

Albemarle County Planning Commission
January 29, 2019

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, January 29, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., at the Albemarle County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Bruce Dotson, Karen Firehock, Chair Tim Keller, Jennie More, Vice-Chair Julian Bivins, Pam Riley and Luis Carrazana, University of Virginia (UVA) representative. Absent was Daphne Spain.

Other officials present were Cameron Langille, Senior Planner; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of CDD/Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; David Benish, Chief of Zoning; Mark Graham, Director of Community Development; and Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Keller called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Keller invited public comment on other matters not listed on the agenda from the public. Hearing none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Consent Agenda

Approval of Minutes: December 4, 2018 and December 11, 2018.

Mr. Keller asked if any Commissioner would like to pull an item off the consent agenda. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Ms. More moved, Mr. Bivins seconded for acceptance of the consent agenda; which was approved by a vote of 6:0 (Spain absent).

The meeting moved to the next item.

Public Hearing Items

ZMA-2018-00006 3223 Proffitt Road

Cameron Langille addressed the Commission and said he was the lead planner who had been reviewing the ZMA and would provide background information on the specifics of the proposal,

an overview of how the application was consistent with the Comp Plan recommendations, and conclusion of the presentation with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Langille reported that ZMA 2018-0006 was focused on one parcel in the Places 29 Development Area known as 32A-02-2, and the property was currently occupied by one single-family detached structure and had an address of 3223 Proffit Road. He said the property measured 7.29 acres and was zoned RA, Rural Areas. He noted that the property lay within two overlay zoning districts, one being the AIA Airport Impact Overlay, and it also has an area of managed steep slopes.

Mr. Langille stated that the proposal with the ZMA application was to rezone the property to the R-15 residential zoning district, and the applicant had chosen to proffer a concept plan that showed the general block layout for the development, as well as the internal road network. He noted that they had also provided a written proffer statement that specifically called out a few of the items shown on the concept plan they wished to tie down as proffers.

Mr. Langille presented an aerial view of the property, stating that it was difficult to see the single-family detached structure, but it was just north of 649 or Proffit Road, and the property was primarily wooded with an intermittent stream near the back or north side of the property -- which was not a perennial stream subject to the county's water protection ordinance buffers. He noted that there was no 100-year floodplain or preserved steep slopes on the property, and the distance from this property to the intersection between Proffit Road and Route 29 was about 900 feet to the east.

Mr. Langille said that the property was adjacent to the Full Gospel Assembly of Charlottesville Church, which was the property that's due east of it; the property to the due west was the Southern States retail store and warehouse. He stated that across Proffit Road from this property on the south side, there was a preschool, a single standalone detached home, and another church property. He referenced a zoning map and said the property was zoned RA, Rural Area, and to the north was a large undeveloped area zoned Planned District Mixed Commercial (PDMC) -- which was where the Northpointe development would be going in one day. He noted that to the west of the property was HC and south of the property across Proffit Road was R-1 residential, and to the east was RA.

Mr. Langille presented the Places 29 future land use plan, which showed the recommended classifications of the property as well as its surroundings. He noted that the orange color designated urban density residential, which called for residential uses at densities between 6.01 and 34 dwelling units per acre -- including all types of residential uses: single-family detached, attached, and multi-family.

Mr. Langille said that generally properties that had the UDR classification were supposed to have more than one housing type, and in terms of the surroundings, further to the east on the other properties zoned RA were designated as Neighborhood Density Residential (NDR), which was a

much lower density classification than UDR and called for 3-6 dwelling units per acre. He stated that to the east of the property was urban mixed-use, with the dashes meaning urban mixed use but directly around a center -- and the letters D, NS, and C were mixed-use centers that were actually called out as future land uses in the Places 29 Master Plan.

Mr. Langille presented one of the four sheets from the proposed proffered concept plan that the applicant had given with the application, with Block A being developable area where the applicant would like to have residential areas located; Block B measured about 2.1 acres and was proposed to be open space. He stated that one key item noted on the sheet was the hatched area on the bottom of the screen, and when reviewing the application, the applicant conducted a traffic impact analysis. He indicated that if the property were to be developed at the maximum density possible under the R-15 zoning district, which would be 109 multi-family dwelling units that the amount of vehicle trips that would be generated at peak PM travel hours that are heading eastbound along Proffit Road would require the installation of a new, striped, and dedicated left-turn lane into the development at its primary entrance. He noted that in Block A were the dashed black lines, and the one furthest right that ran north and south was the road that would be the primary entrance into the development if approved.

