the schools or for teenagers to get to the schools. She stated that it is a very dense community now, with Avon Park, Foxcroft, Mill Creek, South Mill Creek, Lakeside, etc. Ms. O'Connor said Avon II had started, and Springhill Village would likely be passed, along with Avinity II coming before the Board very soon. She stated that it is very important for them to have the sidewalks and crosswalks so that children can walk safely to their schools.

Mr. Pete Borches addressed the Board, stating that he was representing CMA properties and wanted to speak about the potential land use change associated with Colonial Auto Center between Route 29 and Berkmar Drive. Mr. Borches said, in the last ten months, he has had discussions with County staff, neighboring property owners, the Places 29 Advisory Council, Planning Commissioners, the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission, the Board, and anyone else who would listen, and he found the feedback to be very positive and reasonable. He stated that the idea to allow an existing business to expand onto contiguous land inside the development area is supported by everyone, and he is hopeful that the Board would share that support and asked County staff to add this land use change to the Comp Plan which it is currently reviewing. Mr. Borches said the County will be facing some of the most significant and fast-moving transportation construction the County had ever seen, and a lot of this would happen on the front steps of their local businesses. He stated that the latest plan from VDOT shows that they will be disrupting the entire frontage of Colonial Auto Center along Route 29 and taking a substantial section of their storage and display area. Mr. Borches said his hope was that the County would help find a way for Colonial Auto Center to prepare and build on existing contiguous property in order to reduce negative impacts to businesses. He said time was critical, and VDOT has made it clear that a notice to proceed would be issued March 4, 2015 which is less than six months away and the contractor would be free to begin construction, staging and right of way acquisition immediately. He said Colonial Auto Center and CMA Properties need the ability to adapt in a similar timeframe, and asked the Board to direct staff to work on finding a way to allow the center to build a travel way and inventory storage parking area on the contiguous property by March 2015. He stated that it is imperative for their business to be able to be proactive and not just reactive.

Ms. Valerie Long addressed the Board, stating that she is a resident of the Whitehall Magisterial District and was also present to speak about the CMA properties land in the Rio Magisterial District. Ms. Long said CMA's desire is to use the property they own, which is adjacent to their existing center that fronts on Berkmar for additional vehicle storage. She referenced an exhibit from VDOT showing which areas were proposed for a permanent easement for storm water management for the project, and also for a construction easement which does impact the center's storage area. Ms. Long said the dealership had asked, at the time their new Nissan facility was being constructed, to be able to use the vacant land they own that fronts on Berkmar for vehicle storage, but the zoning of that property does not permit vehicle storage because it is zoned R-6. She stated that, in order to have it rezoned, CMA would first need to obtain a change in land use designation shown on the Comp Plan, which is currently urban density residential. Ms. Long noted that, at the time Places 29 was reviewed and approved, it had a residential use onsite which is no longer there. She added that the uses of the properties surrounding it as well as the zoning do not include much residential and are mostly commercial.

Mr. John Lowery of the Samuel Miller District addressed the Board and said he had three comments on the Development Areas topic but only two minutes to speak, so he said he would speak later in the meeting or be in touch through the Clerk.

Mr. Jeff Werner addressed the Board and said he would offer several comments which he hoped the Board would consider including in the plan: planning for an aging population, with a growing preference to "age in place." He said the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) suggests that the Plan include a strategy to convene a workgroup to review current and projected trends and, if necessary, offer recommendations. Mr. Werner said PEC's second recommendation is to ensure compatible land uses near federal facilities such as Rivanna Station and said, in the draft plan, Rivanna Station is mentioned only once in the Development Area chapter, and briefly in the Economic Development chapter. He stated that nowhere in the plan does it suggest the County consider the needs and requirements of Rivanna Station, and PEC suggests that the Plan call for a County/Department of Defense (DOD) joint planning program with a goal that the County land use policies would not allow unwanted development

encroachment on government facilities. Mr. Werner said PEC wanted to encourage the County to have an ongoing dialogue with the University of Virginia (UVA) and the City of Charlottesville about commuting and on-grounds housing. He said the University currently provides housing for only one-third of its full-time graduate and undergraduate students with only 100 units of faculty and staff housing. He stated that PEC also believes the Board should require from staff more detailed and regular updates on development. Mr. Werner said there have been a lot of building permits over the last several years and a lot of residences approved, but the Board does not know whether the ones being approved are the ones being built, and the same was true for commercial and other non-residential development. He stated that the Board cannot plan for the future or review proposals if it does not know what has been built.

Mr. Neil Williamson addressed the Board, stating that the Development Areas Chapter is most interesting, but the question is what fits in the development area, what does not, and what the triggers would be for a development area expansion. He said he has watched businesses leave because they could not expand in Albemarle, and there are current businesses bumping up against the development area boundary and are unable to expand or find other locations to move forward. He stated that he also believes the capacity analysis is overstated in the development area by about 30%, based on market trends. He said he had a very positive meeting with Ms. Echols and Mr. Cilimberg where there were a few small corrections noted. Mr. Williamson encouraged the Board to consider what does fit in the development area and what the Board wants to fit into the development area, i.e., businesses, jobs, houses, etc. and how those all fit together.

Mr. Morgan Butler addressed the Board on behalf of the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) and stated that, in 2011 when the County was just getting underway with the Comp Plan updates, the SELC was one of seven local organizations that sent a joint letter to the Board of Supervisors. He said, knowing there would be any number of requests from large landowners to expand the growth areas, the joint letter emphasized how important it was to know how much additional capacity the growth areas have before considering requests to expand. Mr. Butler said if the County pushes into the rural areas when it is not absolutely necessary, it blows a hole through the County's growth management policy and undermines key goals in every chapter of the Comp Plan. He stated that County staff had prepared those studies and presented them to the Planning Commission as part of developing the Comp Plan rewrite, and the Commission's recommendations that have been incorporated into this chapter are based on the results including the one over-arching conclusion that there is no need to expand the County's growth areas with this update to the Comp Plan, not even to accommodate the recently designated target industries. Mr. Butler said, in addition, recent changes to the Zoning Ordinance that allow most industrial uses, including the target industries, to locate on commercially-zoned land, means that the land available for industry within the development areas is even greater than the capacity analysis indicated. He said just because there is sufficient land set aside does not mean the Board's work is done, and Supervisors need to focus efforts on how to get the most out of the land which has been designated. Mr. Butler said the Board needs to make sure that more of the vacant property already designated for certain uses gets used and zoned for those uses, especially when it comes to industrial land. He stated that, as the staff report suggests, have the new Economic Development Office explore how some smaller, contiguous industrial parcels within the development areas can be combined into larger parcels; how new road connections and utilities can be provided to those areas, and how redevelopment can be brought to under-utilized parcels within the growth areas that badly need it.

Mr. Wendell Wood addressed the Board, stating that he would like the Board to consider putting the Somerset Farm properties south of town into the development area, adding that this has been a matter of debate over the last three Comp Plan updates. Mr. Wood noted the amenities of the property that help it meet the County's criteria for development: it is not in the watershed; it has public water and sewer to the property; it has an elementary school and a high school across the street; it has a fire department, all within walking distance of the property; and the property is not in the Monticello view shed. He emphasized that it meets every criteria needed to come before the Board for development land, and he would like Supervisors to consider studying it.

There being no further public input, the Chair closed the comment period.

Ms. Echols stated that every time the Board looks at a chapter and looks at a topic, the first thing to consider is the goal. She presented the Chapter 8 goal and asked the Board to consider whether it was the right goal to have for the development areas.

Mr. Boyd asked if staff had looked at whether the market had driven these types of neighborhoods, and whether the market was supporting the Board's vision of what it should be. He said he would like staff to take a look back, now that the plan has been in place for a number of years, and see what level the County is actually building out, because the Board cannot control the market so people are going to build what people are going to buy. Mr. Boyd said, in his observation, the County leans more toward the low end of density. Ms. Echols said there would be more discussion about that when Supervisors go through the capacity analysis. She asked if the Board saw anything in the goal that needed to change.

Ms. Palmer asked if "bicycle" or "multi-modal" should be included in addition to "walkable."

Mr. Sheffield agreed that multi-modal should be included.

Ms. Echols said she would try to fit it in, noting that it is one of the Neighborhood Model principles.

Mr. Boyd said it is his observation that the Board is not matching up employment opportunities with the cost of the homes that are there, and stated that he did not see how someone could be a clerk at Target and live in Hollymead. He said he did not know how someone would achieve that, but to have this as a goal and not see development which made that happen was concerning to him. He stated that he did not know of anyone who worked in that shopping center and walked across the street into a \$250,000 or \$300,000 townhome.

Ms. Palmer asked if mixed-use suggests that there would be a variety of housing choices in that neighborhood.

Ms. Mallek said there were a lot of accessory units as well and, at Old Trail and downtown Crozet during the recession, 60% of the building permits in the entire County were there, largely because of these same kinds of attributes. She stated that people can get on their bikes or walk to the shops that are there. She stated that there are also apartments in the houses which are providing much of the affordable housing there.

Mr. Boyd said he was not talking about shopping, he was talking about matching homes with jobs.

Ms. Mallek said she did not feel a pioneer industry had arrived yet, but it did not mean it was not going to, adding that there was a lot of work underway to get that to happen but, if the County does not start, it would never come.

Ms. McKeel commented that perhaps this is a goal the County has not yet figured out in terms of making the development area match it. She said there are a lot of people in the urban ring who cannot get to these employment centers because the infrastructure is not there which would allow them to do that.

Mr. Boyd said he was not necessarily objecting to the goal, but was trying to get the Board to determine if it was working. He said he hears comments similar to those at this meeting, where people cannot get across Avon Street Extended to get to school, one cannot get across Route 250 to shop, or cannot get across Route 29. He said this is something that perhaps the Board was not tackling.

Ms. Palmer said the plan is to add those kinds of things and assign a priority.

Ms. Mallek noted that zeroing out the CIP had a huge impact on not getting these things built already, adding that many of these have been needed for years and years.

Ms. Dittmar mentioned that a prominent local realty company was advertising a "walk score," which enables people to view a property's walk-ability and nearest amenities in relation to their home.

Mr. Sheffield said he did not think the County could expect developers to build an all-encompassing community, adding that it must be pieces that are brought together. He said, in the past, the County has leaned on developers to try to include everything, and it does not work to try to force all the amenities into one development.

Mr. Boyd agreed and said the Board could deal with the light industrial or commercial property zoning and build the neighborhoods around that.

Ms. Echols said the Board would be talking further about that on November 11. She said that discussion would include a conversation about the neighborhood model and how successful it is as well as places where work still needs to be done. She stated that, anecdotally, she has heard that people who live in the mixed-use and compact neighborhoods love living there and chose those areas because of those amenities.

Mr. Sheffield said, if you live in an urban environment, you want to support the local businesses around you. He said his children can now go to a dentist in Belvedere rather than him having to pick them up, take them, and then return to work.

Mr. V. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, said the County is about 10 years into the Neighborhood Model process and it is a work in progress. He said one developer said to him – it is not a sprint, it is a marathon. He stated that there is a lot more to do, and developments that may have been further along in the mixed-use concept were likely delayed by the recession. He added that the County would also need to bolster the CIP to provide necessary infrastructure. Mr. Cilimberg said the County is trending in the right direction now, and are seeing many more building permits, more certificates of occupancy within development area projects and not the rural area, to the degree it was.

