

An afternoon meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on November 11, 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 5:02 p.m., by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar.

Attendees recited the Pledge of Allegiance and observed a moment of silence.

Ms. Dittmar acknowledged U.S. veterans.

Agenda Item No. 2. Comprehensive Plan Work Session: Development Areas.

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.

At the November 11, 2014 meeting, the Board will continue its review of Chapter 8: The Development Areas. Specific topics to be discussed include:

- The Neighborhood Model, including Neighborhood Model Design Guidance and Land Use Guidelines;
- Facilitating infill development, including redevelopment;
- Neighborhood Preservation and Public Investment;
- Priority Areas; and
- Urban Agriculture.

A link to staff reports and the Planning Commission's discussions on the Development Areas may be found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Board_of_Supervisors/Forms/Agenda/2014Files/1007/02.1_CompPlanAttachA.pdf

A link to their recommended 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

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

Detailed information is provided below:

- **Achieving high quality development through application of the Neighborhood Model Principles** (pages 8.15 – 8.28) and **Neighborhood Model Design Guidance** (pages A.8.3 – A.8.28)

In recognizing the numerous neighborhoods and mixed use developments that have been approved and have proceeded to development since the adoption of the Neighborhood Model (NM) in 2001, the Planning Commission retained the Principles almost in their entirety. They did add a Principle for multi-modalism, which replaced a

Principle related to neighborhood-friendly streets and paths which the Commission believed had been met when the County adopted ordinance requirements for sidewalks and provision of street trees.

The Neighborhood Model provides many pages of illustrated design guidance which have been used as references for ordinance amendments and project development since 2001. In the recommended Comprehensive Plan draft, this design guidance is updated using information from the existing Neighborhood Model and Places 29. It includes as many local examples as possible that represent the desired form of development.

Staff comment: The Planning Commission endorsed the changes in this Appendix. It is provided mainly for the Board's information. More discussion on the NM principle of redevelopment is discussed later in this report.

- **Facilitating infill development, including redevelopment of existing building or new development on vacant and underutilized land** (pages 8.28 – 8.29)

Infill is a method to make greater utility of undeveloped land that is surrounded by development and utilize existing urban infrastructure rather than further expanding the Development Areas and providing the new infrastructure necessary to support it. Infill can take the form of a single use or mixed use. It can be residential, non-residential, or a mixture of both. Infill usually takes place on smaller, scattered tracts of land. It presents particular challenges because such sites often have constraints that complicate their development and can have more immediate impacts on existing neighborhoods than greenfield development.

and

- **Redevelopment** (page 8.26)

The 10th principle of the Neighborhood Model promotes redevelopment as a way to maximize use of existing urban infrastructure and lessen the need to expand the Development Areas. Redevelopment provides the added benefit of improving existing properties and making them more attractive for users. Redevelopment opportunities are ripe in places such as underperforming shopping centers, buildings that have reached the end of their economic life, deteriorating mobile home parks, and residential neighborhoods experiencing vacancy, maintenance and/or crime issues. Particularly as regards redeveloped residential areas, the resulting improved conditions can lead to the displacement of lower income residents.

One of the biggest challenges with redevelopment is the cost. Typically, new development on vacant land is less expensive than redevelopment. Redevelopment can have similar impacts to neighborhoods as infill. In Charlottesville, redevelopment is promoted for greater intensity of use and greater density of development.

Staff comment: Infill and redevelopment provide both challenges and opportunities within the Development Areas. Supervisors Shifflett and McKeel provided an email to the rest of the Board related to infill and redevelopment, which is provided as Attachment A. Attachment B provides additional comment on these topics along with suggestions for additional strategies.

- **Neighborhood Preservation and Public Investment** (pages 8.7, 8.26, 8.28-8.31)

Neighborhood preservation is a topic which is raised in the Comprehensive Plan in conjunction with designating new Villages (page 8.7), redevelopment (page 8.26), and infill (pages 8.28 – 8.29). Neighborhood preservation is also considered when new land use designations are considered for properties during the Master Plan process, when requests are made for changes in land use designations with Comprehensive Plan Amendments (CPAs), and when boundaries of Development Areas are assessed with each Master Plan update. Recommendations for public investment in infrastructure, such as road improvement projects, sidewalks, and libraries, are provided in several sections of the Comprehensive Plan draft. Objective 7 (page 8.30) describes a desire to match infrastructure availability and capacity when approving new developments. Strategies to ensure that improvements are available for new development are found on pages 8.30 – 8.31 in conjunction with designation of priority areas.

Staff Comment: To date almost all of the Plan's emphasis has been placed on retaining the fabric and characteristics of existing neighborhoods and reducing negative impacts from new development. There have been no descriptions of or strategies for improving existing neighborhoods. This topic has been raised by Supervisors Sheffield and McKeel as needing additional discussion.

- **Priority Areas** (pages 8.30 and 8.31; also page A.8.70 of the proposed Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan)

Priority areas are places in the Development Areas where opportunities for infill, redevelopment and/or greenfield development are particularly good/important and can be most effectively supported by existing and planned infrastructure and services. The concept of priority areas first appeared with the Pantops Master Plan in 2008. The 2010 Crozet Master Plan, the Places29 Master Plan, and the proposed Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan all now identify priority areas. (The Village of Rivanna Master Plan did not provide any opportunities for internal priority areas because Glenmore occupies the majority of the Village and new development is very limited.) Priority areas were also envisioned as preferred areas for public investment in facilities and services as well as locations particularly suitable for rezoning consistent with master plan recommendations. Two of the priority areas identified in the Pantops Master Plan and the Places29 Master Plan became designated as Urban Development Areas (UDAs) when the state mandated designation of UDAs in 2011.

Staff Comment: The Board of Supervisors asked staff to highlight the information above on priority areas. This information may be useful for future discussions related to the proffer policy.

- **Urban Agriculture** (pages 8.32 and 8.33)
Across the country, more people are paying attention to where their food comes from and how it is produced. This in turn has led to more citizens interested in participating in their own local food production, with emphasis on food and products that are grown organically, locally, and sustainably. Local food production is supported in the County's Comprehensive Plan, but mainly in the Rural Areas. Over the past several years, however, a number of residents have asked for permission to keep chickens, pigs, or goats in Albemarle's Development Areas. This topic was identified for study in 2011 at the beginning of the update process.

Staff Comment: Staff prepared a detailed staff report for the July 24, 2012 Planning Commission meeting (link provided at the beginning of this report). It provided background on ways in which urban agriculture (mostly through the keeping of hens, milk goats, and bees) occurs in some localities and issues for discussion in Albemarle. While the Planning Commission supported allowing community gardening in the Development Areas, it was not convinced that agricultural activities involving animals or livestock were appropriate for the Development Areas. They recommended that such agricultural activities be studied to see if there are ways to allow for urban agriculture without harming the safety, welfare, and enjoyment of adjoining property owners.

- **Additional Information**
After the Board's October 7 work session on the Development Areas, the Village of Rivanna (VOR) Advisory Council met to recommend a final set of changes to the text of the Plan regarding the measurement of density, expectations for density in Village Centers, and additional expectations for consideration of the needs and wishes of persons already living and owning property in an area, should new Villages be designated or expanded. Attachment C contains the VOR Advisory Council's final recommendations.

Most of these requests were included in the staff report for October 7 and the Board provided direction, as indicated in the Action Memo found here:

http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/Forms_Center/Departments/Board_of_Supervisors/Forms/Action_Letters/2014_Actions/10072014actions.pdf.

Some of the additional wording changes can be included as part of the edits to this Chapter; however, other requested changes are substantive. These changes normally would be discussed during the next Master Plan update for the Village of Rivanna. Staff offers no additional recommendations, but has provided Attachment C for the Board's information.