Mr. Langille stated that as part of the information learned from the traffic impact analysis, the applicant was proffering some road improvements along Proffit Road -- specifically the Places 29 Master Plan recommends a future cross-section of Proffit Road that had curb and gutter, which it currently did not have at all; a 10-foot-wide planting strip for street trees, and behind the strip it called for a six-foot sidewalk, with none out there currently. He said that the hatched area was a part of the property that would be reserved for dedication of future right of way, and it was wide enough to accommodate the new left-turn lane into the development if the rezoning is approved.

Mr. Langille presented a more detailed plan from the concept plan, noting the location of the internal road network, which was laid out in a grid fashion, and the sidewalk along Proffit Road and the primary entrance. He stated that there was a six-foot sidewalk along the proposed property line, and "Road C" was proposed, based on review comments received from the Department of Fire and Rescue, as a restricted access point into the development. He said there would be bollards installed along Proffit Road, which could be removed in the event that emergency vehicles needed to get into the development. He noted that if the development were approved under R-15 and they developed to the maximum number of units possible, they were supposed to have two points of access -- but ACFR staff have said that the second point would be enough to serve that role.

Mr. Langille mentioned that in the written proffer statement, which was Attachment D in the materials sent to the Commission, the applicants wanted to proffer two inter-parcel connections as part of the concept plan. He said the first was "Road D," which is the furthest road back and extends all the way to the adjacent property lines. He said that this would allow in the future, if either of the two adjacent properties redeveloped, for the potential for a new public road

connection between all three parcels that would run parallel to Proffit and could potentially take vehicle trips off the road.

Mr. Langille said that the draft proffer statement had five proffers, entitled now as proffers A-E. He stated that Proffer 1 was the two street interconnections; Proffer 2 was the Proffit Road right-of-way reservation and improvements; Proffer 3 related to the number of units they wanted to develop on this property. He said that with the UDR classification being six units per acre, based on the acreage of the parcel at 7.29 acres, that would mean 44 dwelling units to meet the minimum acreage at 6.03. He stated that the proffer was consistent with the Places 29 Master Plan's recommended density; Proffer 4 dealt with relegated parking and parking standards regarding screening off-street parking spaces that may be adjacent to Proffit Road, depending on if the property got developed as multi-family or townhouse development; and Proffer 5 related to affordable housing.

Mr. Langille reported that the staff recommendation for the ZMA was that they are recommending approval because it was consistent with the Comp Plan's recommended use types and residential densities based on the UDR future land use classification. He stated that the request was consistent with 9 of the 12 Neighborhood Model principles, and there was a full analysis in Attachment E of how this proposal was consistent with all principles of the model. He said that staff has suggested some revisions to the draft proffer statement, specifically Proffer 4, which relates to relegated parking, and Proffer 5. He noted that it would bring the proposal fully consistent with 11 of the 12 Neighborhood Model principles, and it also accomplished the Places 29 Master Plan's transportation recommendations for Proffit Road improvements.

Mr. Langille said that Attachment G had the staff-recommended language for the specific proffer revisions, and since the time the Planning Commission packets had been sent out, he had spoken with the applicant, who was willing to make the revisions to the proffer statement as suggested. He noted that this concluded the staff presentation on the proposal, and he referenced the recommended motions on the screen as shown.

Mr. Dotson asked about striking Proffer 5, as he found it unusual that an applicant was offering a proffer on something that was a problem clearly recognized by the county, yet the report was recommending striking that proffer. He said that he wondered when either the planning staff or legal staff could give the background and explanation for that.

Mr. Herrick stated that as the Commission may be aware, Virginia Code Section 15.2-2303.4, the proffer legislation that the General Assembly enacted in 2016, put constraints on the proffers that could be required or requested -- as well as those accepted or suggested on behalf of the locality. He said there were great limits on what could be accepted, and that statute defined the term "unreasonable proffer" as any proffer not specifically attributable to the proposed development. He noted that in this case, it was staff's opinion that affordable housing had not been shown to be specifically attributable to the point were it was not something that could be

accepted without running afoul of the code section 15.2-2303.4, and that was why staff recommended not accepting that proffer.

Mr. Dotson said that anticipating the applicant's statement, a question to them to consider would be absent that proffer, would they still intend to build a certain amount of affordable housing.

Mr. Bivins stated that he owned a piece of property in Alexandria and had been involved in receiving a special use permit application for a property in front of what he owns. He said he had shared with counsel what he found to be an unusual situation, as they were using a number of different methods in Alexandria to improve around art, affordable housing, streetscapes that was part of the SP process in Alexandria. Mr. Bivins stated that he would like the county to put forth an opportunity to study this and see if it was applicable here, where they were using a number of special use conditions to achieve some of the things Mr. Dotson had mentioned.