Mr. Boyd said trending in the right direction is what he wants to hear and, hopefully, the Board can support that.

Mr. Cilimberg said Mr. Boyd made a good point about having residential that can be supportive of the commercial in its midst and job opportunities in its midst which was the whole town center concept.

Mr. Sheffield commented that this gets into the infill discussion.

Ms. Mallek said the north town center around Rio and 29 was anticipated to bring in more residential because of the commercial redevelopment there.

Ms. Echols stated that she would like to take Supervisors through the capacity analysis but, before that, she wanted to remind the Board that the development areas are the places where the County wants economic development to occur, the places where the County provides services and infrastructure, and also a higher quality of life than perhaps was considered in the past along with housing which supports the growing population. She said the crucial question is whether the development areas can accommodate the expected growth, adding that staff did a residential capacity analysis as well as a commercial and industrial land capacity study. Ms. Echols noted that, as staff looked at this, they did not factor in any redevelopment, and assumed that all new development would take place in the development areas. She stated that, while they know that is not true, they wanted to see what the development areas could support.

Ms. Echols said another question that was raised pertains to buildable land, and whether the capacity analysis was done based on the total acreage of parcels that are undeveloped, or if they factored out the constraints. Ms. Echols reported that staff did factor out constraints; they took the total land area and then took out the steep slopes, the floodplain, the stream buffers, and all other elements that limit the use of that land. She stated that they then took out all the acreage that was already slated for development, mostly ZMAs and SPs, the rezonings that have taken place since 2001 along with current subdivisions and site plans for by-right development that were being approved at the time. Ms. Echols said staff did this a year ago and, when they were updating this information, they expected to be talking with the Board at that time about the Comprehensive Plan, but noted that she was not sure a whole lot had changed in the last year which would affect these numbers. She explained that staff also took out the non-parceled land, which includes things like railroad right of way, rivers, and other areas that are not available for development, in an effort to clarify what is buildable. Ms. Echols said staff then took the buildable vacant residential acreage and looked at it in the density range for existing zoning which, in this case, would be the high end of density, with the higher level using the density bonuses. She stated that staff also looked at the same density range from the Comprehensive Plan, and that density range and acreage gave them an idea of how many units would be possible on the buildable land either through zoning or designation. She said they added that to all the rezonings, site plans and subdivision plats to arrive at a future housing capacity.

Ms. Echols mentioned that a lot of land currently in the by-right area of zoning is zoned R-1 and R-2, so there is not a lot of density on it and staff's expectation is that, when people do not want to rezone, they try to maximize as much as possible out of those lower levels. She said Mr. Williamson pointed out the mistake in the total approved number of unbuilt units, as their list of projects had some duplications and, as of October 30, 2013, there were 7,970 approved unbuilt units. Adding those to the possible number of dwelling units for zoning and the Comp Plan, staff arrived at ranges. She said, by conventional zoning, there was a range of about 13,500 to almost 20,000 and, if everything were rezoned as stipulated in the Comp Plan, the range would be just under 14,000 to just under 30,000 units. Ms. Echols said, in comparing these to the number of needed units, using Weldon Cooper data projecting the population a year ago at 101,575, there would need to be approximately 6,423 new units to accommodate the population in 2020 and almost 15,000 in 2030.

Mr. Boyd asked how staff came up with that number. Ms. Echols said staff used a people per-unit multiplier of 2.19, and explained that the multiplier is how many people the census estimates are in each unit with the vacancy rate added to it. Mr. Boyd asked if staff had gone back to see if that number is accurate. Ms. Echols said they have, and noted that the American Community Survey uses sampling techniques to assess this information. She said staff went back to see if this was current because it was used in the 2000 census, with GDS staff confirming that it was.

Mr. Boyd asked if staff could go back and extrapolate the multiplier based on houses previously built, numbers of people and the population match. Ms. Echols explained that the census data also took into account how many units and how many people were in each unit, then calculated the average by census block. She said they also had the records of how many vacant units there were in a given area.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the historic data was census data and was not analyzing actual houses for resident numbers. He said it has actually trended down over the past 30 years in terms of number of people per unit, with more singles and small family sizes. He said the numbers are conservative, which is probably good because it is giving a higher residential unit need than they actually have.

Mr. Boyd asked if the downward trend might be due to the aging population. Mr. Cilimberg confirmed that it could be a factor in those numbers.

Ms. Echols said staff took the future housing capacity minus the need, to tell whether or not capacity can meet potential demand. She stated that future housing projections show that, in 2020, they can easily meet that need; in 2030 and, if there are no rezonings and only by-right zoning is used, there will be a potential shortage in the development areas. Ms. Echols said, most likely, the capacity is somewhere in the middle, and a combination of the rezonings and by-right development will occur, and staff expects that there will still be people who want to develop property by-right, and that there will be people who want greater density on property and will be asking for rezonings. She added that the range is somewhere between the low end of the zoning and the high end of the Comp Plan. Ms. Echols said, when staff talked with Blue Ridge Homebuilders about how staff arrived at the numbers, they asked about the relationship to building permits. She said she looked at the last 20, 10, and 5 years of residential building permits and, over the last 20 years, the County has averaged 762 new residential permits per

year; the last 10 years, it went down to 600 and, with the recession, it went down even lower than that. Ms. Echols said, using the highest of the last 10 years and multiplying it by the number of years, they came up with an even lower number. She stated that the original math stipulated 6,423 units; using just building permits at the average for the last 20 years, they would need even fewer than that; for 2030, it is the same dynamic. Ms. Echols said staff feels their numbers are fairly conservative, and that is why they believe they have enough capacity for 2020 and 2030. She noted that staff did not share this with the Planning Commission yet because they wanted to go back and do some double-checking. She added that staff feels the combination of rezonings and by-right development would provide numbers which are somewhere in this range.

Ms. Palmer asked if there was any reason to think that the historic pace would change in the next 10 years. Ms. Echols responded that she did not know. She stated that population growth and new housing starts slowed dramatically during the recession.

Mr. Cilimberg mentioned that the comparisons of the 2020 needs and 2030 needs were based on the population growth as projected by the Weldon Cooper Center, and they are projecting more growth than what building permit data has shown in the last five or ten years.

Ms. Palmer asked if anything particular had been identified that was driving that number, and apparently there is not. Mr. Cilimberg agreed that there was no specific factor or set of factors.

Ms. Palmer asked Mr. Cilimberg if he knew the reason for Mr. Williamson's earlier comment that the capacity figures were 30% over. Mr. Cilimberg replied that some of it is the trends staff is seeing in the actual development of projects compared to their maximum density allowance, and some analysis done several years back indicated that, for approved rezonings particularly the larger ones, they were seeing about 70% of actual density developed. He said, even with that though, staff has accommodated that percentage with this range very easily.

Ms. Echols stated that, after looking at all of the data, the Planning Commission concluded that sufficient land area exists through 2020 and probably 2030, and did not see a compelling reason to expand the development areas for residential growth. She said Commissioners were concerned, as Mr. Werner mentioned, about the lack of information being provided on a regular basis, and felt it was essential for staff to be monitoring the development activity and doing a build-out analysis every two years to see what is going on. Ms. Echols said it is not a quick or easy exercise, noting that the Planning Commission uses these efforts to get growth in the development areas versus the rural areas as a measure of how well the County is doing. She stated that the Commission did look at a number of expansion area requests, and referenced a map noting the locations of those requests. Ms. Echols said there were some requests outside the watershed for residential uses that the Planning Commission could not provide any support for. She said, in the Redfields area, there was a change in land use designation on a piece of open space, but that is gone away because the situation has been resolved. She stated that the Planning Commission did recommend the Whittington proposal because the Board had asked them to; and also Somerset Farm, which the Board has already heard about. She reported that there were two requests north of Pantops – one for the Wheeler property and one for the Vermillion property, neither of which would not have provided much extra capacity and had some challenges in development. In addition, she said there was a request between Neighborhood Two and Hollymead in an area that has historically been rural and the Commission did not see a compelling need for additional land. She stated that, in each case, Commissioners looked at the proposals, but were not convinced that any of them warranted an expansion.

Mr. Boyd asked how staff was factoring in the Biscuit Run phenomena because a lot of the approved rezonings have thousands of units with zero built. He said it could be due in part to the recession, but a lot of the LLCs went bankrupt during that period, and it is uncertain if they will ever develop. Mr. Cilimberg said a few of the zero projects were talking to staff and would potentially be applying for at least some of that area to be developed as their zoning is approved and, as an example, Cascadia was underway. He stated that the recession is a factor, and is also a question of timing and the time it takes to develop, which is not unusual for a lot of big projects.

Ms. Echols reported that the non-residential capacity analysis is as important as the residential capacity analysis and staff calculated how many acres they have of buildable industrial land and buildable commercial land to derive a total for buildable non-residential land. She said mixed-use parcels were difficult to factor, so they tried to take out the commercial aspects of a mixed-use project and came up with some acreage figures that, in and of itself, may not mean a lot. She said staff developed some tables showing how many parcels there are and what size they are but they also considered the fact, from a commercial standpoint, that over five-million square feet of property was still in the pipeline in 2013 as there was a lot of commercial rezoning which took place in the early 2000s, and a lot of that is being filled in now. Ms. Echols said they did not factor in the existing zoned land from a square footage standpoint because there is no good way to know how many square feet of building space would be put on just raw acreage, and it just depends on what the use is. She stated that, as a starting place, they looked at what their target needs were and, in Chapter 8, there is a chart which specifies the target needs for acreage and site in order to develop a site. Ms. Echols said bioscience and medical devices are targeted at 3-5 acres of commercial land; business and financial services require 3-25 acres which can fit into commercially-zoned land; information technology, defense and security require commercial land but sometimes industrial land; agribusiness, food processing and related technology depends on what the use is as some need industrial land, some will have commercial land, and some can be in the rural area where there are farm activities occurring.

Mr. Cilimberg said the zoning changes that were made a year or so ago provided liberalization of the commercial districts, so all of these industrial uses can now go in commercial zoning although sometimes those will require a special use permit.

Ms. Echols stated that there are complimentary targets which were selected in health services, and their needs vary although most of them can go into commercially-zoned properties; and arts, design, sports media can usually go into commercially-zoned land. She said the Planning Commission concluded that, overall, the combined zoning and designated land were sufficient for future needs, but were concerned that there are not many parcels of 3-5 acres, and a lot of the uses that need new properties are looking in 3-5 and 3-25 acres. Ms. Echols said the Commission thought smaller parcels may be combined to create larger parcels, and the targets can use commercial zoning. She said staff looked at the industrially zoned and designated land near the National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC), which is where the defense targets are expected to want to locate, and there are a lot of smaller parcels owned by the same individuals which could potentially be combined. Ms. Echols stated that the plan recommended additional employment designations between Avon Street Extended and Route 20 South in an area that will continue to be discussed because of challenges to the neighborhood. She noted that, while the County may have enough acreage, it is hard to help someone find a place to locate if they do not have a road to serve that property and do not have utilities extended to it. Ms. Echols said the Commission recognized that fact and made some statements in the plan about that being an important factor which would need to be addressed in the future. At the time, she said, the Commission did not know there was going to be an economic development office created so a lot of the development needs and the ways the County meets those needs will evolve further than what was just put into this Plan. She mentioned that the Board has said, when the new economic development director comes on board, the Board will want that individual to look at the economic development section, assess what the County has, and bring back recommendations to the Board. As with the residential, she said the Commission stated that it needs to continue to monitor this and make sure that a supply exists.