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, addressed the Board, stating that Supervisors have been going over all the chapters in the Comprehensive Plan beginning the previous May. She said, at tonight's meeting, the Board is scheduled talk about the Development Areas, as it did in October. She noted that the Board was expecting to talk about the Transportation chapter and Parks and Green Systems chapter in December. She said, in January, the Board will review the Community Facilities chapter along with the other items which were referred to the Planning Commission. Ms. Echols said there have been a lot of questions about the red-line chapters, and she stated that staff would make both the red-line and the clean copies available so it will be easy to see what updates have been made. She stated that those copies would be provided to the Board via DropBox, along with the subsequent chapters, but staff's

request is that Supervisors discuss the changed chapters after the full review of the entire document. Ms. Echols said the Board is scheduled to review the Implementation chapter in February, at which time, the Board will be setting up its priorities and identifying the items which are most important to accomplish first. In March, the Board will go over the red-line chapters which will be the Development areas including the final changes to the Implementation chapter. She noted that the Board should be ready for a public hearing in April with adoption to occur after that. She stated that there have also been many ways in which the Board has gotten public participation and, while there have not been tons of comments received through Engage Albemarle, staff has received some and have compiled them for the Board. Ms. Echols said the Board also receives emails from constituents and others who are interested in this particular project, and there have also been 60 or so Planning Commission meetings for the public to provide input.

Ms. Echols reported that the current work session intends to finish up Chapter 8 – Development Areas – which would begin with public comment at the beginning of the meeting and again at 7:00 p.m. She said the topics for this meeting were the Neighborhood Model and the higher-level discussion of principles, where the Board is with the Planning Commission's recommendations, including the two appendices – Neighborhood Model design guidance and land use guidelines; and discussion on infill and redevelopment, neighborhood preservation, public investment, priority areas and what those mean, and urban agriculture.

The Chair opened the public comment period, stating that there would be two comment periods during the work session.

Mr. John Lowry of the Samuel Miller District addressed the Board and stated that, as Supervisors approach the finish line to an epic effort of revising the Comprehensive Plan, accolades need to be given, as the Plan is the County's most important policy document. He said, compared to the late 1990s, the new version is elegant, readable and available online. Mr. Lowry said the Comprehensive Plan was built on conflict, and begins with the wish to have Albemarle County look and feel rural which is in direct conflict with the development area. He stated that the growth area is to capture population, business and retail activity. He said, in order to make the Plan work, water and sewer hookups are not allowed outside the development area adding that, in most places, water and sewer is a sign of progress but, in Albemarle, it is a policy tool. Mr. Lowry said conflict is also created by the County's Zoning code. He said, in order to direct population growth to the development area, homebuilding density is allowed in a growth area but not in the rural area. He stated that the consequence is that large homes are built in the countryside, retirees come to the County and pay real estate taxes, which gives the appearance of being healthy but has an associated cost which is paid by thousands of those who are less well-off who come here to work but cannot afford to live here. Mr. Lowry said, with this Plan, the conflict is only going to get worse. He stated that use of property tax within the development area also creates conflict, adding that tax on rural land is least whereas tax on light industry is a magnitude greater and, on commercial property, it would be doubled. Mr. Lowry said, as a result, mostly homes are built in the development area. He noted that staff had included land in the development area for light industry, but the Planning Commission pulled most of that addition until it could be demonstrated that a property would be "business-useful." Mr. Lowry said he hoped the Supervisors would say 'yes' to good things for young people, as they need better job opportunities. He stated that, at the end of the Comprehensive Plan, there is the implementation chapter, and he hoped Comprehensive Plan amendments would be welcome. Mr. Lowry mentioned that Monticello received a Comprehensive Plan amendment for county water and sewer earlier this year, and hoped that the Board would be open-minded when businesses come to the County to request amendment to the Plan. He emphasized that the Plan is not an end, it is a beginning.

Mr. Jeff Werner of the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) addressed the Board, stating that the County added land to the growth area at Piney Mountain for Motorola, but that business ended up locating in Goochland County, never building their factory there. Mr. Werner said, in looking at the maps and the property information, there is a lot of light industrial land out there. He said, if the people who own that land do not want to develop it for light industrial, then perhaps the County should take it out of the growth area and add it to an area where someone is willing to do so. He said he believes in the market and, if the market is there, the land will develop. Mr. Werner stated that, concerning the land-locking of the Department of Defense facility, the Comprehensive Plan says, "Encourage base location expansion consistent with County policies," but he would suggest something that says, "The County consider the needs and requirements of Rivanna Station." He said the County should make a commitment to working with the University on on-grounds housing for faculty, staff and students, as a significant amount of traffic in the community is going to one of the thousands of parking space at U-Hall or Blue Lot. Mr. Werner said there are only about 100 units on grounds for faculty and staff, and about 30-35% of the student population lives on grounds. He said there are a lot of different words used, i.e., services, facilities, infrastructure and asked the Board to define what those words mean as a more complete picture. He said it would help people understand the Plan a little better.

There being no additional speakers, the Chair closed the public comment period.

Ms. Echols stated that the Board could move forward with the Development Areas presentation, but she had heard that Supervisors were interested in making comments on what has been done to date.

Ms. Dittmar reported that she would be working with staff to prepare a flyer which could be attached to any emails Supervisors receive which could explain to people who may be confused in terms of the Board having already made decisions. She announced that, on the first Wednesday of every month, there are two comment periods, so people can comment at that time even if the Comprehensive Plan is not on the agenda. Ms. Dittmar said the public could also email the Board or just the Supervisor

of their choice, and citizens can also use the "Engage Albemarle" platform. She noted that Supervisors would be holding town hall meetings in November and December, and one of the things people may wish to comment on at these meetings is the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Dittmar said there would be a clean-up and prioritization work session in 2015. She said a public hearing for the Comprehensive Plan would be held before the Board makes a decision on adoption, which would be on top of the 60+ meetings before the Board ever started and all the meetings that have already taken place in 2014. She noted that the reason the Board went from two meetings per month to one meeting is because Supervisors were using only a certain amount of time at each of its regular Board meetings. She said the Board did not feel that was enough time, nor was it focused so the decision was made to add a third Board meeting per month to talk solely about the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Dittmar said she attended her first annual Virginia Association of Counties (VACO) meeting with several Supervisors. She said the Board was complimented on how much the Board engages citizens in the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that there has been some confusion about actions people think the Board may have already taken. She said, in that regard, she met with a business manager in her district, and also Neil Williamson who had written an editorial, both of whom were left with the impression that the Rural Area chapters had given Monticello veto power with its viewshed. Ms. Dittmar emphasized that this is not what the Board did, and felt that would be made clear once that is looked at. She said there was also an impression that certain recreational uses in the rural area would be banned and, while those are of great concern to the County and the Board would want to consider the adverse impacts of those uses, nothing had been banned. Ms. Dittmar said, if the language seems to constrict more than what individuals would like it to, there was still plenty of time to discuss it. She stated that there was also concern about the Board's attitude toward economic development, but the County has posted the economic development director position and was seeking a seasoned professional to kick off the formation of the County's formal office here. She said the position closes on November 24. Ms. Dittmar said this effort shows a real commitment on the part of this Board and previous Boards as far as what it wants to do in that area in the future.

Ms. Echols presented the Development Areas, and stated that the Board had reviewed the goal for that chapter at its last work session. She stated that development areas are places where people want to live, places which have walk-able neighborhoods, employment centers, and also where the County extends its services and facilities. She stated that there are 12 Neighborhood Model principles, and referenced a series of slides to illustrate what the existing list looks like and what the Commission did with that list. Ms. Echols said the Commission reordered some of those principles in terms of what the Neighborhood Model means. She stated that Commissioners made a change to one of the principles which deal with multi-modal options. She said staff took the list to the Commission along with ideas as to how to reduce or generalize it, but the Planning Commission stated very clearly that it did not want to do that. Ms. Echols said a mixture of uses was important to Commissioners, along with Neighborhood Centers as place-making and places for people to be, housing types and affordability, interconnections, and neighborhood-friendly streets and paths. She stated that Commissioners felt it was acceptable to drop neighborhood-friendly streets and paths because there are currently requirements for sidewalks, curb and gutter, so having that as a principle was not as important as making sure there were more multi-modal transportation opportunities. Ms. Echols said parks and open space became 'parks, recreational amenities and open space' to help support the residents in the development areas. She said site planning, which respects terrain, was changed to 'respecting terrain and careful grading and regrading of terrain.' She noted that there is an understanding that, if the County is going to be using the land in the development areas and it is hilly, the landscape would have to be modified somewhat in order to accommodate new development. Ms. Echols said the real issue is, as greater densities occur, the County would want to ensure that the parcel to parcel relationships are positive in order to avoid creating a lot of 'mesas' that fall off in a steep slope at an adjacent property line. She explained that the text acknowledges that the County cannot preserve every environmental feature in the development areas if those are going to be used for development. She noted that the final provision emphasized 'clear boundaries within the rural area.'