Mr. Keller suggested hearing back from counsel on it, then hold -- based on his recommendation -- a discussion for new business that's aside from this particular application.

Mr. Herrick agreed that the best form to address that would be in a separate discussion not tied to any given proposal.

Mr. Don Franco with Roudabush and Gale, agent for the applicant, addressed the Commission and stated that they had been working with staff to come up with a plan that was acceptable to staff and met the ordinance requirements. He said that they felt they had presented a good plan, but he would try to address some of the concerns just raised. He stated that with respect to affordable housing, he was slightly confused and it would be nice to be able to proffer that. Mr. Franco noted that at the low end of the density, because the property owner was not sure what it would end up being, they were talking about losing six ADUs, assuming that the by right was taken away and the differential was removed -- making 15% of 41 units about 6 units. He said that to get to the 109 units would require density bonuses, and those density bonuses would likely include that affordable housing component. Mr. Franco said they were leaving some on the table, but not every unit was being lost.

Mr. Franco noted that there was a question as to whether the applicant still planned on creating affordable housing, and his client was the property owner and a number of different people had looked at it, with their intent to sell it. He pointed out that there was no way to know what the buyer was going to do, and the only guarantee he knew of was getting close to the 109 -- and they would have to invoke the affordable housing density bonus.

Mr. Keller invited public speakers.

Mr. Morgan Butler of the Southern Environmental Law Center addressed the Commission, stating that the SELC had provided some written comments to them and he would summarize them. Mr. Butler said there were several positive elements to this proposal and the SELC did not have any

major concerns with it, and their comments were more in the interest of trying to get clarity and enforceability with one of the elements that has the potential to be positive -- the open space element. He said that this was a very important part of this project, and according to the staff report it was added in response to concerns raised at the community meeting as an effort to mitigate some of the impacts of the proposal and protect some of the environmental features, such as large existing trees and vegetation on the northern end of the site. He noted that a good portion of the intermittent stream on the site ran through that part of the property that had been shown as open space.

Mr. Butler stated that the SELC applauded the applicant for wanting to include an open space element in this project, but their concern was that the two enforceable items once the project was approved -- the proffers and the application plan -- left very unclear what could happen with open space and what parts of it would actually be preserved. He stated that in looking at the use table on page one of the development plans, the allowed uses listed for Block B, the area indicated as the open space element, were recreation, storm water management facilities, public utilities, and/or open space. He said that it was not clear what areas within Block B would actually be preserved or undisturbed, even though that was one of the main reasons for including it.

Mr. Butler emphasized that it needed to be clear in the development plans what extent of Block B actually would be preserved, including identifying the areas of trees and existing vegetation mentioned in the staff report that are supposed to be preserved. He said it also would be helpful to identify what other uses were likely to take place within the open space and where those would likely be located, so that the adequacy of the open space could be determined and judged. He stated that in addition to providing that information to provide some clear parameters on what open space would actually mean here, it made sense to specifically reference that open space element in the proffer as one of the major elements that had to be reflected in the actual development -- which would help make it a more enforceable part of the proposal.

Mr. Butler stated that the SELC had no major concerns and there were positive elements, with the open space element being one piece that had the potential to be very positive -- but at this point, it was still very loose as to what could actually occur there. He said that it seemed to have been proposed for specific purposes, and the SELC would like to see those fleshed out in more detail in the development plan and be referenced in the proffers so it becomes enforceable.

There being no further public speakers, Mr. Keller invited the applicant to return.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Franco if he wanted to make any comments related to what Mr. Butler had said about the open space and its specific uses not designated.

Mr. Franco responded that the specific uses were designated, and they just represented a broad range, which was what Mr. Butler's concern seemed to be. He stated that the first part was that it was not necessarily designed for preservation, but was open space for that community. He said that depending on the ultimate density achieved, 44 was likely more single-family detached. Mr.

Franco noted that the 109 was more townhouse-ish, and they would want to have a recreational component -- a series of trails with different stations or a number of different things.

Mr. Franco stated that their idea had never been to preserve it as untouched land, and there was one neighbor in the northeast corner with a tree she was very passionate about saving -- and she was not sure if it was on her property or the developer's, but he would be happy to create a proffer to say it would not be disturbed and that was the only tree mentioned in meetings with neighbors. He stated that they felt that leaving a bit of buffer and a recreational area were important components, but this was not designed to be preservation.

Ms. Firehock stated that that the open space had not been proffered, and this was a conceptual site plan -- not a legal document.