Ms. Echols reported that there were several non-residential expansion area requests, including the Yancey property located near I-64, and that was considered at several different levels but the Crozet Master Plan did not recommend that the Crozet development area be expanded to include that property. She said Commissioners talked about, in the economic development section, properties that are both east and west of Rt. 250 that are south of I-64. She noted the challenge at this time is the cost of getting sewer service to that particular area but also there would be changes to the Shadwell interchange that would affect the properties. Ms. Echols emphasized that the plan did not say, "This will never happen," it just said that the time is not ripe yet for something to be designated in this particular area. She said the Board would have an opportunity to discuss the property north of NGIC when it discusses Places 29, but the Planning Commission did not support any of the non-residential expansion area requests, but did try to find additional area for employment uses, and found some in the southern and western neighborhoods.

Mr. Boyd said if staff took the non-residential capacity, eliminated the University property, and eliminated where there is no infrastructure, the County would be under-capacity, at least that is what he has been hearing anecdotally from the business community. He asked what the impressions were from the commercial realtors who participated in the roundtables that the County held, and asked whether these numbers came out of planning books or actual experiences from people who deal with commercial property.

Ms. Echols replied that these are numbers staff measured but said his point is relevant regarding the number of parcels currently available. She stated that Ms. Catlin could address in more detail the specific needs some businesses have identified. She said staff took all of the properties and looked at them by hand on maps and analyzed them as to what was available, what capacity was, and where the infrastructure was located. Ms. Echols acknowledged that the County does not have a lot of medium-sized properties and, if the Board has a question about what is happening on the practical level, Ms. Catlin could elaborate.

Mr. Boyd said he was trying to stay at the high level of this, but this is what he was hearing from people who are in the commercial real estate business, i.e., they were having trouble finding places to locate and to expand. He said, at one of the jobs roundtables he attended, he heard from businesses that they need to be near interchanges because they want to have easy access to the interstate and want to be around the railroad as well.

Ms. Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive, addressed the Board, stating that staff had done an exhaustive look at the maps to determine what was available. She said staff overlaid the type of criteria Mr. Boyd was talking about because all location is not created equal when it comes to businesses and what they want. She said the real challenge is that there is property available, but it is not served by what it needs to be served by because most of these companies do not have the resources or the timeline or the desire to take raw land and convert it into something that is ready for them to go into. Ms. Catlin said the state of the property is one issue but the location is the other and staff has seen a real desire by businesses to be in close or close to strategic transportation. She emphasized that, when staff says they have "acres," it does not necessarily mean those are in the right place or are in the right state of readiness. She stated that one of the priorities of the Economic Development Office would be to take an exhaustive look at this. She noted that redevelopment might offer an opportunity because some of the County's most strategic land is not greenfield land. Ms. Catlin said there is a lot of strategic work to be done on this, and this plan takes the County as far as it can go with where they are, but with the recognition that work needs to go into the readiness piece and the location piece and the redevelopment opportunities piece.

Mr. Boyd asked if the Board was going to 'kick the can down the road' for the new Economic Development Department. Ms. Catlin said staff has tried to create some new opportunities in the places they felt they could in the southern areas to ensure they advance some opportunities with this plan, but also recognizing that it is not something that is going to happen overnight when it comes to site readiness.

Ms. Dittmar said what the County can do is make sure the language in development areas and economic development chapters work well together. She mentioned that a recent national report indicated that communities having an interstate enjoy a higher standard of living because of the job opportunities along the interstate and, if the County manages development appropriately, it can do great things for its citizens.

Mr. Foley said this is major work for the new Economic Development Office, and he envisions that, in the future, staff would need to come back to the Board about proactively amending the Comp Plan and rezoning property because of a possible partnership with the private sector and the County to make some land available which could involve the County extending utilities to make it a site that is attractive to business. He noted that this is what other localities are doing so, when someone comes knocking on their door, staff can have a spot available, but it is something planned rather than reactive.

Mr. Boyd said the term he keeps hearing is "pad-ready sites," and noted that this has hurt the County in the past because there are not a lot of those available. Ms. Catlin said having another five or six Comdial buildings would allow the County to do great things, because "condo-izing" existing large buildings offers a more flexible footprint for businesses as they grow.

Mr. Boyd said he would agree, but there is also the Badger-Powhatan site. Ms. Catlin said that location is not quite as attractive for people.

Mr. Cilimberg said, in his profession, what is being noticed is that business and industrial type uses that used to mean more greenfield or industrial park kind of uses are now more interested in a mixed-use environment or in close proximity to restaurants for lunch, etc. He said this makes properties like Hollymead much more appealing because it is possible, through the new zoning classifications, for industrial-type uses to go in what would, at one point, have been considered commercial. Mr. Cilimberg said the County already has the zoning in place, and now it is a matter of identifying users who would want to truly be in that setting to open a business or a number of businesses in a building, such as technology companies.

Ms. Catlin said, with the changes that have been made in the last year which modernized some of the zoning categories, the County does provide the opportunity for integration into mixed-use environments.

Mr. Boyd said he was surprised someone was not giving the University of Virginia a run for its money in developing that type of office space.

Ms. Mallek said what the Board has been discussing, in her mind, are things that seem almost out of the County's control and, up to now, the County has wanted to facilitate use of private property rather than building industrial parks. Ms. Mallek said it is really up to landowners to be willing to put their properties on the market so perhaps, when the right opportunity comes along, they will. She stated that what is in the Board's control is to continue to push for renovations to the 118 exit on I-64, because the lack of ability to go southbound to westbound is crippling the landowners and business landowners there and preventing them from expanding. Ms. Mallek said that was in the out years of the long-range plan due to a lack of money, but she would like to have the Board's support to push that back into the near-term.

The Board recessed their meeting at 6:31 p.m., and reconvened at 7:02 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 3. Continuation of Work Session to include public comments and possible Board direction.

The Chair opened the public comment period.

Mr. Keith Woodard of Earlysville addressed the Board and stated that he has five acres he wanted to discuss and just realized the importance of talking about this at the Comprehensive Plan level. He said his five-acre parcel is immediately adjacent to the 5th Street Station on the other side of Moore's Creek and is part of a ten-acre parcel which is partially in the City. He said the zoning is PUD and, if there is ever a place that makes sense to have high-density residential development, this area right next to employment and shopping is one he would like to have included in the Comprehensive Plan for a higher-density development. Mr. Woodard said, to his knowledge, there is no other residential area within a mile of 5th Street station, and this parcel would allow up to 34 dwelling units but even half of that would allow for workforce housing adjacent to the new commercial activity. He asked the Board to consider placing Tax Map M2-68 as a high-density PUD on the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Roger Shickedantz of the Scottsville District addressed the Board and stated that, while the University is supporting biomedical research and would like to see more of that development, the areas that the University owns, i.e., Blue Ridge Hospital and Fontaine Business Park are apparently off limits to

that kind of development, as they are shown in the land use plan to be institutional and not industrial or flex. He encouraged the Board to work with the University to see if some of those properties could be made available for that use, particularly since the Blue Ridge Hospital site is right next to I-64 but has very little residential around it. Mr. Shickedantz said Mr. Cilimberg had mentioned that businesses are looking for mixed use and smaller industrial parcels and, if the land use plan allowed that mix rather than creating large areas that were solely one type of land use, neighborhoods would be more comfortable with that as that is how the County can repair the urban fabric and knit things together.

Mr. Wendell Wood of the Ivy District addressed the Board and said that it was mentioned earlier in the meeting that one goal was to have industrial areas and to attract residential uses around them. He said about \$600 million has been invested for the National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC), with private monies used to build a four-lane highway in addition to water and sewer being brought to the area. He said he recalled that the Planning Commission had supported the expansion but, at the last minute and without any particular rationale, decided not to add residential around that complex which has 2,200 employees and 900 employees across the street at General Electric. Mr. Wood said the property has a road, has public water and public sewer, is not in the watershed, and the consistency in planning does not seem to be there. He stated that Somerset Farm to the south has all of those same amenities, in addition to school systems and being walkable.

Mr. Boyd asked if the County had a moratorium on Comprehensive Plan amendments. Ms. Echols said there was no moratorium, but there has been a policy over the years of not accepting or reviewing Comp Plan amendments within six months of adoption of the Plan. She noted that there are two formal applications currently on the table, which staff wanted to bring before the Board. She added that another had been requested the day before this meeting, and she encouraged the applicant to come talk to the Board about how it may want to deal with it.

Mr. Boyd said he was thinking about the CMA project, the Woolen Mills project, and Mr. Wood's projects, and did not know why the County would be waiting to get through such a lengthy process.

Ms. Mallek said that is the direction staff is expecting the Board to provide after this discussion. Ms. Echols said staff was hopeful the Board would be deciding that issue tonight.

Ms. Dittmar said the policy was in place, but Supervisors are looking at what is in the pipeline, partly because Supervisors want to consider a careful process for Comprehensive Plan adoption, but have development needs.

Mr. Boyd said if the Board is going to be realistic and honest about its intent to mitigate the impact on businesses because of the Solutions 29 package, the CMA should be at the top of the list.

Ms. Echols stated that, with Places 29, there were some expansion area requests but also some discussion on industrial land inventory. She referenced a map showing the Charlottesville/Albemarle Airport and the existing mobile home park, which has zoning that extends across the property line to several parcels. Ms. Echols noted that the property owner, Mr. Wood, said residential use should be honored. She said the Places 29 Advisory Council looked at it and made a recommendation to the Planning Commission that the area be changed to urban density-residential, and the Commission supported that recommendation. She said this change would involve a slight loss of industrial land, but whether it would actually be industrial because of current zoning which allows residential uses is uncertain. Ms. Echols said that was a recommendation in the Places 29 Master Plan from the Commission, and the other recommendation pertained to water tanks. She noted the location of Airport Road on the map and said that, while one water tank was brought forward to the Planning Commission, there was discussion of a second one needing to be there for some redundancy. She said the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) has requested that these be put in the Plan so, when it is ready to do the work, the Board can determine if there is compliance with the Comp Plan. Ms. Echols said both the Planning Commission and the Places 29 Advisory Council were fine with these as well.