Mr. Sheffield said he has heard from some constituents that there is not a lot of flexibility in the Neighborhood Model the way it exists now, but he was not entirely clear what was meant by that.

Ms. Echols explained that, when the County has a special use permit or rezoning request in the development areas, that request is compared to the Neighborhood Model principles to determine how well the principles are met. She said not every project meets every principle; it is an aspiration. She said, in the existing Comprehensive Plan, the Neighborhood Model principles inform the preferred form of development. Ms. Echols noted that, if someone wanted to develop something similar to Fontana, that would not be the preferred type of development now because it does not have curb and gutter, sidewalk and street trees. She said there are more compact development forms such as Old Trail and Belvedere, but that is not to say there are not some circumstances in which someone could propose something that has a different form; it is just not the preferred form. Ms. Echols said the flexibility is really a matter of how the Planning Commission and the Board want to apply the principles. She stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a guide, and the Board decides on how much of a guide it wants it to be for new development which is proposed. She said the flip side of that is the Neighborhood Model was intentionally developed to try to create the places where people will want to live, in a more dense form than what the County was experiencing in the 90s, which was a much more rural suburban form that seemed to be using up a lot of land without providing for amenities.

Mr. Boyd said what he would like to know is, when staff reviews a particular proposal, which items on the list are absolute necessities. He added that most of the neighborhoods that were built in the County prior to 2001 would not fit the Neighborhood Model today, but a lot of people like those

neighborhoods. He stated that Forest Lakes is an example because it does not have through streets; it has cul-de-sacs and things people want to have.

Ms. McKeel stated that she hears from her very urban neighborhoods that there is concern when the Neighborhood Model butts up against existing older neighborhoods. She explained that there are people who experience sudden changes in the dynamics in older neighborhoods beyond what it has any control over and does not always mesh, particular in areas right up against the City. She said, like Mr. Sheffield, she is looking for that flexibility. Ms. McKeel stated that she recalled seeing something in the Comprehensive Plan which talked about transition areas, i.e., transition from Neighborhood Models to existing neighborhoods.

Ms. Echols responded that there were two things: a Transition Land Use category which staff is recommending be taken out of the list of land uses, and is less about form and more about uses. She said, in the infill section which the Board will discuss at this meeting, the model talks about how to preserve existing neighborhoods while accommodating new development and it is not easy. Ms. Echols stated that, if someone lived in a neighborhood for a long time with a vacant parcel next door, there is an expectation that the parcel would not develop for a very long time and then someone comes in with a proposal for development, which is a hard thing to understand. She said this is compounded by the goal of increased efficiency and greater density so the County does not have to expand the development areas. She said, in the infill section, there is language about ways to mitigate those impacts, especially at the edges. Ms. Echols said, regarding Mr. Boyd's question about flexibility, when staff is reviewing something, they look to find ways the Neighborhood Model can be applied without having a stark difference between the property next door. With Fontana, for example, she said there was an additional part of that development which was rezoned in 2006. She said staff's recommendation was for the new streets that were extending Fontana north of where it is now would have curb and gutter and sidewalk and street trees so the existing form of the rural section was not continued. Ms. Echols said this was partly because the regulations had changed and the development to the north of that was going to have curb and gutter and sidewalk and street trees because that was a requirement. She stated that, in the transition areas that are moving from something that exists into something that will be different, staff looks for the ways they can have the Neighborhood Model accommodated without having such a stark contrast where people feel like they are living in a whole different world or are going to be affected and have the impacts beyond what is expected. Ms. Echols emphasized that it is challenging.

Mr. Boyd said he and Mark Graham had attended a lot of meetings at Fontana where they talked about what happened at the Pavilions. He said those residents were very unhappy about what was built next to them, because it was a very high-density townhome development.

Ms. McKeel said, as developers are building in dense development areas, there is a deterioration of the infrastructure to address curb and gutter, sidewalks, septic systems, etc. so, all of a sudden, the newer neighborhoods seem much more attractive. She stated that, if the County is not keeping the older 40 and 50-year old neighborhoods up, there is huge turnover in those areas within the urban ring. Ms. McKeel stated that the County needs to be looking not just at the new developments and Neighborhood Model developments, but also considering the older existing neighborhoods.

Mr. Sheffield said the County has done that work in the past, but it had to be abandoned with the recession.

Ms. McKeel said she did not really see any work like that up until 2007.

Mr. Foley stated that the Board has set up specific funding in the Capital improvement Program (CIP) for master planned areas but that was for new developments. He stated that there was some money designated for interconnecting streets, but there has not been a focus on infrastructure funding for sidewalks and things in existing neighborhoods. Mr. Foley noted that the County never even got to the new areas due to limited capital funding.

Ms. McKeel said the County must address this or people will continue to move out into the rural areas. She said her goal is to make the Development Area an attractive place to live, and to make it a choice. She stated that Crozet is a great model, but you cannot take that model and move it into the area around the urban ring because it just does not work, so the Board has to figure something else out.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff would like to address at this meeting the areas that are the close-in, suburban ring areas. He said this is an issue in a lot of the urban places around the country, with a lot of work being done in some of those places to try to address it programmatically as well as with capital improvements. He stated that he was not sure it could be addressed in this Plan, but it should probably be a high priority strategy for work in the next year or two to start addressing these things and identify ways this could be funded.

Mr. Foley said he and Ms. McKeel have discussed the sidewalk planning process, which currently identifies priority sidewalk projects according to certain criteria that has been in place for some time. He said the question is whether those criteria ought to begin to change, so that sidewalk funding could go to some of the critical interfaces between new and old neighborhoods. He said that is a strategy the Board should consider, because the County does have sidewalks going into places where some people say there is not a lot of walking traffic. Mr. Foley said, although a lot of work has gone into that sidewalk plan, it is a strategy the Board may have to rethink.

Mr. Cilimberg said one of the reasons for the tension between developing areas is, when there was a very large rezoning for Fontana, the Pavilions and a lot of other development under the Luxor rezoning, it was very limited in terms of specifying expectations. He said the rezoning basically gave that large area a higher-density zoning category along with the opportunity to do a lot of different densities of residential, but did not address infrastructure needs, relationships between areas, amenities, use of cash proffers, etc. Mr. Cilimberg said the County got from that development some of the tensions out of a zoning that probably needed to address much more than it did, which is one of the reasons why the Neighborhood Model became so important. He said the model was a better way to address large areas and, in turn, provide for and spell out the kinds of things that would happen within those areas. He said the County began to see projects that were more like a Forest Lakes or a Belvedere because, at that time, the expectations in zoning were not as great.

Ms. McKeel said she is all for having flexibility because the Board cannot make it work everywhere. She said a good example was Out of Bounds, which was working out all right because staff provided that flexibility.

Ms. Mallek said one tool that was used in the way that the newer versus older neighborhoods in Crozet have been affected similarly is an evaluation of whether having the maximum density in the infill places is always the best way to go about it. She stated that when someone is trying to use a density of 6-36 units versus 4-6, it is a very big change.

Ms. McKeel stated that the Board does not want the development area to seem like an apology for the rural area; Supervisors want it to be a vibrant place where people choose to live.

Mr. Boyd said the Pavilions situation was due to a by-right development, and he has been defending that position for a long time.