Mr. Franco responded that it was a proffered plan.

Ms. Firehock pointed out that a conceptual plan was not the same as a site plan, so they did not have the open space designated on this -- and it was totally unenforceable to say their was a section that was open space, and open space could be a paved playground or woods with a trail. She said that Mr. Franco had indicated he was the agent for the owner who would sell the property, so whatever would transfer with that sale would not necessarily designated exactly how the space would be used, nor its boundaries.

Mr. Franco commented that he was happy to work with staff, and the plan he had presented several iterations ago labeled that "open space." He said they were asked instead to label it Block B, and in their proffered uses define the uses that couldn't take place there -- which was why there were recreational and typical open space uses such as public utilities, etc. as uses allowed in that block. He emphasized that it was a tool that would guarantee that there wouldn't be houses in there and that only the recreational devices went in, but something more intense if intense development occurred on the other side could go in that area.

Ms. Firehock asked if staff wanted to comment on Mr. Franco's contention that staff had directed him to proceed in a certain way.

Mr. Langille clarified that the draft proffer statement specifically mentioned the concept plans, so letters A through E, items listed in those proffers as shown on the concept plans would be legally enforceable if this were to be approved.

Ms. Firehock responded that she understood that but didn't see open space listed in the proffer statements.

Mr. Langille explained that there was a version of the plans initially that showed open space and potential lot lines, which the applicant wanted to retain as flexibility for all potential uses allowed under R-15. He said that staff told him that if you proffered and called out open space and a

development proposal came in later that encroached into it, it would potentially have to result in an amendment to the ZMA application. He stated that instead what they saw with these types of things was a use table that called out by block the permitted uses, which was what was on the front page. He noted that it was not called out as a proffered item in the proffer statement.

Ms. Firehock commented that she had been a Commissioner for almost a decade and had seen concept plans where items were not included in the final because they weren't actually enumerated as needing to be included. She stated that she understood that everyone wanted a flexible plan, but now that they don't have the open space shown, it could be of any size.

Mr. Langille confirmed this and said that the applicant was correct in stating that if this was developed to maximum density, they would have to do bonus factors such as preservation of trees, provision of affordable housing, etc. He stated that ultimately there were recreation requirements that the zoning ordinance required if a certain number of residential units were developed, so there would most likely be some form of active recreation -- and that could possibly go in the open space area and include things like playgrounds, which may necessitate tree removal.

Ms. Firehock clarified that she was not calling for nothing to happen in that space, nor was she trying to demand a proffer from an applicant at the dais, but she was concerned that some of the narrative in the report stated that the community was happy the applicant had said they wouldn't really disturb this area and that would be a buffer. She said that may end up happening, but she was wary because they didn't have any way to control that.

Mr. Franco emphasized that they could not develop there except for open space uses, and lots could not transfer over there but something more intense like a playground could develop in that area -- but they were not talking about no open space. He said that a tot lot or something like that was still part of the recreational open space, so the open space was guaranteed and was guaranteed to be in the two-acre size range because of the proffered plan and accompanying text. He added that there was no way they could come back and say they would put houses there, and that was not their intent.

Ms. Firehock asked if it was staff's understanding that there would be a two-acre open space.

Mr. Langille replied that he would like to consult with the County Attorney on that to clarify the status if it was shown on the concept plan but wasn't specifically called out in the proffer statement.

Mr. Herrick explained that the proffer statement said that "the property shall be developed in general accord with the plans," and the plans showed a certain area as being either open space or another designation.

Ms. Firehock stated that she did not see that on the plans.

Mr. Langille said that the first page called out Block B to be open space and states an acreage figure in some of the notes on the first sheet.

Ms. Firehock commented that she felt confused, as he had said they didn't want a hard line in the event they had to encroach into it. She asked for specific clarification as to whether it was a defined area or not.

Mr. Langille responded that it was 2.1 acres shown on the plan, and that was defined -- with a boundary line between the development.

Ms. Firehock stated that there was a hard line, and that would be the open space.

Mr. Franco said that "general accordance" meant it was a big, wide hard line. He said that in other words, there was some flexibility -- and general accordance to him meant that if they were at two, that was close enough to 2.1 as well as 2.2., and that line may wiggle instead of being a straight line. He added that this was the flexibility they were getting but would get approximately 2.1 acres of open space, not preservation space.

Mr. Langille pointed out a line representing the boundary between Block B open space area, with everything else being Block A where residential uses would take place.

Ms. Firehock said that the only remaining concern was what goes on in there, as it was not enumerated, which was her issue as well as Morgan Butler's.