Ms. Echols noted on the map the location of Route 29, NGIC, and the current Comp Plan designation with an area zoned urban density-residential, an area zoned neighborhood density-residential, and an area zoned office/research and development-flex. Ms. Echols said the County was trying to provide some additional opportunities for jobs in this particular area and, in working with people at Rivanna Station and Mr. Wood, staff wanted to determine if there was a way to increase the amount of office R&D-flex/light industrial, move that center up a little bit, and then replace the residential by going outside the development area a bit. She said staff was able to endorse that change, but the parcel has more challenges topographically and also abuts Watts Passage. Ms. Echols said, when Mr. Wood asked if he could bring that parcel into the development areas, the Planning Commission began to have some concerns because making changes to a development area boundary in this particular area really needed to have public input, with notification to people who live along there. She emphasized that the Planning Commission was not necessarily against it, but said the applicant should submit a formal CPA request since they had already done their work, or bring it to the master plan update process for the Places 29 Master Plan. She said either one of those would facilitate the necessary public input in light of the potential impact on properties in the rural area at that boundary. Ms. Echols said the Planning Commission was not in favor of expanding the development areas boundary at that time for this particular use, which Mr. Wood had brought to the Board's attention earlier in the meeting.

Regarding Mr. Borches' request, Ms. Echols noted the location of Colonial Auto Center in relation to Rio Road and Berkmar Drive, and said this particular property used to have a mobile home park on it with the zoning and designation of urban density-residential. She said, since that mobile home park is

now gone and there is similar ownership between the properties and for the reasons Mr. Borches brought to the Board earlier, he wants it to have a designation that is similar to the adjoining property, a zoning that would allow for the ability to put vehicle storage on this particular property and be able to develop it as part of the entire complex. Ms. Echols said Mr. Borches had a pre-application work session with the Planning Commission, with the Commission indicating there were some things about this request that it would like to have consideration made for. She said some had to do with design and some pertained to the extension of Myers Drive. She said, at the time, the Commission said Mr. Borches would need to make a Comprehensive Plan amendment, and also have a conversation with him about the things that are important for the rezoning but, in general, felt the use was acceptable. Ms. Echols stated that the applicant did submit a CPA request for consideration, and the timing is such that the Comprehensive Plan work has not been completed, so it may be possible for the Commission to accept this request and make recommendations about how this should play out for a rezoning which could then be folded back into the process the Board is going through.

Mr. Sheffield commented that he thought Myers Drive was completely on Mr. Borches' property, and asked if, instead, it was split down the middle. Mr. Borches confirmed that it straddles the property line between the Myers and CMA properties.

Ms. Mallek said the takeaway is that Colonial Auto Center does not have control over it.

Ms. Echols said the Planning Commission would need to sort that out by looking at the issues of practicality, the ability of having this road extended, and whether it makes sense or not. She stated that the road is not shown on the Places 29 Master Plan map, but staff looks for interconnections and there is some potential for connecting it between Route 29 and Berkmar Road; however, it needs to be studied further before making any decisions are made.

Ms. Palmer asked if the Planning Commission would go through the stormwater mitigation for the parking lot, the sidewalks, etc. Ms. Echols responded that most of that would be taken care of through regulations as far as the requirement for sidewalks. She explained that, for a public road, sidewalks are required, on a private road, there might be room for negotiation, and the Commission would advise on that part. She said storm water management would be worked through County regulations. She said the things to be considered pertain to the design of the building, where the parking is located, how access would take place from the different roads as well as in between the two parcels, and those are the kinds of things the Planning Commission wanted to have input into. She confirmed that this was not a public road.

Mr. Cilimberg said sidewalks would still be required even if it were a private road.

Mr. Sheffield asked who makes the determination of building a turn lane, and whether the property owner would have the prerogative to build in a turn lane on a commercial property from a public road. Ms. Echols said VDOT generally makes the decisions on whether or not it can be approved.

Mr. Sheffield asked if a property owner could build one if he wanted one. Mr. Cilimberg clarified that it would be based on what VDOT determined would be necessary and what VDOT would be willing to permit in its right of way. He said, if Myers were connected through under a normal circumstance of this being a private street in the development areas in the midst of other development, there would be sidewalk requirements. He said what Ms. Echols was speaking to was the Planning Commission's willingness to entertain the additional land use designation and to also look at it at the master plan level initially and then make a recommendation to the Board, with the zoning request likely to follow shortly behind based on the interest of the owner.

Mr. Boyd asked what the timeframe would be for that, because the landowner has an immediate need due to the road construction. Mr. Cilimberg said the timing for the Comprehensive Plan change would be the Board's timing, provided the Commission can look at it and get a recommendation back to Board, and it would then be the Board's timing to complete the review. He said what might come up in the conversation at the Planning Commission level is the possibility of the applicant submitting a zoning map change before the Board takes its action.

Mr. Boyd asked if there might be a temporary dispensation the County could grant in this case. Mr. Cilimberg said there could be a zoning map amendment processed with a change to the Comprehensive Plan occurring concurrent with the zoning change, as long as the Board is comfortable with that.

Mr. Sheffield said he was fine with it, acknowledging that the Board would make the CPA change. Ms. Echols said, if things were not working quickly enough, the Board could separate its actions, and the question is how soon the Planning Commission could get a recommendation back to the Board. She said, given its calendar, the Planning Commission could probably be working on this fairly soon.

Ms. Mallek noted that one of the recommendations was that the Board direct the Planning Commission to take this on and get it back to the Board by January 15, and asked if that was the kind of motion the Board should make. Ms. Echols said Supervisors could do that, adding that, if the Commission is not able to make a recommendation to the Board by that time, Commissioners will notify the Board.

Mr. Sheffield said the Board could still move forward with the land use designation change when the Comp Plan is approved. He said he supports doing this but not for the Route 29 projects reason but

because this is the start of the Berkmar corridor's transformation. He said he has mentioned to the Places 29 Council that they need to start thinking about what the corridor will look like when Berkmar is finished because this would not be the last time someone comes to the Board about changing the land use designation.

Ms. Mallek said, in order to support the long-term nature of how this parcel would go with others that are changing is to require that a street with sidewalks be built through the middle of this very narrow property and that is a lot to ask.

Mr. Sheffield said he was referring to Berkmar, not Myers Drive and he would prefer to leave that up to the Planning Commission and the applicant in terms of the appropriateness of cutting it through Myers Drive. He said, given the way the grade-separated interchange would be designed, it might cause some traffic flow concerns there.

Ms. McKeel asked how quickly this might happen. Ms. Echols said the Board could ask the Commission to get it back by January 15 or at its earliest possible convenience and, if the Board sets a date, Commissioners would have a deadline to work towards. She stated that January 15 would be the next meeting after the Development Areas chapter, and that would give Commissioners enough time to hold a public hearing and get a recommendation back to the Board.

Ms. Dittmar said she would like Mark Graham and perhaps Mr. Sheffield to talk with VDOT about some of these items for the short term and also in the context of the overall plans.

The Board was in general agreement to send this to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Sheffield said Mr. Davis has suggested making a motion for the Planning Commission to review it, if the Board has a specific date in mind.

Mr. Boyd said he would like to see what the Board can do if the project stretches out, so the landowners here can get some relief from provisions such as signage requirements.

Mr. Davis said, under current zoning regulations, that kind of relief is not available. He explained that this is not a new situation, with the Board taking the position that it did not want to have temporary uses written into the Zoning Ordinance because it would dispense with public process.

Ms. Dittmar said the County was planning to meet very soon with business people to take a whiteboard approach to find out what they need, adding that this is an extraordinary situation. She said, if it is within the Board's purview to take some actions for relief and it legally can, then the Board would want to consider those things. Mr. Davis said those actions would require Zoning Ordinance amendments which would have to be explored.

Ms. McKeel said it sounds as though the Commission could hear this pretty quickly, and the Board could move it on. She said, if it happens that there is a delay, the Board could go back and deal with it.

Mr. Sheffield **moved** to send the land use designation to the Planning Commission for consideration.

Mr. Davis said an existing Comprehensive Plan application had been made, so the Board would simply be directing the Planning Commission to proceed with the existing CPA application filed by CMA properties with a recommendation to the Board by January 15, 2015.

Mr. Sheffield clarified his motion, which Ms. McKeel **seconded**.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Mr. Sheffield asked to hear from CMA Properties as to whether the January 15 timeframe was sufficient.

Ms. Valerie Long said the applicant was hoping for some guidance sooner, and wondered why it had to go back to the Commission for a second review because, at its meeting, there was no opposition or concerns raised with the focus being largely on procedure. She said going back to the Planning Commission in January for more review means the applicant could not submit a rezoning application until the third week of February at the very earliest. Ms. Long said the rezoning application would then proceed in its normal fashion, so the applicant could at least get started on that. She said, when they came before the Planning Commission in April, there was general agreement with the proposal but said the Board was already proceeding with the Comp Plan review. She said waiting until January again is a long timeframe.

Ms. Palmer asked Ms. Echols if the Commission needed to look at the change in the scope of the entire master plan. Ms. Echols said this was the first formal application that had been made.

Mr. Davis said Ms. Long's proposal has a complication because it would assume that the Board would complete the work on the Comprehensive Plan sooner than this separate application would come forward, and he did not think that was the case. He said the fastest way to move this request forward was to have a separate application. He said, while that would require a Planning Commission legal public hearing, it would come to the Board and be processed prior to its Comprehensive Plan review.

Mr. Cilimberg said that is what the Board's vote just set up to happen. He said the Board makes the final decision on the land use, so it depends on Supervisors meeting its Comp Plan review to get the change in place. He said the applicant can apply for a zoning map amendment at any time, but the problem for staff is, until the change is made in the Comp Plan, that guidance is not in place as part of Board review. He stated that staff would have to review the application with the assumption of a change that had not taken place yet or not be able to recommend approval because the land use change had not happened. Mr. Cilimberg stated that he did not think the Comp Plan review and recommendation was the critical path for the applicant. He explained that the critical path was the zoning map amendment, and getting that approved so they could proceed with their development. He said it was possible to do that in parallel, but it would carry with it staff review assuming the land use change which has not happened yet.

Mr. Sheffield and Ms. McKeel said the Board is essentially committing to that.

Mr. Davis said the applicant could apply for the zoning map amendment at a point in time where there would not be the final Comprehensive Plan decision and then starting the ZMA process which requires a review and staging period. He noted that the applicant could do it in a staged way that would eliminate overlap of the two.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff has had, on occasion, some changes in the zoning text where an application for a special use permit has been made before the zoning text change has taken place, so staff reviews it based on the change being proposed and there could be a similar circumstance for a zoning map amendment application. He stated that the applicant could make the application and file on the next filing date after their mandatory pre-app meeting.

Mr. Davis said the assumption then would be that these would get to the Board at the same time.

Mr. Cilimberg said they would be reviewed for a zoning map change as the Commission is looking at the Comprehensive Plan change, and would basically be looking at the two together.

Ms. Palmer asked how much that would speed this up, and if there was any precedent being set proceeding this way. Mr. Cilimberg said he did not know how the Board might want to act on the zoning map change, but there have been Comprehensive Plan changes happen concurrently with a zoning map change, specifically for the Mill Creek Shopping Center. He said the Commission would have to look at the zoning map change anyway, so it might as well specify what it thinks is important to have in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Cilimberg said staff could simply take them together to the Commission, adding that he was not sure how much time it would save the applicant as it depends on what comes up as part of the zoning map amendment review.