Ms. Mallek said she would like a little more explanation of what is meant by "respecting terrain." She said one important issue is having topography and not assuming that everything has to be flat.

Mr. Foley asked Ms. Echols if staff would clarify the comments related to "interface" as a higher priority, because it is one thing to talk about it and another to make it part of statements that guide planners in making decisions.

Ms. Echols said she would get to that, as it comes up later in her presentation.

Mr. Boyd said this discussion gets to the question Supervisors have been battling around for years: whether the Neighborhood Model is "a" model or "the" model.

Ms. Mallek stated that "preferred" is the key word, not "required."

Mr. Boyd said "the" model is the interpretation being made by developers.

Ms. McKeel said she was not sure if people that live in the development areas feel they are getting the services being talked about, adding that the County needs to make sure it is walking the walk.

Mr. Boyd commented that the top item is pedestrian orientation and mixed uses, yet the County has structurally built barriers to that with Route 29 and Route 250. He said the Board needs to start concentrating on how to somehow make these pedestrian-friendly and connect commercial areas with residential.

Ms. McKeel commented that both she and Mr. Sheffield have bus stops in their districts where people are unable to get to them, because it is not safe to cross the street to get to the bus stop.

Ms. Echols said this is a very good illustration of why the Neighborhood Model became important because, before the model, the County indicated it wanted to have a pedestrian orientation but, in the development regulations, providing sidewalks was optional. She said, until the County included that stipulation in the Neighborhood Model which indicated this was an essential part of the development areas without providing those as the exception, the County did not have people providing sidewalks very often.

Ms. McKeel said that is great for new developments, but does not address existing ones.

Ms. Echols stated that, using Northfield Green as an example, staff's position was that the applicant was asking for way too much density for the context within which it was set. She said staff's recommendation was to try to get a form and a density that works better with the existing neighborhood. She said it was not a matter of doing everything in every single case. She added that there is certainly subjectivity to this, and staff wanted to make it clear that, in all cases, every aspect of the Neighborhood Model may not be appropriate. Ms. Echols said the current Comprehensive Plan says that and, if it is not stated clearly, staff would want to add that back in so it is clear.

Ms. Echols reported that the Neighborhood Model currently has examples for design guidance which are slightly outdated and need to be updated. She said staff got a lot of recommendations through the Places 29 Master Plan as to how to achieve the principles of the Neighborhood Model, which is more of a "how to" guide. She said, in one example, providing for affordable units included accessory units in townhouse apartments. She said it is hard to tell from the outside that there are affordable units on the

inside of these structures, which was one of the model's recommendations. Ms. Echols stated that the point of the design guidance is to offer different ways to achieve different principles, and the proposed appendix is a bit larger than the one in the existing Neighborhood Model and reflects many of the successes in how developers have achieved these principles. She congratulated developers in this community for creating and achieving these principles, adding that there are many real examples now which can be demonstrated such as Wayland's Grant in Crozet, which prompted calls from nearby localities requesting tours of these types of developments.

Ms. McKeel commented that, while there is a connection between accessory and affordable units, those can be very different.

Ms. Echols agreed, stating that the example she provided is a way to make affordable units within an existing neighborhood through the use of accessory units.

Ms. McKeel said this led to another concern that the older established neighborhoods had: when you build under the Neighborhood Model and allow for accessory units, it is built in and planned for – and people understand it; however, when you take older neighborhoods and allow accessory units, you have essentially changed the zoning and the whole character of the neighborhoods, which were not built for that purpose. Ms. Echols responded that the zoning had not been changed.

Ms. McKeel said the County is essentially changing the zoning without really changing it. She said what is happening is that more people are moving into an older existing neighborhood but allowing many accessory apartments and rental units that were not built for it in terms of driveways, parking, etc. She pointed out that is concerning for the people who live in those older neighborhoods.

Ms. Mallek asked in what areas had the County done that. Ms. Echols said the County has not made any changes to the zoning for accessory units. She said every single family house in a residential district has the ability to add an accessory unit; it simply has to meet the zoning requirements which, in part, are that it has to be contained within the house, and must have zoning clearance for that particular unit.

Ms. McKeel said it does not play out that way because they often do not have the parking; they say they do but no one checks to make sure. She stated that she would really like to put this on the table, because the accessory units in older established neighborhoods have essentially had a de-facto rezoning, and many constituents have expressed frustration about this to her.

Ms. Dittmar said her understanding was, if she wanted to put an apartment in her home, she would have to get a building permit. She added that, in the application process, there would be a use issue that would come up as well. She stated that there are things which trigger oversight through the permitting process.

Ms. McKeel said she has lived in these neighborhoods, and it does not play out that way.

Ms. Dittmar said those are violations, and is a different thing than what the Board is considering tonight.

Ms. McKeel said, while the Board is discussing accessory units in the context of the Comprehensive Plan, she would like to put it on the table.

Ms. Echols said that is something staff might have talked about during the Housing chapter, and perhaps Supervisors would want to bring that up when that chapter resurfaces for discussion. She said that is the place where the Plan addresses different ways to achieve affordability as well as different options.

Mr. Foley suggested staff put that in a parking lot list of things to come back.

Ms. McKeel agreed with that approach.

Ms. Palmer asked if it is permissible for a homeowner to put an additional unit within their house as long as it is contained within the house. She also asked about designated space for parking and also if the homeowner would be required to obtain a building permit to do so. She asked what else a homeowner would be required to do.

Ms. McKeel said, in theory, it can play out one way and, in reality, play out another way.

Mr. Davis stated that what is being discussed is called an "accessory apartment" in the Zoning Ordinance, which is covered by supplemental regulations. He said it requires a minimum of three off-street parking spaces arranged so that each has reasonably uninhibited access to the street and is subject to the Zoning Administrator's approval. He clarified that three parking spaces would be required to be identified for a single-family unit to establish an accessory apartment.

Ms. McKeel said if the County is going to say that, then the County needs to ensure that is the case because it is happening and there is no enforcement.

Mr. Sheffield suggested the Board table that discussion for another conversation, because he has residents that have the opposite concern which is the difficulty of getting through the hurdles to have an accessory apartment.

Mr. Davis stated that there are a lot of criteria for that.

Ms. McKeel said it may just be in her area, because she hears lots of complaints about it.

Mr. Foley said it is important to not say there is no zoning enforcement.

Ms. McKeel said she did not mean there was none, but her experience has been that there have been some issues with it and, once it is there, it is very difficult to deal with.

Ms. Echols suggested that Supervisors finish the Neighborhood Model and set that issue aside.

Ms. Echols presented the new land use categories and guidelines, where staff is trying to standardize what the master plan land use categories are so there are not a lot of different uses for different areas. Ms. Echols said the guidelines speak to the purpose and intent of the district, the primary uses, the secondary uses, and expected heights. She said the Planning Commission deliberately asked for some photographs and a plan version of what it is the County would be promoting so people can get a positive image as to what these particular land use areas would look like. Ms. Echols stated that the examples she has were Parkside Village, Belvedere, and Wayland's Grant. She said what these examples show is a more compact form of development but also how the County would want its new neighborhoods to look and feel. She said she was pointing this out so the Board would know it is different than having every master plan with a different set of land use categories and guidelines. Ms. Echols noted that staff used a lot of what was in Places 29, but also what was used in Crozet and Pantops in order to standardize them.

Ms. Echols stated that the last section under the Neighborhood Model was also in the appendix, and provides some guidelines for setbacks, sidewalks and urban streets. She said it came from several different places, with the first being the Crozet Master Plan where the County talked about Neighborhood Model-type streets and the appropriate distances from the street where one would want to have a building, and what planting zones would be like. Ms. Echols stated that Crozet was very different than the Places 29 area, so there are different sizes of streets and different functions of streets, with different setback needs and requirements. She said the Places 29 Master Plan provided some extra guidance for the streets which are larger than those in Crozet. Ms. Echols said the state did some work on recommendations for different types of streets and what those setbacks would be, and staff took all three of those sources of information and put them in the recommendations that the Planning Commission has made for different setbacks, for buildings, and other types of improvements that would exist along the street. She mentioned that this was new for all of the development areas and was the basis for which some zoning text amendments would be coming to the Board in the near future related to reduced-front setbacks.