Mr. Franco stated that he was happy to try to resolve her concern, and what went on in there was dictated by the allowed uses -- but the amount of uses, etc. was not. He said that perhaps specifying that within 100 feet of the back boundaries or some "no touch" buffer preservation area would resolve it.

Ms. Firehock responded that it would be helpful so the neighbors felt they had somewhat of a vegetative buffer, but there was also an intermittent stream and it wasn't falling under the water ordinance but was a drainage so it would be draining things away from that site. She said that to try to lessen the amount of disturbance, more detail would be useful. She added that she felt the applicant was on the same page with this.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing.

Ms. Firehock stated that there was a comment about the school district demands and she wondered if Mr. Dotson had anything to add to that since he was on the long-range planning task force for the schools.

Mr. Dotson responded that the statement and the staff report were accurate.

Ms. More said that Ms. Firehock covered her own concerns well, but said that as she read through the applicant's justification, the R-15 zoning would create a transition between the primary non-residential uses and the existing low-density residential. She stated that the transition zone if the property were to come in at the higher end of density was a bit of a stretch of the imagination for her, but she understood that this was the land use designation and that was the high end allowed and that didn't seem to be much of a transition between what was shown on the maps.

Mr. Bivins stated that there would be a nice piece of sidewalk that ends on the other side, but he was concerned about how to create a walkable area in this district with the housing that was below it, which he thought was Forest Lakes. He said that his concern was how to fashion a livable space so people can walk to the Food Lion, and this felt like a good first step. He added that he was worried about Block B because he felt there would be pressure on the north point, behind Block B, and how they make the transitions between this potentially exciting project and what was going on there -- and it was important that they retain the blended character of that area. Mr. Bivins said he was thankful that the applicant was looking at a way to keep Block B an open space.

Mr. Carrazana said that the intent was to sell the property and as it transitioned to a new owner, they would likely be looking at developing and it would probably not look exactly like this -- and he asked if any changes would be in the form of an amendment.

Mr. Langille responded that the street layout as shown in the image presented would be tied down and if they wanted to alter it, it would require an amendment -- but ultimately if it were approved, the developer would have to concentrate their actual uses in the area in Block A. He noted that if they wanted to change that, it would require an amendment that would have to go through the legislative approval process.

Ms. Riley commented that she did not have a problem with the uses outlined for Block B but did have concerns about some possibility for the staff to tie down the preservation of some of that buffer that the neighbors and Mr. Butler had concerns with.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Gast-Bray if they had talked about having a presentation on connectivity, as he saw the merits of a six-foot sidewalk and wondered in the areas that were rural transitioning to suburban whether a wider sidewalk next to a roadway with higher speed traffic, at least further down. He stated that he was not convinced that something that had some separation of grade from the curb of the highway wasn't something staff should be considering, and he hoped staff could have that presentation soon so the Commission could understand what their rationale as a staff was for anticipating the connectivity Mr. Bivins was referencing and what the various solutions might be -- and whether there might need to be flexibility and thinking about what that connected way might be. He stated that in this kind of area, it may be that something that was more bicycle and pedestrian-related and therefore needed some separation from a higher speed vehicle would be better.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that it would be best addressed under new business.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Keller asked if someone was prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Dotson said that he would make a motion and commented that he thought it was an excellent and well-presented staff report. He stated that he was disappointed about the situation with affordable housing – and they all know that building new market rate housing would generate the need for people to provide services to that housing that will not be able to afford market rates. He emphasized that those impacts emanate from the site, and by right they should be mitigated onsite. He said that he did not believe that they currently had the research available to indicate that they were specifically attributable to this particular site – but that was a broader problem than he hoped they could investigate in the future.

Mr. Dotson moved for approval of ZMA-2018-00006 3223 Proffit Road, with the recommendations and proffers as indicated in the staff report.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion was approved by a vote of 6:0 (Spain absent).

Mr. Keller thanked both the applicant and staff for a very clear report. He asked Mr. Franco if he had a question.

Mr. Franco asked if they had to come back and react to some of the discussion heard at this meeting, such as putting a preservation area in, etc.

Mr. Herrick replied that they would not, as long as the applicant understood that was not a suggestion of the locality – but if the applicant wished to change its proffers going forward, that was certainly something we could take a look at.

Mr. Franco asked for confirmation that they would not have to go before the Planning Commission again, and Mr. Herrick responded that this was correct.

Mr. Gast-Bray noted that he would bring back that information back before the Commission's edification.