Ms. Echols said what the Planning Commission had reviewed previously was this general plan, but identified issues it felt needed more discussion and resolution on some particular aspects before it could be advanced. She said those particular aspects may or may not have complications related to them, and that is the benefit of taking this to the Planning Commission so it can review this for the big picture and then attach the issues to the rezoning. Ms. Echols said it is possible that the applicant could change their ZMA to match what the Planning Commission says, if it is submitted concurrently. She noted that it is different than what the Commission saw, but it would have to be looked at from a rezoning standpoint.

Mr. Cilimberg clarified that the Board referred the Comprehensive Plan aspect of this back to the Commission to get a recommendation back by January 15. He said the applicant at any point between now and then could go through the pre-app process and make a zoning map amendment application. He said staff would just deal with it under the circumstances at the time. He explained that, by referring it back to the Commission, the Board is asking it to make a recommendation for the Comprehensive Plan, which includes land use. He said the Commission has more or less indicated that the use is not concerning, however, part of the recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan is the land use change as well as other elements of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Sheffield asked Ms. Long if this would meet the applicant's goals. Ms. Long clarified that they could submit the application, go through the pre-app process, have that reviewed by staff and, in the meantime, the Commission would be preparing to provide input on the land use designation process. She said, as long as the applicant can start the rezoning process and not have it delayed, it should work very well. She said there are fewer submittal deadlines at the end of the year, but they have already done a lot of work on this.

Ms. Palmer asked what particular items had the Commission raised, and whether staff felt those issues would interfere with this application going forward. Ms. Echols responded that the primary issue was sorting through Myers Drive, as the Planning Commission thought it could be extended all the way up to Berkmar, but the applicant may not be able to do that, based on VDOT requirements. She said staff did not know the answer to that particular question, but it was one that needed to be worked through as it was an important part of the land use in that area.

Mr. Sheffield said, if the County is going to allow commercial and light industrial to start growing up around this area, what is to stop tractor-trailers from using Myers Drive. He said the Planning Commission needs to think beyond just this one parcel. Mr. Cilimberg said that is part of this Comprehensive Plan review. He said the Board has given the Planning Commission a deadline, which is what it needs to do. He added that the specifics of the zoning map amendment is what staff would work on with the applicant in the pre-app process and in the application when they are ready.

Ms. Mallek said she did not know what the minimum distance would need to be for a public street that close to Rio Road and Berkmar, adding that she was not sure it was a great spot for a street.

Mr. Sheffield said it would become a de-facto road even if it is a private road.

Ms. Mallek said she did not feel comfortable mandating that a private landowner be required to put a public road in the middle of his property, as it is not in the master plan and has not been considered throughout Places 29.

Mr. Cilimberg said it was in Places 29 at one point, but was later removed.

Ms. Echols clarified that the Commission now had the Board's direction, and the applicant knows he can submit rezoning at the time he has it ready. She said there is a submittal date on the third Monday of October.

Mr. Cilimberg said it was not possible for the applicant to make because of the pre-application window, but there is a November/December combined application which is the first Monday in December. He stated that staff can get a pre-app meeting scheduled as soon as the applicant is ready, and it sets them up with staff's response to then make the application for the zoning map change.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the mandatory pre-app was part of the County's streamlining process. Mr. Cilimberg said it was to identify things people were not submitting to the County previously, and then were told they needed to provide those things 46 days after application.

Ms. Mallek said it is a very good plan.

Mr. Foley noted that the change had broad community support.

Ms. Echols referenced the map presented, noting the current Comprehensive Plan boundary and the location of NGIC. She stated that there was discussion of potentially adding additional office/R&D-flex/light industrial to increase the inventory, moving the center over, moving the urban density-residential designation up to the development area boundary, and moving neighborhood density residential farther out. She said it was determined that the parcel would have fewer impacts on adjoining property owners, and the Planning Commission was comfortable with bringing that parcel into the development area; however, there was another parcel that, upon request by the owner to be moved in, the Commission became concerned because of a strip of land connecting it to Watts Passage. Ms. Echols said the owner has said he would not connect to Watts Passage, but it sets up the potential for some conflicts in this particular area if the potentially affected property owners are not part of the conversation. She said that is why the Planning Commission indicated it was not totally adverse to it, but not willing to say it was acceptable because there are other people who need to be part of that conversation.

Ms. Mallek said that is a very rural, small road which is not prepared to be a back door even if it is not this year, but five or ten years down the line when it happens. She asked how the center was planning to be used. Ms. Echols responded that the center is intended to be a neighborhood service center, supporting the residential uses as well as industrial uses.

Ms. Mallek asked about supporting Rivanna Station, and expressed concern about encroachment on that facility because she wants to ensure it can continue to prosper and grow and not be forced out because of being hemmed in by houses.

Ms. Dittmar asked Mr. Foley about the report from the state on what communities need to do to protect the asset of military bases, which was due out this fall and stems from the fact that forward-thinking communities around the nation were protecting its bases by ensuring that land and infrastructure was appropriate for the installation.

Mr. Foley said he has not heard anything at this point but would follow up.

Ms. Mallek said, when the Board met with Senator Kaine, he asked the County to reach out to Fredericksburg and other communities that have prepared its asset list, etc.

Mr. Cilimberg said, from a timing standpoint, this would probably take longer than the timeframe needed to wrap up the Comprehensive Plan review with the Board, and would probably fit better with the update of Places 29 as part of the consideration. He stated that, from a timing standpoint, this may be a bit more difficult to handle in the context of the Board's Comprehensive Plan review and decision but, for Places 29 review, it is probably one of the areas of focus.

Ms. Dittmar said one of the things the Board has been discussing in the context of the Rivanna Village and Places 29 plans has been the importance of having places to live where people can walk to

work, but it is possible that the Board could make decisions now without having enough information that would eventually force Rivanna Station out. She said she would like to find out about the report.

Ms. Echols clarified that she would send this back for further discussion at a later date, which would have been staff's recommendation also. She said the Places 29 outstanding issues seem to be resolved if Supervisors are fine with the mobile home park change and the water tanks.

Ms. Mallek said she was OK with the water tanks, but taking light industrial land is a bit concerning because Board members continue to say there is not enough. She said, when the mobile home park went in many years ago, it was described as a temporary use and there was not a zoning change to giving up the light industrial in the Comprehensive Plan. She said she did not want to make changes prematurely which have created the situation Supervisors are complaining about now.

Ms. Palmer said she continues to be told that the County does not have enough light industrial because the Board keeps rezoning it and, if Supervisors want industry close to where people live, it cannot keep doing that.

Ms. Dittmar asked if the Planning Commission liked the idea of doing this. Ms. Echols said Commissioners felt OK with it because it had existing zoning on it.

Mr. Cilimberg said, at the time of the rezoning, there was a question of whether the mobile home park would be permanent, and there was a convertibility possibility if it was approved and could become industrial later, based on demand. He said the Planning Commission and Places 29 Committee recognize that there is an established residential community there, so the idea was to reflect in the master plan land use designation that residential community's existence rather than continuing to show it for industrial.

Ms. Palmer pointed out that, if it goes to high density, the residential neighborhood would change. Mr. Cilimberg explained that if, under the designation for residential use, it could always be brought back for rezoning to have a different kind of residential there, but they could ask for that as an industrial rezoning also; it just would not have the support of the Comp Plan.

Ms. Dittmar said that is a bit confusing. She stated that there are certain places where businesses like to locate, one of them being near the airport and, objectively, people do not like to live near runways because of the noise. Ms. Echols said the land use plan shows the use as LI, and zoning allows the mobile home park as well as the same residential use to extend over somewhat.

Ms. Mallek said she is not in favor of changing that boundary.

Ms. Palmer said she is concerned about the loss of light industrial, adding that staff has done an exhaustive study of industrial properties, and asked if staff had examined that in the study.

Ms. Echols responded that staff had. She said all of the properties in this area were the ones in the small parcels which would need to be combined in order to make them usable. She said there are streams, although not protected, which could be affected by other sets of regulations, as well as some topography issues that truly limit the amount of buildable property. Ms. Echols stated that staff may have taken out some of the slope areas next to the streams, and tried to designate more area in other master plans. She said, for example, Neighborhood Four and Five master plan has more office R&D-flex/light industrial space designated than currently exists in the Plan. She said it could balance out but, because it has existing zoning and the existing development on it, staff did not consider it to be part of the inventory. She noted that the Planning Commission struggled with this before the Places 29 plan was adopted, and were persuaded that the County needed the industrial land. She said the advisory council also felt that the likelihood of having it available in the near future was probably low.

Ms. McKeel said she agreed with Ms. Palmer, adding that it seemed as if the County was always changing industrial zoning yet hearing that more was needed.

Mr. Sheffield said that was a good point.

Mr. Boyd said he was not in favor of doing away with the light industrial, as he has been advocating for it for a long time, and asked how large those parcels were. Ms. Echols said she was not certain of the size.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the water towers, and whether a pump station was being located in the path of Meeting Street to connect to Airport Road. Ms. Echols said that is where it is situated on the map and was not intended to be in the path of that road.

Mr. Sheffield said there was also a cell tower there. Ms. Echols confirmed that there was, and said the depiction on the map is in the wrong place as the road was intended to go through.

Mr. Cilimberg said the County would not want to have anything indicated that allows a second water tower which would obstruct the continuation of Meeting Street, because that is part of the Berkmar Drive parallel road ultimately. He noted that Meeting Street is where the stub-out of the road to the south is and would continue across that property to the intersection with the road that serves the fire station. Ms. Echols suggested that the Board hold this one in abeyance, and she would check with the Service Authority to get those answers.

Mr. Sheffield said he did not think it was necessary to hold it, but just wanted to make sure where Meeting Street was cutting through in the future. He said the cell tower company might see an advantage to mounting their antenna on the water tower.

Ms. Dittmar suggested moving forward, pending Ms. Echols' confirmation that it would not be of any concern.

Ms. Echols said the next item for discussion is Pantops, which is next on the list to have its land use plan updated. She pointed out the location of two roads requesting removal by the landowners. She reported that both the Commission and the Advisory Council felt it was appropriate to do so. She said one of the roads was being looked at was a possible alignment for the Eastern Connector, but that is no longer being considered. Ms. Echols said one road is an extension of State Farm Drive, but there is another road which makes that redundant. She said, when this matter went to the Planning Commission, the property owner said they felt it was redundant adding that it would also split their parcel in half. She stated that, since that time, the new owner of the property has said he wants to build it, and noted that this is where the new Chick-Fil-A would be located.

Mr. Boyd said Chick-Fil-A figured out how to get the road through there, which is what everyone wanted anyway.

Ms. Echols said the Village of Rivanna Master Plan was done by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC), which did not totally coordinate with the County's mapping system. She explained that the maps which were prepared, while they show the land uses correctly, have features that are not consistent with other county mapping. Ms. Echols said the map is referred to as a "supplemental land use map," which converts the environmental features to parks and green systems so it can be consistently shown, but does not change any of the land uses. She stated that this was supported by the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council and the Planning Commission and, since that time, the County has received a water tank application which would be coming to the Board as a request for a special exception, but must go to the Commission first for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. She said this has gone through the advisory council many times and, at the last mandatory meeting, there were three staff members and four members of the public; two of the attendees were members of the fire station who just happened to be there. Ms. Echols said this is supported by the community because it provides some redundancy in water service, and staff would like to proceed with getting it on the Plan.