Mr. Boyd said, when the Development Initiatives Steering Committee (DISC) was creating the Neighborhood Model, the whole idea behind it was to create a place where one could live and play and work but he did not see professional types of jobs being created in these neighborhoods, where people can afford to live and have their employment there. Mr. Boyd said it seems the County needs to separate those two things. He added that, at the recent VACO conference, he listened to what other communities were doing as far as economic development and it was very different than Albemarle's approach. He said, in his observation, people cannot afford to live in the neighborhoods and work in the retail establishments there.

Mr. Sheffield asked Mr. Boyd to clarify what he meant about the approach of other localities. Mr. Boyd explained that those jurisdictions were focusing very specifically on industrial zoning.

Mr. Sheffield said those localities were working from the employment side to the residential, rather than residential to employment. Mr. Boyd said he did not know the answer, but it was his observation. He said the pattern that Albemarle had been following for a long time was to build the neighborhood first and then build the jobs around it, and he was not sure that was working.

Mr. Sheffield asked if it could be an easier market to satisfy the residential side. He said it seemed the commercial aspect was harder so perhaps the County should try to get that first. Mr. Cilimberg said the commercial side needs rooftops.

Mr. Boyd said that pertained to retail, and he was talking about professional and medical type offices.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there is the more holistic approach that the master plans are trying to address which is trying to identify in master planned areas where jobs can be located in relationship to residential, rather than every residential project trying to have an employment center in that project. He said it is the combination of residential, commercial and industrial type development in close proximity, with the "centers" concept in the master plans attempting to at least try to bring the residential closer to the jobs. Mr. Cilimberg said, with a lot of jobs potentially concentrated at the UVA Research Park at Hollymead, the idea was that there would be good opportunities nearby for residential development. He said North Point was, in part, intended to compliment the jobs which would ultimately be located in the research park.

Mr. Boyd said, unfortunately, because of Route 29, it does not become pedestrian-oriented. Mr. Cilimberg said that is why the County needs to address how to make areas more connected through infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Boyd said that might help the business community too, because a lot of millennials want to bike to work or walk to work, and he feels it is government's responsibility to build the infrastructure, such as pedestrian overpasses.

Ms. Dittmar asked Ms. Echols if the Board was ready to move beyond this part. Ms. Echols said she did not know if there were any specific issues related to the principles of the Neighborhood Model or the design guidance or even setbacks. She said the subsequent topics would be on infill, redevelopment, neighborhood preservation, and the importance of investing in infrastructure.

Ms. Dittmar said she had some comments about objective three.

Ms. Echols stated that objective three was, "Promote commercial, industrial and other non-residential development within the development areas."

Ms. Dittmar said several Supervisors had recently attended a presentation on where technology companies wanted to locate, and these are issues which have been raised before at the Tom Tom Festival and elsewhere. She asked if this chapter would address that because, even though the spreadsheet references "location needs," it does not really talk about the commercial model or the jobs model. Ms. Dittmar said she is not fully educated about special districts which can be created that would function as business corridors. She added that there are some aging or decaying locations on which work could be done.

Ms. Echols said that issue is in the master plans, adding that there are particular areas such as in Places 29 which are small area plan recommendations to address what Ms. Dittmar brought up.

Ms. Dittmar said there is more than just Route 29, with Pantops, Avon Street Extended, Woolen Mills, etc. She said, for those places that do not have a specific master plan, perhaps there should be some language in the Comprehensive Plan about the creation of dynamic areas for "place-making."

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the Neighborhood Model was intended to imply that. He said what Ms. Dittmar is indicating is more of an active language on the interconnection and interaction of those areas and uses. He added that place-making is increasingly important in economic development based on the kinds of jobs being created and the kind of lifestyle those employees like, particularly younger ones.

Mr. Foley asked staff to clarify the language in the Comprehensive Plan which would prop that up and promote it.

Ms. Echols said staff could put it in there adding that there is a relationship between the priority areas already in the plan and what the Board is talking about. She said staff could add a strategy which talks about identifying areas for additional study and potential investment to create places for future mixed-use areas.

Mr. Boyd said the County should also pick places near the infrastructure that these companies are looking for such as access to interstates, access to railroads, reliable power, water and sewer, high-speed internet capabilities, and so forth. He stated that he is concerned the County does not currently have those sites.

Mr. Cilimberg said it really depends on what kind of company Mr. Boyd is talking about, because some might be looking for attributes such as location near rail lines, but others are more about a synergy around employers that are more internet-based.

Mr. Sheffield said the County is coming up on the need to revise Places 29, which is based on when the adoption process began. He noted that he is a bit frustrated by that plan because it is too massive for Supervisors to get their hands around. He said the advisory council the Board created is still struggling with how to take that forward, and stated that things have changed since that Plan was put together. Mr. Sheffield said he is trying to figure out how to approach that plan to make it what the Board wants it to be and make it effective because it is getting stale and losing its viability.

Ms. Echols said other master plan areas might say the same thing, adding that Pantops has been patiently waiting for the next update and is actually next in line to get an update. She said, after that, it is a question of whether Places 29 needs to be bumped up after Pantops. She stated that Pantops is the County's oldest plan and needs to be revitalized in certain areas. Ms. Echols referenced a slide with a land use plan which identifies a priority area for planning and public investment which would create certain places, with a river orientation that is very similar to the river corridor project and also the revitalization of the area south of Route 250. She said, in Crozet, it is the downtown area that is the priority, and the industrially-designated area east of the downtown where there are opportunities to create two nodes that would then connect those two places. Ms. Echols said, in Places 29, the first priority has to do with transportation improvements. She said, for areas that need lots of attention, perhaps the Board would address those in the master planning process or just specifically identify what needs to be updated. She stated that the Southern and Western neighborhoods also have priority areas, focusing on study and investment of the small area near Monticello High School in addition to the Woolen Mills areas. She stated that the second area being considered is the Southwood Mobile Home Park. She said the third

area is the Ivy Road corridor, which has some improvements already planned. Ms. Echols emphasized that the concept does exist, however, it may not be articulated to the extent it needs to be. She said the Board would make the decision as to which master plan gets updated next, adding that the Pantops Advisory Council has asked when it could get started on the update, as they are ready and waiting.

Mr. Sheffield said these plans cannot be just about setting the infrastructure the County is investing in, but also setting expectations for those neighborhoods. He said his frustration with Places 29 is that the advisory council has deviated from those expectations. He stated that, with Berkmar Drive, the Board talked about allowing Colonial Auto to rezone the property, and he supported it because it helps to initiate that process and redefine expectations. Mr. Sheffield said Supervisors will still wrestle with people pushing back, but at least the Board can point to these documents and define expectations.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the master plans can feel a little overwhelming because they cover such a big area and try to cover so many interests. He said it seems the Board is saying there needs to be more focus on specific aspects of the master plans and the update process. He said, when the County did Crozet's update, the Board ended up focusing on a few things which needed attention, things which were most important in making decisions. Mr. Cilimberg said, in Places 29, the Board identified the small area plan around the Route 29/Rio Road intersection, but a larger area should be covered either with or before a new master plan update, because it would be more focused on how to make that area work.

Mr. Sheffield said the Board does the work, but when it rezones to match the master plans, the County is still getting pushback from the community. He stated that the County is in a new era of the development area, adding that the recession has changed how he looks at that. He said the County needs to get ahead of things before they get rolling.

Mr. Cilimberg said the Downtown Crozet District was something the master plan had identified as being important so, rather than waiting around for rezonings that might or might not fit the guidelines for downtown, the Board decided to zone the downtown area of Crozet to meet its expectations.

Mr. Boyd asked if that had paid off yet. Mr. Cilimberg said there have been a couple of projects but, unfortunately, the area they would have liked to include in the zoning chose not to be included and that is where the attention is now being paid.