Mr. Keller thanked them both.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

WORK PROGRAM

CDD Work Program

Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, said this was a work session since annually Community Development had gone to the Board of Supervisors annually to verify where the work program should be focused. He said that typically he came to the Planning Commission after going to the Board, but he was reversing it and coming to them first to give them the opportunity to provide perspective that he would share with the Board the following week during their work session. Mr. Graham presented a PowerPoint.

Mr. Graham said the purpose of the work session was to review the background of Community Development's current work levels and priorities, and also to give an overview of those priorities and other interests to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Graham said one of the first things he always pointed out was that the work program was not an independent activity but a dependent activity as related to other development going on in the community. He said that as the amount of development increased, the amount of time they had to spend on the work program decreased, and if development activity dropped significantly, that provided much more time for the work program. He said that how much time would actually be spent there was related to how much development activity was going on, as well as how many resources were available in terms of staffing levels. He said they had seen a significant increase in staffing over the last five years, as shown on the trend line, but also noted that they were still about nine positions down from where they were in 2008. Mr. Graham said that while the department may have picked up efficiencies in process along the way, he was not sure if they had been totally able to offset that with those improvements.

Mr. Graham presented a pie chart that reflected development activity.

Mr. Graham noted that particular to residential building permits, which were the bulk of their work, they had seen significant increases over the last few years -- basically doubling in the last five years. He said that last year there were about 1,050, which was about 200 above their previous record, so building permit activity was booming. He said that was for the overall year and they had seen some drop off in the second half of the year -- and it now seemed to be leveling back to something closer to their long-term averages. He stated that one of the things they were seeing a lot of was people adding solar to their houses; it had become a very regular thing and they had basically gone from 65 in 2016 to 106 in 2017 to 180 in 2018. He said this all reflected on existing houses where people were coming back and adding solar versus new houses that had solar. He commented that there was increasing interest in this, and he assumed it was due to the lowered cost of installation.

Mr. Graham said that the new big area in terms of work staffing was the ministerial applications such as subdivisions and site plans. He said that over the last five years, there had been a slow increase in ministerial applications that was increasing upward. Mr. Graham said that the

numbers did not reflect the complexity of the applications, but they did give a good indication of where the workload was going.

Mr. Graham said the next big area on the pie chart was the legislative applications, which were the rezonings, zoning map amendments and special use permits that the Planning Commission routinely saw. Mr. Graham noted that the trend was basically flat but there were a few outliers such as 2010 and 2014 -- but if you omitted those, the number of legislative applications had been fairly constant over the last 10 years.

Mr. Graham said the next area on the pie chart was the number of zoning complaints, and there was a significant increase in this area. Mr. Graham noted that the increase in 2012 and 2013 was related to signs in the right of way because there was an intensive program that generated a lot of complaints. Mr. Graham said that had now diminished, but there were a lot more complaints related to property management, which took a lot more work.

Mr. Keller asked if these complaints were in the rural areas as well as the development areas, or more in the development areas.

Mr. Graham said that there were a lot more in the development areas. He said there were a number of complaints in the rural area but it had been a fairly constant level.

Ms. McCulley stated that Mr. Graham was correct that the property maintenance complaints were mostly in the development areas, but she said the rural areas also had similar complaints such as junked cars and yards.

Ms. Firehock said she was part of the spike of complaints in 2017, adding that there were billboards with lights that shone into the sky that she believed were a violation of the night sky ordinance. She asked if they were not flagged as violations because they were grandfathered or because the lumens were low enough to be allowed.

Ms. McCulley said these would be legally nonconforming and that the county prohibited new billboards years ago when they updated the sign ordinance, and Community Development had tried hard to close loopholes such as the ability to replace damaged billboards but there were protections under state law. She said that Community Development took every change they could to consolidate signs or bring them down in size, but they were moneymakers and served specific purposes.

Ms. Firehock said she just wanted them to change their lights, and even though she hated billboards, she understood their function. She added that she had stopped calling to complain.

Mr. Graham said those were the big areas in the pie chart, and when he put that all together in trying to predict the next year, development was cooling from the 2018 peak, which was a record-setting year. Mr. Graham stated that housing permits slowed in the second half of the year but

they were still at or above the long-term average. He said he would call this a “soft landing” but not a dramatic decrease.

Mr. Graham said that recruiting and retaining staff remained challenging and that full employment certainly appeared to be true from Community Development’s perspective, commenting that it was hard to find and retain good staff.

Mr. Graham said there was a strong emphasis for affordable housing, which was something raised with the Board of Supervisors last year, and it would show up in the proposed work program. He said that affordable housing was both a local and national issue and that from experience, every time there was a housing boom this came up as an issue because it related to the amount of housing that was available.