Ms. Mallek noted that it had come to the Board for a lease two years ago, and the County is just catching up on the plan for what needs to be done. Ms. Echols confirmed that was the case, noting that it is on fire station property.

Ms. Echols related that the Board has received comments from the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council. She said there were some residents who felt the Glenmore rezoning had some confusion about the history of the village and why it was the way it was. She said those residents feel it would be helpful to add some clarifying language to the master plan which provides some history as to how that village came to be. Ms. Echols said there were also some questions about how density was calculated, and the Board received some recommendations about net density. She noted that she spent some time with the advisory council in an effort to show how the County uses its maps to calculate density in the land use plans. She noted that this is simply clarifying information to be added, not a policy change related to reducing density.

Ms. Dittmar thanked Ms. Echols for spending extra time with the advisory council. She indicated that the advisory council wanted to do a little wordsmithing but she indicated to the council that would come later. She said one of the challenges with growing neighborhoods, such as Avon Street Extended and Rivanna Village, is that new people are coming in who do not know the history. Ms. Dittmar said this added language intends to help new residents understand that in a contextual manner.

Ms. Mallek stated that the way density has been calculated has been a thorn for the neighbors, and she would propose that the County factor in the number of units that can go on a piece of property in the same way that it factors in constraints on a property in a capacity analysis. She said if a property has the majority in steep slopes or wetland or stream buffer, the current plan provides for all of the allowable units to be crammed in on the remaining 10 acres, which increases the density required and makes a much bigger impact on neighbors.

Ms. Echols said that is a distinction between what zoning allows and what the land use plan says because the Zoning Ordinance for a by-right development currently states it must be calculated on the gross density which is worded similarly in the Neighborhood Model plan. She said if someone is coming in to do by-right zoning, it has been the County's policy, in an attempt to help people achieve greater density in the development areas, to allow them to calculate the gross acreage of the parcel without taking out the constrained land. Ms. Echols said, in the County's master plans, if someone is rezoning property, staff takes out the constrained land and says they can use the density that is color-coded on the maps.

Ms. Mallek said that is what happened at Blue Ridge Commons on Jarman's Gap as a rezoning. She said Piedmont Housing Alliance was able to put in 80 units on a tiny piece of property which never would have happened on by-right zoning. She said it has been a bad experience out there, adding that it has not been built yet because of the recession, but it is a poster child for overdoing it with the number of units put in there.

Mr. Cilimberg said the County met with the Foundation that was looking to build there, and they never made an application. He stated that some of the discussion was the Foundation asking for more density than what the master plan would allow under a rezoning.

Ms. Mallek said the community is under the impression that it is all going through.

Ms. Echols asked if she was referring to the Albemarle Housing Improvement Program (AHIP) property, adding that she would check on it and get back to Ms. Mallek with current information.

Ms. Mallek said, regardless of where it is, the problem is when the steep slopes are not considered in the places someone cannot possibly build, it creates way too much and goes to the whole livability issue of the growth areas. She said if the County wants growth areas to do well, it has to be a wonderful place to live, not a place where people feel like sardines.

Ms. Palmer said, in the staff report discussion of Rivanna Village, Ms. Echols mentioned that the County should consider looking into federal regulations to ensure the County is compliant. She said it may be that the Board should be looking at its water and buffer ordinances.

Mr. Cilimberg commented that there is a distinction in how staff has to process a by-right development versus how staff reviews a rezoning under a plan. He said, when considering a rezoning, the County uses the master plan for that area as the base and those master plans have removed the non-buildable areas in most cases. As an example, he said the Riverside Village rezoning wanted density that would have been applied to the entire acreage but staff indicated in their report that the maximum density should only be what was shown in the plan for development, so that is the difference of a rezoning versus a by-right. Mr. Cilimberg said, for a change such as Ms. Palmer is describing in a by-right, the Board would have to make changes in the Zoning Ordinance as to how staff calculates densities for development of conventional zoning districts, and that is a different animal than the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mallek said she understood that, but noted that it does affect the master planned areas to some extent. Mr. Cilimberg said that is the case where there is by-right development.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the County faced that with the Rivanna Village project because Glenmore Associates had the right to do a lot more. She said Glenmore could have built at the higher level but agreed to build at a lower density. Mr. Cilimberg said that project was scaled back.

Ms. Echols said there is property in Crozet that has R-6 zoning on it and, when the property owner wanted to get density bonuses to get nine units per acre instead of six, what was recommended in the master plan was not that much density, so the owner could not get their density bonuses. She added that the master plan essentially guided how the density on that property was realized. She presented an example of the properties for Rivanna Village at Glenmore. She said, by adding in the water protection ordinance buffers and the steep slopes overlay, those are the regulatory restraints which do not really go very far because the streams are intermittent and thus do not have the same regulation through the ordinance. Ms. Echols said the Army Corps of Engineers is applying some federal regulations which make it very difficult to develop anything near those streams or affect those streams. She stated that it could be done, but the developer would have to pay to mitigate the impacts, which is resulting in people not wanting to build on streams. Ms. Echols said this is where staff needs to do a bit more research because, if they are always going to be protected and there will never be any building that takes place on them, those might as well be taken out of the equation but, currently, staff does not know that definitely. She stated that the other factor is the new state regulations related to streams and water quality which may affect some of the streams as well.

Ms. Mallek asked if these streams were already protected 100 feet on either side with the water protection ordinance buffers taken into the eastern part of the County several years ago. Ms. Echols said they were not, adding that these were the only buffers.

Ms. Mallek said she thought intermittent streams were included in that ordinance.

Mr. Boyd clarified that those were in the watershed, and Ms. Echols agreed.

Ms. Mallek said she thought all of those intermittent streams had been moved under one set of rules.

Mr. Boyd said that had to do with critical slopes. Ms. Echols said staff would follow up on that issue as well. She said the Board may want staff to do some additional research with regard to the environmental features and what will be protected.

Ms. Palmer said that was a good idea.

Mr. Boyd asked if this would cover the 30% that Mr. Williamson referred to earlier. Mr. Cilimberg said the 30% was more in reference to the actual density of development which developers end up developing. For example, he said there may be an allowance for 1,000 units in a particular development but only develop 700 because the market was more oriented to single-family detached.

Mr. Boyd said the reason he has asking is because of new EPA regulations that went into effect in July which impact these.

Mr. Cilimberg said North Pointe is also affected by new regulations for the streams and the extent to which those can be covered.

Ms. Echols said the section regarding the update of the Zoning Ordinance for clarity about density was something the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council pointed out as having inconsistency with how the County measures density for Neighborhood Model Districts in relation to how it actually does this with rezonings. She said Mr. Davis would be checking into this, and staff would get back to the Board on that.

Ms. Echols reported that she had separated out the Southern and Western neighborhoods, even though they are part of the same master plan. She presented both the current and proposed plans noting the new inclusion of the parks and green systems. She said the major changes between the existing plan and the recommended master plan are: reworking of the land use categories to make those consistent with the other plans; addition of the parks and green systems; identification of 16 centers or focal points of activity; embedding the Area B recommendations; changing the land use designation on Biscuit Run; changing the Southwood Mobile Home Park designation from neighborhood density to urban density; and a PVCC change in Whittington and Parham Spring Hill. Ms. Echols pointed out the center designation of Biscuit Run, with the exception of the Breeden parcel, is shown as parks and green systems. She said the Breeden parcel was owned by a different owner than the rest of Biscuit Run and still has Neighborhood Model zoning on it. She said it would be difficult to develop because it relies on the road systems for the rest of that rezoning. She said the Breeden parcel has 100 units of development potential, and this plan recommends that the density potentially be moved closer to the road as it does not have to be in the specified location. Ms. Echols commented that this is a very unique parcel with a lot of opportunities for different kinds of uses, so staff has written in some flexibility into the plan.

Ms. Mallek said if the landowner could work out a swap with the state, the owner could have the freedom to do that.

Ms. Echols said the ability to negotiate that option has been approved by the General Assembly, but there has not been any further action than that.

Ms. Echols reported that the Southwood Mobile Home Park is currently shown as neighborhood density and is currently owned by Habitat for Humanity, which has been spending a lot of money and effort to improve the quality of life and physical environment there through a variety of programs. Ms. Echols said Habitat has indicated that, in order for this to be redeveloped, it would need to have greater density, and they have made a commitment that all the people who live in the mobile home park will have housing when it is done. She said Habitat has also recently done the Sunrise Mobile Home Park in the City, which is an example of how they have successfully redeveloped a similar site. Ms. Echols said the Southwood site has a center which could function as a neighborhood center with some non-residential use available for the density in this area as well as some of the other residential uses in the neighborhood. She stated that the County has a team comprised of the Social Services Director, the Housing Director, the Police Chief, and Fire and Rescue. She said those individuals are trying to make this a safer place for people to live. Ms. Echols said when this goes through its rezoning process, there may be some need for the County to participate more fully in helping Habitat come up with a redevelopment plan beyond what the County would normally do with the private sector. She said, if this is something that causes the Board concern, Supervisors should let staff know, but Southwood is a place that is recognized as having needs and is very different from many other places in the County.

Ms. Mallek asked if the center area was near the current Boys & Girls Club location. Ms. Echols said it was not. She pointed out the location of the Boys & Girls Club.

Ms. Dittmar noted that this is a project that will be looked at nationally, as Sunrise was, and will be looked at by many communities across the country as a model if it goes well.

Ms. Echols reported that the Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) property was institutional and is being shown as urban density-residential, at PVCC's request, to be available for future development and to help fund improvements on the PVCC site. She pointed out the location of the Whittington and Mosby Mountain properties, adding that the Board instructed the Planning Commission to include this in the development area and noted the existing development area boundary. Ms. Echols said the County would have to bring in some other properties to make it work, and what is proposed is to bring in the Mosby Mountain development as well as an additional tract.

Ms. Palmer said this was a very specific change to the development area because it already had water there, which was a precedent the Board did not want to break.

Ms. Mallek said it was intended to allow them to get sewer rather than cutting down all the trees for the septic field which ended up happening anyway. Ms. Echols clarified that the County did not want to extend public sewer service outside of the development areas because it was already slated for water, but not for sewer. She said staff wanted to ensure that property was included in the development areas so it was consistent with the County's utility extension policy.

Ms. Echols said staff identified places for transportation improvements in the transportation plan: Sunset/Fontaine Connector, which had been in the plan but had changes because the traffic analysis suggested that the road would not be needed until sometime after 2040. She said the recommendation is that the right of way be secured for a future connection, and to use that right of way for pedestrian and bicycle access. She said the Southern Parkway was a similar situation, and noted that there were proponents and opponents for both of these roads, with the Planning Commission recommending that the

County secure and retain the right of way and build a portion of the roadway through Southwood Mobile Home Park to eventually make the needed connections there. Ms. Echols said the connection over Biscuit Run would likely be needed after 2040, but it should be used for pedestrian and bicycle access.

Mr. Boyd asked what it means to “acquire the right of way,” and asked what binding nature does that have on the County, noting that there is not any funding allocated for that. Ms. Echols explained that, if someone were to do a development in that particular alignment, the County would be asking them to dedicate right of way for a future road.