Ms. Mallek said the pending application is to bring it into the zone.

Mr. Foley said that is an example of an implementation phase, adding that a lot of what the Board is discussing is about implementing it. He said the Board is setting the frame within which all of it goes, and this discussion helps determine if that frame is appropriate. He emphasized that there is so much work to go to the next level of implementation, and the strategic plan for development areas would start to address what the County does on the ground that makes a difference, such as zoning.

Ms. Dittmar said objective three, which is non-master plan specific, provides an opportunity for the Board to articulate its vision for the vibrancy of commercial/industrial and non-residential development. She stated that there are some new initiatives which would be exciting to address here, i.e., looking at specific trends such as overlay districts focusing on special urban areas, enterprise zones, or strategic investment areas such as what the City has focused on. Ms. Dittmar said, as the Board moves through the Comprehensive Plan, it could consider some of these tools to look at how to protect or enhance or enrich or excite.

Mr. Cilimberg said Ms. Dittmar's statements inspire place-making but also identify tools which might be utilized in doing that, although not all will be applicable for the County. He added that there are ways to create incentives and creating special areas for revenue production.

Ms. Mallek asked if Places 29 should be divided into smaller pods going forward because of the enormity of it, adding that the Rio area itself is bigger than the entire Crozet growth area. She stated that it would be a real burden to expand on what staff demands are, but it might help each individual pod to move forward faster.

Ms. Echols said that was possible, as there are four neighborhoods the County is trying to do planning for, with a lot of it related to the Route 29 corridor. She said something that could be considered would be how to make the smaller areas a bit more cohesive. She stated that the Board had talked about having two different advisory councils – one for the south and one for the north – but it was not possible to do that at the time. Ms. Echols said one of the real successes of the Crozet story is that the community was so invested in the Plan and there were advocates for the Plan. She said what the County would want for all of the master planned areas is for the community to have ownership of the master plan and be advocates to other people moving to the area or people who have a different set of expectations.

Ms. Echols reported that the Neighborhood Model has a particular principle which talks about the importance of redevelopment, including infill, and this has been a matter of improving but not expanding the development areas. She said this would be using the development areas more efficiently by getting as much utility out of it as is possible. Ms. Echols stated that there is also objective five, independent of the Neighborhood Model recommendations, which talks about facilitating infill development including redevelopment but, in doing so, respecting the cohesiveness of existing neighborhoods and minimizing the impacts from new uses. She said tension exists in every community where there is infill or redevelopment and is between what exists and what is proposed. Ms. Echols stated that there are five strategies here and most of them come out of the existing Comprehensive Plan. She said the first

strategy has to do with provision of infrastructure improvements such as road improvements, utility extensions, and other things that can be impediments to developing sites. She said the next strategy involves encouragement to help avoid rural development pressure; the next relates to the importance of involving the neighborhoods to find ways to minimize negative impacts. She said staff is currently using neighborhood meetings as a way to solve problems before they become so huge that it is difficult to get past them. Ms. Echols said one of the challenges in meeting with the community is, if there are neighborhoods that do not want anything to happen, it becomes a difficult conversation for the developer to have with adjoining property owners. She said one of the places where that was overcome was the Spring Hill Village rezoning which recently took place in the Southern neighborhood. She said the neighbors were clear that they did not want light industrial so they worked with the developer to come up with a preferable scenario to what was on the plan initially.

Mr. Sheffield said one of the hurdles with redevelopment and infill is that there are some parts of the community that will accept it and others that will not. He said it would be helpful for the development community to understand that up front, and that is where the master plan process helps identify neighborhoods that are saying they do not want things to change.

Ms. McKeel commented that strategies C and D are negative, and asked if there was a way to make those more positive.

Mr. Foley noted that, in the past, Board members have referenced strategy 5B which says, "Encourage infill development within designated development areas." He said this strategy is important in and of itself and not just to prevent rural area development.

Mr. Boyd said he wants the focus to be on job creation and business, and what he would like to see expanded is recommendations from staff about what the County can do such as tax incentives, tax districts, etc. He mentioned the proposal from Carter Myers, stating that he has been floating that idea for more than a year.

Board members indicated that the proposal just came in, and Ms. Echols indicated that the Planning Commission was currently discussing it.

Mr. Sheffield said the Board has realized the potential delay and fast-tracked it and, in thinking of redevelopment, he was focused more on commercial and industrial.

Ms. McKeel suggested stating, "Aging neighborhoods and commercial areas."

Mr. Sheffield said the Board may wish to avoid connecting residential neighborhoods with the term "redevelopment." He stated that "reinvestment" might be more applicable.

Mr. Cilimberg said it sounds as if the Board is suggesting a more holistic approach to the idea of infill redevelopment, not only as something the County will aspire to do positively as part of place-making, but also identify ways it might happen.

Ms. Echols said, at a minimum, it sounds as if the County will need to have some additional strategies and one would be how the County would help the development community know how to best do infill in a way that is positive for a neighborhood. She said a second strategy would be to study techniques and measures for successful redevelopment.

Ms. Dittmar asked if this would be for all developments, or mainly for neighborhoods.

Ms. Echols said it would be for all developments and would provide guidelines for how infill can be done that is not so starkly different than what is around it. She said the Board talked about neighborhood preservation earlier in the meeting, and discussed ways of providing better advice or more proactive work with the development community when infill is occurring for commercial or residential development. She said that is what staff's first bullet was intended to be.

Mr. Sheffield said developers need to understand that it is a more engaged process with the community, as there are residents who would continuously want to be more engaged throughout the process.

Mr. Cilimberg said, in some cases, it would not be about relation to a neighborhood; it is more about land that has become economically ripe for change. He said it may not have a neighboring area with concerns but may instead relate to the potential of redevelopment and mixed uses.

Ms. Dittmar stated that the County shares jurisdictional borders with the City in a lot of the development areas, and wondered if there might be opportunities for joint planning such as the Woolen Mills discussion. She asked if a reference to that strategy should be included.

Ms. Palmer said the County already has that with the Rivanna River project.

Mr. Foley said it is also being discussed in the joint City-County meetings related to transportation, as that particular group is also looking at the boundaries.

Ms. Mallek said it would be helpful to add a sentence in the Plan also.

Mr. Sheffield asked if some of the Economic Development Office's duties would be to figure out incentives for commercial redevelopment.

Mr. Foley said that would definitely be included and he would make sure it will be called out specifically.

Mr. Sheffield stated that he wanted the second bullet to be more specific to industrial/commercial redevelopment, as he did not really like the idea of neighborhood redevelopment.

At 6:39 p.m., the Board recessed their meeting, and reconvened at 7:09 p.m.

Ms. Echols said the Board would continue its work on objective five.

Ms. Dittmar invited public comment.

There being none, the Chair closed the public comment period.

Ms. Echols said, at this point, the Board would return to its conversation about the importance of neighborhood preservation, which is not highlighted in this particular plan. She explained that the County speaks to the importance of preserving the character of existing neighborhoods when master plans are done. She said, when the County does master plans, attention is paid to the areas right outside of the development areas to see if there is a need to do something different at the borders, potentially expanding them. She said, in discussions about preserving existing neighborhoods, there has been discussions about what happens at the interface of the rural area and the development area. She said, given the level of conversation that has taken place, the emails received from several Board members and the importance of putting more emphasis on what is going on in existing neighborhoods as it relates to the physical infrastructure, staff thinks the Board may want to recommend additional strategies for investment in the improvement of existing neighborhoods in order to distinguish it from redevelopment and shift the focus to enhancing existing neighborhoods. Ms. Echols said the Commission did not cover this topic as it did not come up during its meetings, however, this matter has been identified as being important to the Board so now is the time to suggest more input and even specific strategies.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to see an objective ten dealing with existing neighborhoods.

Mr. Sheffield suggested an objective to address "Neighborhood preservation and investment."

Ms. McKeel commented that she would like to see language like that.