Mr. Graham stated that an item related to zoning complaints was that service expectations for Community Development were increasing with calls about homestays, property maintenance complaints. He said this was characteristic of Albemarle County transitioning into a more urban area that was now acting more like an urban area than a rural exurb type of development.

Ms. Riley said that if there was a recruiting challenge and there was an emphasis on affordable housing, the county needed to study workforce housing and look at it as a recruitment and retention component for the county’s workforce.

Mr. Graham responded that Ms. Riley was absolutely right, and Community Development hoped to incorporate it into the work planned for affordable housing in the coming year.

Mr. Graham stated that the items in blue depicted what was already on the work program as a result of the Board’s strategic plan, and ones with an asterisk depicted where Community Development was playing a support role rather than a lead role -- such as with climate action, where Facilities and Environmental Services was taking more of the lead role. He stated that being in the support role can still take a considerable amount of effort. Mr. Graham said that affordable housing was a priority raised with the Board of Supervisors last year, and they agreed to fund a contribution to the regional housing study that was being done by the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. Mr. Graham said that study would be presented to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors and that would help guide the kickoff for the update of the county’s affordable housing policy, which could include such things as recruiting and retention.

Mr. Graham said that another item on the work program was the zoning ordinance recodification, which was an ongoing task from the previous Board strategic plan, as well as water protection in the rural area as discussed with the Board. Mr. Graham said that zero lot lines and agricultural land uses were two topics for which the Board of Supervisors had approved resolutions of intent. Mr. Graham said the religious assembly ordinance, which dealt with churches, needed to be cleaned up due to federal legislation. Mr. Graham said the Crozet Master Plan update had been

discussed with the Board previously and once the Pantops Master Plan was finished, Community Development hoped to get started with the Crozet Master Plan update, which was a few years overdue.

Mr. Graham said the final big item was development review. He said that Project ENABLE, the county's economic development strategic plan, had a goal of improving efficiency by reducing or controlling barriers. He said that he translated that as a directive to reduce uncertainty and shorten approval times, which was the real goal of the development community. He said the recodification of the zoning ordinance was intended to make it easier to understand, which he said would reduce some uncertainty. He stated that Community Development was looking at process improvements to reduce review times, but those would be fairly small and going from 45 days to 40 days and that getting down to 35 days would be incremental. He noted that timing was great if there was only one review -- but if a plan took two, three or even four reviews to reach approval, there was an issue with the complexity it took to get to the approval.

Mr. Graham said that effectively reducing or removing barriers required a focus on simplifying the county's requirements. He said the use of the word "simplify" was a deliberate one rather than "eliminate" because simplifying requirements without eliminating development expectations, which Graham said he did not think the Board was interested in doing, would require a large investment in staff time and considerable engagement. Mr. Graham said he did not think Community Development was in a position to undertake this effort until 2020, assuming the Board of Supervisors had the interest in prioritizing it over other things. Mr. Graham said he did not think it would be a simple task. He began to explain how prioritization was done.

Mr. Keller asked commissioners if they had any other issues they wanted to add to the list.

Mr. Graham said he was going to wrap up and asked if there should be any changes or emerging issues added. He said he wanted to get the Planning Commission's perspective on whether the priorities were right or if there were other issues that should be raised with the Board.

Ms. Firehock said the list of priorities was in Attachment A in the report and the list of potential projects. She asked if it were correct to say that none of the potential projects were to be done at this time.

Mr. Graham responded that she was correct.

Ms. Firehock asked if they would be done after 2020 unless something came up.

Mr. Graham replied that this was correct unless the Board of Supervisors directed otherwise, but also noted that the Community Development staff was fully allocated right now with current projects and possibly even over-allocated.

Ms. Firehock stated that she could not be a judge of how staff spent their time or whether they were fully allocated. Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Graham asked about the agricultural changes and asked for more information about the agricultural land use ordinance change.

Mr. Graham said there had been Board interest in cleaning up some of the items related to other uses, particularly special uses of agricultural properties.

Ms. Firehock said that was something that Community Development was doing but the Planning Commission just needed to understand what it was.

Ms. McCulley said phase one of the agricultural land use ordinance was intended to be a fairly straightforward effort to bring agricultural operation uses into the same regulatory scheme as that used for farm wineries, breweries and distilleries. Ms. McCulley reminded them that there was a lot of public input and engagement with the commissioners and others and they came up with items such as providing notice to neighbors and curfews.

Ms. Firehock asked if this had to do with events.