Ms. Mallek said that is how the Corey Farm to Three Notched section is happening, because the right of way is being set aside all the way through many different parcels.

Mr. Boyd said, in the past, that has been referred to as designating a road there, not purchasing a right of way. Mr. Cilimberg said it is securing the right of way through the development process, and many times it ends up being part of a development’s internal road system.

Ms. Mallek said, in order to avoid a similar situation like Sutherland School, the land had been set aside for future connection and it took about 10 years to reclaim the land so, once it is in the County’s control, when it is time to do it, it can get done.

Ms. Dittmar said Joel DeNunzio has indicated that it would be many decades before there would ever be enough money for VDOT to even consider the parkway there. She said, given other demands in the County, she wondered about how prudent it is to talk about the parkway as if it is imminent, especially given what it would mean to people.

Ms. Palmer said it is an excellent way to get into town on a bike, is really fast, and could be an excellent bike and pedestrian connection.

Ms. Mallek said, if the County does not reserve the right of way now, it would not get done, because some building would be put in the way. She said it is currently in the MPO’s long-range plan, although way out there due to funding. She said the most successful projects have been ones for which the right of way has been slowly accrued over decades. She asked about the large parcel denoted on the map.

Ms. Echols said it was Covenant School.

Ms. Echols reported that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the master plan before the Board but, since that time, there was a rezoning proposal for the Parham site, Spring Hill Village, which the Board would be considering at its meeting the following night. She said there was also additional input on the southern neighborhoods on county-owned land, adding that the Board has also received the Woolen Mills CPA request along with another request at this meeting. Ms. Echols said this has been one of the most controversial land use changes because it affects future development on this parcel and also residents in the nearby area. She noted the location of the existing land use plan’s category of “industrial service,” which the County will not be having in the future as it is now office/R&D-flex/light industrial and heavy industrial. Ms. Echols said knowing that there is a need for additional industrially-designated land, staff tried to expand that designation where they could so they took that designation southward onto a 13-acre parcel which did not seem to have any critical slopes on it although it is very hilly. She said staff also went north a bit on some undeveloped land that could potentially be used in the same way. Ms. Echols said Galaxy Farm Road was shown as urban density-residential, and staff talked with the owners to recommend it be changed to a neighborhood density-residential so there was opportunity for a better mix of housing types in this area, potentially more single-family residential instead of all apartments. She said, in expanding this particular area, one parcel was being considered for a new development, known now as Spring Hill Village, which has a large residential component.

Ms. Echols said, when the Planning Commission went through the Comp Plan update, Commissioners wanted it to be office/R&D-flex/light industrial with a residential component to it, and that plan has caused some concern for many of the residents in that general area. She said, in working with the neighborhood and the Commission, the new owner of this property has come up with a development plan that is primarily residential with an office use on one corner. Ms. Echols said this would change if the Board wants it to be urban density-residential and supported this particular development. She stated that the Planning Commission’s recommendation would no longer be valid because Commissioners recommended approval of it as it is now. She said that is the situation when there is a need for more industrial or employment-based uses, coupled with a desire for things that would have fewer impacts. She said the Planning Commission had specific language related to this parcel which says, “This area should be office/R&D-flex/light industrial; it is expected to provide for further development, especially to provide for light industrial uses and employment. The Parham parcel in particular has a higher set of expectations. Currently an undeveloped parcel, this property could be developed solely for office/R&D-flex/light industrial for target industries, or contain a mixture of uses including residential, but not including retail.” She said the Commission went on to say that there were important features of that property for design that make it more compatible with nearby and adjoining properties. Ms. Echols said this went on last August, and the developer provided a new plan, which the Planning Commission has now recommended approval. She said this issue is up for public hearing before the Board the following night, adding that there has been concern among nearby residents over this proposal.

Mr. Boyd asked about the net difference of swapping out some designated areas. Ms. Echols said staff did not do an exact measurement of it; staff was trying to gain specific pieces.

Mr. Boyd said he would like to know those details before the Board could address it at the meeting.

Ms. Dittmar asked about the nature of the residents' concerns. Ms. Echols said neighbors were concerned about the compatibility of office/R&D-flex/light industrial with the nearby residential uses, and were worried that just about anything could be put there, especially if the County were to do some proactive rezoning of currently designated but unzoned land. She said they were concerned about impacts.

Ms. Palmer said Mr. Shickedantz was concerned about splitting up those uses, and stated that he did not have a problem with the light industrial use as long as the parcels were smaller. Ms. Echols said she would probably want to ask him for clarification; adding that one particular plan was supported by the neighborhood.

Mr. Sheffield asked what staff was asking the Board to consider tonight, given that Supervisors were going to be considering it again at the meeting the following night. Ms. Echols said the Board could consider it at any time. She said this information was to explain what the change was which originally came from the Planning Commission, and where it is now.

Mr. Cilimberg said the Planning Commission recommended the office/R&D-flex/light industrial as part of the Comp Plan review, and have now recommended zoning that is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan recommendation. He stated that, if the Board goes along with the zoning recommendation, staff would need to make the appropriate changes in the designations in the Plan which the Board is now reviewing.

Ms. Mallek asked if staff was looking for neighborhood density or urban density.

Mr. Sheffield said it is in the development area.

Mr. Cilimberg said it is across from Avon Park and does include the office building on that corner.

Ms. Dittmar said her observation shows a desire to have more neighborhood than business there, but perhaps the Board should also consider Mr. Boyd's question of where the LI would be replaced.

The Board agreed to provide consideration at its meeting the following night.

Ms. Echols reported that there were a number of meetings in the community due to concerns related to County-owned property. She pointed out the location of Mill Creek Drive, Monticello High School, and the fire station, adding that the County owns all of those properties. Ms. Echols said there was a suggestion that one of those properties might be appropriate for a recycling convenience center, and that caused a lot of concern among residents there. She said there were a lot of suggestions about how the property should be used in the future, and the biggest part of that was the community wanted to be involved and to have a say in it. Ms. Echols said the recommendation from staff is that there be a small area plan developed which involves everyone. She said it involves the County, because of its land bank there and future infrastructure needs. She said it affects the property owners and residents. She said there is also a desire to have a town center development, with an emphasis on something walk-able and multi-modal, however, that is more of a design aspect than necessarily a use aspect. Ms. Echols said staff feels the master plan should state its expectations for this type of design and should also state the preference for different types of County uses and possibilities.

Mr. Foley asked if the small area plan would go beyond just County properties. Mr. Cilimberg said it would.

Ms. Dittmar said, prior to the community meeting which she and Ms. Palmer had hosted, there was a neighborhood group comprised of different homeowners association members. She said, over the summer, she and a summer intern hiked all over that area and noted that there is a lot of residential density in that location. She said it could be a nice gathering place/center for that community.

Ms. Mallek said, in the previous public hearing, people talked about something for the existing shopping center. Ms. Echols said the Planning Commission saw this as a center area, an area of focus, but the recommendation would involve all of the area, not just county properties.

Ms. Dittmar said the fire station has traditionally been a community center, and it was symbolic to her to keep the existing station as a focal point.

Ms. Palmer said her hope was to have the crosswalks and the walk-ability part long before the town center is built.

Ms. Mallek said the sidewalk already goes to the edge of the football field, so there is just a stretch around the corner which needed to be done.

Ms. Palmer asked about the status of the crosswalk to Cale Elementary.

Ms. Mallek said that sidewalk was in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

Ms. Dittmar said this item was still being worked on, but pointed out that there were multiple group meetings going on with the County, schools and VDOT all trying to coordinate discussions.

Ms. Mallek said it was in the appropriation the Board had voted on the previous week. Mr. Cilimberg said it may not be a crosswalk at the school, based on VDOT requirements as well as the desire of the school. He added that David Benish was also working on it.

Ms. Mallek asked when the Board would be informed of activity at Mill Creek so it has some knowledge of what is going on before a lot of time is spent on it. Ms. Echols said the idea is to get ahead of that, to know what the design features are, and also determine a potential list of uses. She said when the plan is developed is determined by the Board as far as priorities. She said the Board would set the expectations so everyone knows what those are, along with an appropriate set of uses for that location. She said the idea is that it will be mutually decided upon, not simply handed down.

Ms. Dittmar said, after this is adopted, she and Ms. Palmer would appoint a citizens' advisory committee to begin generating ideas.

Ms. Echols said the last two items related to the Woolen Mills requests. She said the applicants have submitted an application for a comprehensive plan amendment (CPA). She said this is an interesting property because it has historic preservation aspects; it is in the floodplain; the building is in the floodplain; there are opportunities for greenways; opportunities for the City and the County to work together on a corridor plan; there is economic development potential, and a lot that goes into what comes out of this particular use. Ms. Echols said the issue, in many ways, is the floodplain but there are also access issues. She presented a map noting the location of other features such as East Market Street. She stated that the question is determining the best use of the property in this context. She said the applicants would like to see it redeveloped in a way that provides for mixed use with the current designation being industrial service. Ms. Echols pointed out the area shown as office/R&D-flex/light industrial, and the location of existing residential properties which are recommended to have that designation. She explained that the text of the plan says those could be used for small non-residential uses with the idea of preserving the historic resource. She said this is all part of a National Register Historic District, and those buildings are the reason for the designation as they are the mills for Woolen Mills. Ms. Echols said there was a question as to whether the Planning Commission could look at this at a higher level in light of a potential rezoning, and perhaps more time to consider it is needed.

Ms. Palmer said the first thing she thinks about is the location of the sewage treatment plant, as there have been complaints about the odor from properties that are even farther away. She said the County does not know if that can be corrected, or how expensive it is going to be, so the thought of adding more people there to complain about the odor is a concern to her. Ms. Palmer stated that she did not know what the Planning Commission would say about that, but she would want some resolution on it.

Mr. Sheffield said he would be inclined to leave that up to the developers.

Ms. Mallek said it is not like they do not know what they are getting into.

Ms. Palmer said the problem is putting more people there without knowing the situation.

Mr. Boyd said odor control would be a huge expense.

Ms. Palmer said it might be up to the developer, but people would move in perhaps without knowing how bad the odor was and would then come to the Board to complain.

Ms. Dittmar said this is an unusual part of the County, adding that this property is in her district. She said there is a lot of old LI along with historical buildings which have questionable use potential; then there is the City adjacent to it, and the river right there. She said these developers have a creative idea that they want to explore, so there is nothing wrong with asking the Planning Commission to take a further look as to what it might mean. Ms. Dittmar said it needs a small area plan and a focus of its own.

Ms. Palmer said she agreed, but also wants to make sure odor control is considered.

Mr. Boyd said he agreed with the odor control issue staying on the Board's radar, but there is no reason to not allow the developer to continue their exploration.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the Commission could take a closer look and get back to the Board at a high level, but a small area plan work would be farther down the road. He said the Board could approach this as it did with Borches request, have this go back to the Commission, with a request to have it done by January 15.

Ms. Mallek said this would be Comprehensive Plan level work again.

Ms. Echols said staff's recommendation is to see if it can be done. She said the Commission would review it and, if it is possible to provide a recommendation in time for the Board to finish the Comprehensive Plan work, it could be incorporated but, because of the number of complicated issues, that may not be possible.