Ms. Echols said the Board could add an objective six which would speak to the importance of investing in older neighborhoods for their preservation.

Mr. Boyd said he would also like to add investing in infrastructure in areas such as Route 250 and Route 29 in an effort to make those roadways more pedestrian-friendly.

Ms. McKeel said she thought that would be part of it.

Mr. Sheffield said that would connect neighborhoods to adjacent retail and commercial areas.

Mr. Boyd said that would help with job creation, adding that the County lost a major employer at Pantops because they wanted to be located in a walkable neighborhood.

Ms. Echols stated that the Board had requested examples of successes, with one example being Old Trail. She said Old Trail allowed for a major employment center and that code of development allows for it which would provide opportunities for people to live and work in close proximity. She said the employer Mr. Boyd mentioned earlier had indicated to the County that there was not enough energy in Old Trail for them to locate there.

Mr. Boyd said U.S. Joyner might be an example, which seemed to provide higher level jobs that would allow people to live in Crozet and work for that company.

Ms. Echols said U.S. Joyner came from Waynesboro, and the owners wanted to move the building to Crozet.

Ms. Mallek said she met a young software entrepreneur at the place-making meeting held at The Haven. She said he was excited to learn about the possibilities in downtown Crozet, and he already lives there.

Ms. Echols stated that objective six talks about preserving the natural systems that are shown for preservation on the master plans, and those are covered quite well with the master plans. She said objective seven talked about matching infrastructure availability and capacity with new development, especially in priority areas. She said priority areas were something the Board had asked about, adding that there has been discussion with the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee's work on the proffer policy. Ms. Echols said priority areas are identified on the master plans as places that would be available for infill, redevelopment, and new development where those opportunities are good, and most effectively

supported by existing infrastructure and services. She stated that those would be preferred areas for public investment and have been identified as more appropriate for near-term rezonings because they are either already identified for public investment or are already projects occurring in that area where investments are going to be made. Ms. Echols said the master plans have said that, if rezonings are proposed outside of those priority areas, greater mitigation of impacts may be needed. She explained that priority areas were established in order to give the Board better guidance when it is looking at a rezoning application and what is being done to mitigate impacts.

Ms. McKeel said she wanted to ensure the language does not imply that these are the only areas where there would be investment.

Ms. Echols said strategy 7B says, "Make decisions to approve new development with an understanding of where public investments are being focused. Give priority to approving rezonings and special use permits that are consistent with the priority areas established in the development area master plans." She said most of the language, if not all of it, has been lifted out of the existing plan. She said it first started in the Pantops Master Plan where the first priority area discussion was held, and was picked up in Places 29 and then again in Crozet. Ms. Echols said this started out as the place where the concept of concurrency was going to be discussed, because there has been a lot of concern that developments would be approved but would be so far into the future before the infrastructure needed to support those developments would ever be in place. She stated that this is where the idea of creating priority areas to provide guidance to the Board as to where capital improvements should go. She said objective 7 includes, "Continue to establish the priority areas in all master plans" and "Do not approve proposed rezonings and special use permits outside of priority areas when planned facilities are not in place, to support the project and existing neighborhoods, unless the proposed project would provide significant improvements to ensure adequate infrastructure and services are available to the area."

Ms. Palmer said she understood Ms. McKeel's concern, and suggested adding, "Continue to establish areas in all master plans which will be the places where the County will be prioritizing investment and infrastructure services," just to make it clear that the County was concentrating on certain areas first.

Ms. Mallek suggested phrasing it as, "...will first be investing..."

Mr. Boyd said he would like to see specifics on how to accomplish these concepts. He said there should be references to methodologies which can be used to finance infrastructure such as service districts.

Ms. Echols said the Implementation chapter addresses some of the ways to fund the kinds of things the Board wants to do, with the emphasis now on wanting to be more proactive. She said those could be added to the Implementation Chapter with a hyperlink.

Ms. Echols stated that the next section was Urban Agriculture, and she noted that staff spent a lot of time on this topic with the Planning Commission. She said community gardens are currently not allowed in the development areas as a stand-alone use, and the idea has been that agriculture takes place only in the rural areas. Ms. Echols said the City has different locations where there are community gardens, and county residents have asked if they could have a community garden on a vacant lot until the owner wants to develop it, with owner permission, but staff has had to say that the Zoning Ordinance does not allow for that.

Ms. Mallek asked how the community garden was allowed in Old Trail. Ms. Echols said zoning there allows for it but, with a by-right development, unless something is part of the open space available for everyone in the neighborhood, it is not allowed as a stand-alone use. She stated that there may be other individuals or groups in an existing neighborhood who are looking to do community gardening, and the Board may want to consider outside groups who would be doing gardening in a neighborhood other than their own. Ms. Echols said one of the gardens on 5th Street is worked by the International Rescue Committee immigrants who have come to this area, want to do gardening, and have the ability to get access. She said any group wanting to have a garden would have to be welcomed into that neighborhood and would also need the ability to get to the space as well as being able to store the necessary implements. Ms. Echols said the Board may want to explore the need for a special use permit if the garden is not intended to serve the neighborhood itself.

Mr. Boyd said this only pertains to neighborhood gardening, not farm animals. Ms. Echols said this would pertain to only vegetation at this stage. She stated that the issue of "urban chickens" has caused concern with neighbors several years ago. She said the Planning Commission wrestled with this because it wanted to support healthy living and urban agriculture but did not know how the County would be able to do that and also protect existing neighbors. She stated that staff gave them information about how it is done in Charlottesville. She said staff talked to the City's Zoning Administrator to find information on any problems experienced, who told staff that there are not many problems with the worst one being that a chicken can get loose. Ms. Echols said the County has more neighborhoods than the City, so the situation may be different, but the Planning Commission said it wanted to study it more to figure out if it could be done in a way which would provide healthier food opportunities without causing problems for existing neighbors.

Mr. Boyd asked if the City required that the animals be kept in a cage or a fenced area. Ms. Echols said the animals had to be in fenced areas, and confirmed that roosters were not allowed.

Mr. Boyd said he has heard pros and cons of this issue from constituents.

Ms. Palmer said she was a big fan of having chickens, but was concerned about people's ability to keep them in, how fast the traffic is, and how few animal control officers the County has. She stated that it is a very busy department which is quite understaffed, and expressed concern because goats are very good at getting out.

Ms. Mallek said there is also a standard of care which is very difficult in a very small space and, if an owner does not have really good storage places for feed, it could become an attraction for vermin. She said she worried about the life of a chicken that is stuck in a dog crate with 10 other birds.

Ms. McKeel commented that this is happening in pockets all over neighborhoods, some successful and some not so successful.

Ms. Palmer said this is happening in suburban neighborhoods in rural areas everywhere.

Mr. Sheffield said some of his constituents have expressed concerns about the slaughter of animals such as chickens and goats.

Ms. McKeel commented that it can be a cultural thing.

Mr. Sheffield said the difference is it is being done out in the open. Ms. Echols said the areas the Planning Commission wanted more study on were beekeeping, goats and laying hens.

Ms. Dittmar commented that the City of Charlottesville does not have any rural area, whereas Albemarle does, and Supervisors should proceed carefully going forward as she did not realize it was such a big issue. Ms. Echols said it really is, adding that the Planning Commission's recommendations for urban agriculture were to amend the Zoning Ordinance for community gardens as a stand-alone use, and study ways to allow urban agriculture.

Ms. Dittmar asked if any of the Board members had comments under this section.

Mr. Sheffield said he had exchanged a few emails with Ms. Echols regarding remnant roads that no longer make sense. He stated that Ms. Echols said previous changes went through a process with the Community Advisory Councils and the Planning Commission but, if there is no objection, he would like to review the roads that no longer serve their intended purpose or may never be built.

Mr. Boyd said this initiative was done with the Pantops Advisory Council.

Mr. Sheffield said he could share the list of roads with Board members individually.