Ms. Dittmar asked Mr. Cilimberg if the City had looked at the Woolen Mills area. Mr. Cilimberg said it was not in the identified items for this upcoming joint meeting, but the river corridor was one topic which would be talked about. He added that the TJPDC was facilitating meetings on the Rivanna River.

Mr. Boyd said he and Ms. Palmer were serving on the joint committee regarding the Rivanna River, therefore, he would like to know what is being proposed.

Ms. McKeel said this did not seem to have the same urgency as the Borches review, so perhaps this could go on the list of future topics for the Planning Commission.

Ms. Mallek said people who have invested millions of dollars in this need an answer one way or the other.

Ms. Echols stated that January 15 may or may not be enough time.

Ms. Mallek asked if the County already had something called "transitional/flex/historic/residential" or something similar, or if it would be created for this purpose. Ms. Echols said the transitional designation was going away, however, there are other districts that could apply which would help accomplish the objective. She said there are a lot of issues in this proposal, i.e., does the Board want to retain this for office/R&D-flex/light industrial uses. She said the Board may want to get feedback as to the importance of this and, if the Board wants it to be something that is not an employment generator, that would be a whole different use. She stated that people who live in the City have some strong opinions about it. Ms. Echols said the Commission may find some complexities with this, but staff would report back to the Board on their progress.

Ms. Mallek said this is a very unique property and the river, at times, is high enough to kayak over the spillway.

Ms. Dittmar said the Board could at least ask for a status report by January 15. Ms. Echols said that should work.

Mr. Boyd said he agreed with Ms. McKeel that there is no urgency to this.

Ms. McKeel said this is important enough to have it very carefully done, and she did not want it rushed through.

Ms. Dittmar said investors sometimes just need to know yes or no.

Ms. Echols said the final project for consideration was zoned PRD as part of the Willoughby development, but it does not have any uses on it, so some of the issues would be access to it. She said it is one of those parcels which is right next to the City, so it would need some review. She clarified that the property total is 5.67 acres, adding that she was not sure what the access to the parcel is now.

Mr. Cilimberg said it is through the City.

Mr. Woodard said there is proposed access through the Willoughby Subdivision and Harris Street, adding that they are also proposing a bridge across Moore's Creek to access the 5th Street Station. He said it would be part of the development plan to have that access in the area on the map marked "Charlottesville City" is Harris Road, which comes up into Willoughby. Mr. Woodard confirmed that Rivanna Trail goes along Moore's Creek, and he would grant them an easement, adding that the use is currently allowed.

Ms. Echols said the property is shown as neighborhood density-residential, and the applicant would be asking for urban density-residential, so that is the question before the Board. She confirmed that neighborhood residential allows for 3-6 dwelling units per acre; urban density is 6-34 units per acre.

Mr. Cilimberg said there have been concerns expressed by the Willoughby neighborhood because the project is a higher density. He said those concerns are related particularly to traffic adding that the adjacent area is single-family detached. He stated that the parcel could be developed under neighborhood density, but not under the density required for apartments, so the request is to have the density increased from neighborhood to urban, adjacent to the shopping center on one side of the creek and the more immediate Willoughby subdivision.

Mr. Sheffield said he would agree with sending it to the Planning Commission, as he sees it as an appropriate use in that area.

Ms. McKeel agreed.

Ms. Dittmar said, philosophically, she thinks it is a good use, adding that the Commission would adequately engage the public, along with Mr. Woodard working with the neighbors.

Ms. Echols asked if the Board wanted to have the Commission look at this to assess the necessary timeframe, or provide the Board with a status of its feasibility prior to Supervisors finishing up the Comprehensive Plan.

Board members agreed with the latter option.

Ms. Mallek clarified that it pertains to the Comprehensive Plan amendment stage, not the rezoning.

Ms. Mallek asked if the County was basically leaving the short-term effort on Stribling and destroying that wetland as the preferred choice, rather than doing something else.

Ms. Echols explained that there was a proposal to develop the Granger property by-right, and they were going to be able to use the existing right of way, road and underpass. She said, for a long-term solution, it did not look suitable but, in order to get the right of way and keep with alternate four of the Area B study, it stayed with that plan. She said the Commission did not want to lose the opportunity for the right of way, especially since it could be developed by right.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the Board: Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Sheffield stated that VDOT had contacted him earlier in the day regarding the Board's endorsement of the Berkmar extension alignment, adding that VDOT has received overwhelming support for "Alignment A." He said the Board's endorsement would need to be done by the following day in order for it to go into the package to the CTB on October 15. He noted that Alignment A was the least disruptive to property owners.

Mr. Foley mentioned that alignment information was available online, and staff would draft a brief resolution for action by the Board.

Board members agreed with that approach.

Mr. Davis said the Board could add this to the agenda at the beginning of the Board's October 9 meeting.

Mr. Foley said staff would have a resolution with a title at that time.

Ms. Mallek said it would not hurt to have the extra 12 hours, so there is no surprise on the agenda.

Mr. Sheffield **moved** to add a resolution endorsing Alignment A for the Berkmar extension project to the Board's October 8, 2014 meeting agenda. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Ms. Dittmar said Ms. Jordan will be distributing the procedures for the Board to review in November, and wanted to alert fellow Supervisors of its arrival.

Ms. Dittmar said there will be a poll circulated as to how the Board likes its information, adding that Supervisors are being inundated with requests for proclamations, resolutions and commendations and she would like to bring that issue up tomorrow to determine how the Board uses the Consent Agenda, letters, and recognitions.

Ms. McKeel reported that there has been mention several times about outreach to business communities in light of road construction projects, specifically at the Rio interchange. She stated that one good example was the request at this meeting from Mr. Borches regarding the impact to his business. She said she and Ms. Dittmar discussed having a stakeholders group modeled after what was done with the courts project. She stated that she is receiving calls from business people about suggestions they have as to how the County might help them. Ms. McKeel said she understood Ms. Catlin had planned a larger meeting, but she and Ms. Dittmar had talked about a smaller group for property owners around that intersection.

Mr. Foley reported that there are three different efforts underway, and will involve a multi-pronged approach, so staff could add this smaller group to the process, however, it would be helpful to know which businesses should be included.

Ms. Dittmar said the Board had already asked for that information.

Ms. Mallek said, at the very least, there would need to be quadrant meetings because, otherwise, there would be too many people left out.

Ms. McKeel said she is not disagreeing with the quadrant meetings.

Ms. Dittmar said Ms. Catlin's planned meeting is big, however, she and Ms. McKeel wanted to do something similar to a stakeholder meeting. She stated that she cannot continue to field questions about what can and cannot be done for assistance, so she would like to have the County make an effort to

answer those questions from a legal and zoning perspective. She said, if it cannot be done as a Board of Supervisors, she would hold a business town hall where she would invite people in order to address it all at once and have matters starting to get worked on.

Ms. McKeel said this would not take away from the quadrant approach, as Supervisors are currently getting requests from businesses in that specific quadrant around Rio Road.

Ms. Mallek said Ms. Catlin's meeting on October 23 was intended to be a "kickoff" to get all the information available to date out to as many people as they can pack into a room, and then have the smaller neighborhood groups come in to talk about specific issues. She said the business outreach letters are doing the equivalent of a door to door approach.

Ms. Dittmar asked if staff would rather have a business town hall for people in the Rio area. Mr. Foley said there is an impression here that the County has not done something, but a lot has been done with staff working in partnership on this. He said, if Supervisors wanted a smaller group meeting, the approach has been for everyone impacted by these projects to get a special invitation.

Ms. Dittmar said the Board asked for this back in September, and she has been telling people that it is in the works.

Mr. Foley said there must have been some misunderstanding, because the effort that staff has been moving forward with Chip Boyles at the TJPDC and others was about the businesses and people directly impacted, not just those directly in the Rio intersection. He emphasized that staff has not been sitting on its hands with this.

Ms. Dittmar said, while Rio is not in her district, the impact on businesses affects all of them, and she did not want to dismiss some of the creative ideas coming forward. She said, in using that approach, it is not being forced on citizens.

Mr. Foley said everything Supervisors are saying is what is being planned for the October 23rd meeting, however, if that is not what the Board wants, staff can create a smaller group around a smaller area and move forward that way.

Ms. Dittmar said this felt like déjà vu to her from the September meeting, when Supervisors said the October 23rd meeting was not intimate enough and needed to be sooner than later.

Ms. McKeel said the Board endorsed the concept of a larger meeting, but also wanted something smaller.

Ms. Catlin said what staff has been waiting for in some respects is for VDOT to feel settled enough on what it has to come out and talk to people, as there has been a lot of change going on. She stated that what staff had envisioned for the 23rd was the opportunity for everyone to be included, so people did not feel left out. She said this first rollout would include everyone affected along the corridor or directly impacted by construction at the same time, from the same place, from the same involved and informed people. Ms. Catlin said the October 23rd event would be an open house with presentations offered twice, and the remainder of the time would offer different stations set up around each project, i.e., the widening project, Berkmar, Best Buy, etc. From that point, she said staff anticipated generating people from those sectors who would then want to have smaller group meetings going forward, starting from a broader base of everyone getting the same message.

Ms. Mallek said that is what she took away from it.

Ms. Dittmar used the courts project process as an example and said, if the Board had convened a large group for that exercise, it would not have been able to hear all of the stakeholders' input, which occurs from more of a work session approach. She said the Rio project is where the rubber meets the road, it is where people are most upset, and she would like to talk with them more formally than the phone calls she has been fielding.

Ms. McKeel said Supervisors are already getting calls from people asking for a meeting, and she is not sure who to bring.

Ms. Catlin asked what the ideal next event would look like. Ms. Dittmar said it should be a stakeholder meeting.

Ms. Catlin asked if Supervisors wanted to select two Board representatives for this meeting. Ms. Dittmar and Ms. McKeel said it should include everyone, similar to what was done for the courts project stakeholders meeting.

Mr. Foley said staff would set up a special Board meeting with the businesses directly at Rio, but the question is identifying the criteria as to which businesses should be included.

Ms. Dittmar suggested staff come up with an initial list and then the Board would review it for omissions.

Mr. Foley said staff would try to set up a stakeholders meeting similar to what was done with the courts, but would also need to identify the right business representatives to invite.

Ms. Catlin said staff would develop a list, and share it with the Board to see if that meets the Board's intent. She stated that this could pair well with the meeting scheduled for later in the month.

Ms. Palmer said the business group may need to be expanded to include those who are not directly at the intersection.

Ms. Catlin said if the meeting is to be kept at the same size as the courts project meeting, the list would need to be somewhat limited.

Ms. McKeel suggested it be a representative for a particular group.

Ms. Mallek suggested someone representing several different businesses.

Mr. Foley said staff would look at a map to see what businesses should be included.

Board members agreed to hold an early morning stakeholder meeting in early November, and staff said Ms. Jordan would clarify the date, the time and report back to the Board.

Agenda Item No. 5. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was no report.

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn to October 8, 2014, 4:00 p.m., Room 241.

At 7:47 p.m., Mr. Sheffield **moved** to adjourn the Board meeting to October 8, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. Ms. Palmer **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 04/01/2015
Initials: EWJ