Ms. Echols recommended that staff sit down with Mr. Sheffield and look at what those are, and advise him as to whether the roads were a big issue with the development of the plan, and then staff could meet with the Places 29 Advisory Council for further discussion. She noted that the road list would need to go back through the Planning Commission if they were going to be part of the Comprehensive Plan, so it would be a matter of timing.

Mr. Sheffield said it did not necessarily need to be part of the Comprehensive Plan adoption.

Ms. McKeel stated that she was hopeful that this conversation would take this chapter back to the Planning Commission for discussion on some of these areas.

Ms. Echols said she was not sure that was needed this time, as the Board has provided some additional guidance but, for the details, it would be sent back to the Planning Commission to flesh out the ways the Board would want to move forward. She said the approach was to take objective five and split it into objective five and six and then ask if that is something the Board would want the Commission to work on in the future in order to get more details. Ms. Echols said her only concern is that the Board will not be able to get through this process in the time staff thought the Board would need to get through it, if it goes back to the Commission.

Ms. McKeel asked Ms. Echols to clarify the timeframe, because the Plan was not slated to be adopted until June. Ms. Echols said staff was planning to have everything back to the Board in March, so the Board could make decisions on it after that.

Ms. McKeel said she would like the Planning Commission's input on some of these items.

Ms. Mallek asked which items Ms. McKeel was concerned about, because the Board did not change anything that she felt would need to go back and be reevaluated.

Mr. Sheffield said the neighborhood preservation item is one example.

Ms. Mallek said a paragraph in there was lifted out and highlighted but, to her, that is not a significant enough change that the Commission should have to have another hearing about.

Ms. McKeel said Ms. Echols had mentioned that the Commission did not deal with any of this discussion during its reviews.

Ms. Dittmar said one reason the Board would send it back is if Supervisors were opening up something new. She asked Supervisors to identify what specific things the Board would be asking the Commission to review.

Ms. McKeel said the Board has added a new objective, and she would like the Commission to review it and provide input.

Ms. Mallek responded that there was a paragraph that Ms. Echols could pull the lead sentence out of, and that would take care of it.

Mr. Sheffield said, if the Planning Commission is overly ambitious about it, it could take much longer than anticipated, but he was curious as to how much Commissioners were willing to take on in terms of changing some of the Development Areas section.

Mr. Foley suggested asking Ms. Echols what things might get some value and what process might be used with the Commission in order to get those back to the Board quickly, because it does not have to be a huge process. He emphasized that a lot of the things the Board has talked about are the things it should be anxious about getting involved with after the Plan is adopted. He said there are a lot of implementation items which Supervisors have talked about and, ultimately, will be the real work.

Ms. Mallek asked if that involved a separate process anyway, because that is what she thought was going to happen. Mr. Foley responded that it did, and would start with strategic plan development. He said making the distinction between implementation issues and policy which could be run by the Commission would be helpful.

Ms. Echols said, if it is a matter of simply taking the new objective and pulling together the text, staff can take that to the Commission. She said, if what the Board wants the Commission to do is to create more, then that would be more difficult.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the Board's intention was not to create more, but she would like to have Commissioners weigh in on what the Board discussed because Commissioners had not done that yet.

Ms. Dittmar asked where the Commission was with the solid waste issue and asked if it could run with that same track. Ms. Echols responded that, on December 16, Commissioners would hold a public hearing, adding that staff was waiting for the committee's final recommended wording for the Planning Commission. For that meeting, she said there would be public hearings on solid waste and the Borches property ZMA. She said, on December 2, Commissioners would address the artists' community issue along with work sessions on Woolen Mills and the Woodard property. She said, if the Commission could take a look in early January, input/feedback could be provided to the Board in February.

Ms. Dittmar commented that broadband fits nicely into the discussion of public facilities, but said that capacity is going to be a huge issue in the future, given the exponential growth in demand, and especially in denser areas. She asked if there should be a cross-link under the infrastructure section of the Development Areas chapter with the broadband section in Public Facilities.

Mr. Foley said there has been lots of discussion about having the conduit put in place when a new development comes in, but there was some question about whether it could be required. He said the fact that it is being talked about as part of development makes the communities better and more attractive, so it would be helpful to talk about strategies.

Ms. Dittmar said, in the Public Facilities chapter under objective one, there is a bullet point that says development areas serve as service center locations for the rural area, but the Town of Scottsville is not considered a development area since it belongs to the town and, in a way, the Town's comprehensive plan is a master plan. Ms. Dittmar said she wondered if there should be some mention about the Town of Scottsville in terms of some of the things the Board is discussing, because it does serve the County's rural area.

Ms. Echols said she was not sure where it would go, but staff could make the link between what Scottsville does for the rural area and how it acts as a development area within the County. She explained that, when the Town has issues on the outskirts of town, Council will talk to the County about it; and when there are things that are going on near the Town of Scottsville, the County talks to Council about it.

Ms. Echols asked if the Board wanted to talk about steep slopes within the development area, and there was general agreement among Supervisors to do so.

Ms. Echols explained that she had pulled out what the strategies were, stating that the first one was, "To encourage developers to design buildings which fit into the terrain, rather than grading the land to fit the buildings." She said the second one would require that regraded slopes be smooth rather than abrupt, which speaks to what the County did recently with managed slopes. Ms. Echols said the existing Neighborhood Model has some graphics which show how to build within the terrain; another example is showing how one can work on the uphill and downhill parts of building on a slope. She stated that those are not currently in the model's design guidance, but can bring some more of that into it so the County emphasizes that aspect as much as it emphasizes how to regrade the slopes.

Ms. Echols stated that the Board had received comments from the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council and noted that many of those things had been covered at the Board's October meeting.

Ms. Dittmar said the Citizens Advisory Committee at the Village of Rivanna had spent many hours on this, most recently 2.5-3 hours at the last one. She said Rick Randolph and Petie Craddock were in attendance and stated a strong preference for specific wording. She said she had promised them that the Board would not disregard their passion.

Ms. Echols said there were several matters of substance that Mr. Randolph and Mr. Craddock were asking to be changed, and staff brought those up with the Board last month. Ms. Echols explained that one of their suggestions was including intermittent streams in the areas that would not be eligible for development, and staff has indicated to the Board that the Army Corps of Engineers has some higher standards which are being applied to those streams. She said, as the master plans are updated, the intermittent streams may be included as part of green space which would get to the net density issue but, without further study, staff did not feel comfortable making that change right now. Ms. Echols said there was emphasis on including adjoining residents and property owners in the conversation about when changes take place to establish villages or make changes to villages, and she noted that the Planning Commission had already made changes to that section to accommodate those concerns. She stated that the Commission's position is that it always takes into account how adjoining property owners feel but, at some point, the County must balance that with overall community interest when making those decisions.

Ms. Mallek said she had a question about the impacts of those villages on rural neighbors, but it seems her concern has been answered.

Ms. Echols said there is already some language included, but staff could work a bit more on the wording. She said Mr. Randolph and Mr. Craddock wanted to have a link to their plan and Ms. Echols pointed out that there would be links to all the master plans so, at that particular place, it does not make a lot of sense.

Ms. Dittmar said Mr. Randolph and Mr. Craddock wanted to have it linked because they were the only village.

Ms. Echols said staff was going to add the link in the beginning where it talks about all the master plans and development areas.

Ms. Mallek asked where things stood with the net developable acreage issue. Ms. Echols responded that the net developable acreage exists with the colors on the plan. She said areas that have environmental features or have been identified for other reasons as being preserved are shown as parks and green systems on the master plan. She said that area is not included with the calculation on how much density is available. She said it could be clearer in how that is explained, but the place where they have asked for more has to do with those places which are not shown in green, and also want that to automatically come out of the calculation. Ms. Echols said, until staff considers what the impacts of the Army Corps' regulations would be on those intermittent streams, staff did not feel comfortable saying that it comes out now; it needs more study.

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

There were none.

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

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 6. Adjourn to November 12, 2014, 3:30 p.m., Room 241.

At 7:57 p.m., **motion** was offered by Mr. Boyd to adjourn their meeting until November 12, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

Chairman

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