Ms. McCulley responded that Phase 1 was only about events and Phase 2 would be a much bigger item that would involve more public engagement, but there was no timeline for it.

Ms. Firehock asked if it was an issue the county was going to tackle.

Ms. McCulley said that at some point, yes, and Phase 1 was underway but Phase 2 could involve looking at items on farms such as farm-to-table events. She said there were things happening at the General Assembly that might preempt what could happen at the local level, and they would need to wait to see how those emerged.

Ms. Firehock said there were five items on the potential project list that she wanted to have explained.

Mr. Keller told her to proceed.

Ms. Firehock asked what FY17-SP Rural Areas referred to and noted that it was listed as a Board strategic plan issue.

Mr. Graham stated that this spoke to looking at rural area land uses in the Board's strategic plan as related to crossroad communities, an item that Community Development had not yet had the time to address.

Ms. Firehock noted that a crossroad community plan was listed.

Mr. Graham explained that it was something raised during the Comprehensive Plan review and the Board had asked that there be a priority for that.

Ms. Firehock asked about rural area inns and said the Commission began that work but didn't get all the way.

Mr. Graham responded that they did part one but didn't do part two yet.

Ms. Firehock said that should be a priority and asked about Phase 2 for wineries, breweries and distilleries.

Mr. Graham said there were questions in the first phase that had proven to be too challenging and were set aside, and these were related to how events were regulated. He said there was a question about whether there was interest in going back and looking at that issue again.

Ms. Firehock said she could not remember putting big things on the table. She asked about rural-area commercial recreational uses and whether that would ask what were allowed uses in the rural area.

Mr. Graham said the big item with respect to that issue was golf courses in the rural areas, and that was still an issue that had not been able to be worked on due to a lack of time and resources.

Ms. Firehock said she thought it warranted attention. She said there had been public comment asking that there to be no recreational uses in the rural areas, and she said she felt that was a blanket statement. She commented that others had claimed their application was the kind of recreation that should be done in rural areas, and golf courses were a weird one because they were not necessarily rural but they had bucolic views. She said she continued to be concerned that rural areas were seen as a preservation zone and noted that Scott Clark had said the rural areas had all kinds of characteristics -- but it all got lumped in as the rural area when there were a lot of different things going on in different parts of the county. She noted that certain constituents had said they would like to see more focus on the rural area. She said she would be willing to work on better definitions of those uses or the characters of those areas and that this needed more attention.

Ms. More said she had a question about the Crozet Master Plan and an asterisk that said it was new to the schedule. She stated that she wanted to see more specific detail and asked if adoption of the plan revision would be 10 years after the last revision.

Mr. Graham replied that it would probably be around that schedule.

Ms. More said she understood all the work that Community Development staff had to do and that there were things that had to be prioritized, but it was frustrating to have master plans delayed, as they were part of the Comprehensive Plan that helped inform communities about

what to expect and provided more specific detail to particular areas. She said that Crozet's master plan update might not need to be an in-depth overhaul but there might be tweaks and suggestions. She said there were a lot of new community members who had joined the community in the past 10 years who she hoped would participate. She commented that she thought it was embarrassing to speak to people and tell them how outdated the plan was and More asked if prioritizing having the plans done more on a timely basis might help staff's workload, because the applications coming to them were residential rezonings and many times they refer what many community members see as an outdated place.

Ms. More stated that the longer time between revisions meant that staff would have to invest more time in the revision rather than doing it in a bigger schedule. She said that when there was a Comprehensive Plan review and there was an outdated Master Plan, that essentially adopted the outdated master plan into the new Comprehensive Plan revision. She stated that she felt much had changed in Crozet since 2009 when the plan was last worked on, and from 2010 when it was last adopted. She asked if it would help staff to process applications faster than having to spend time explaining to community members.

Mr. Graham said that speaking on behalf of staff, a more current master plan helped both staff and the community in understanding the expectations. He said the challenge was how to prioritize that against all of the other interests, noting that it would be up to the Board to invest in keeping the master plans more current and a higher priority for the county.

Ms. More said this would be good, especially in areas that were ambiguous such as where language didn't match maps -- and these were things that need to be corrected. She commented that there was a long list of things that had come up over time and it was more challenging to do them every 10 years as a massive overhaul than to address them incrementally.

Ms. More said her other question was related to gross versus net density, and she said did not see it listed in the work program.

Mr. Graham said it was listed as a potential project but had not been prioritized at this point.

Ms. More stated that there was no expectation for a timeline for that.

Mr. Graham responded that he had not heard Board interest in prioritizing that issue, but if the Planning Commission thought that was important, he would be glad to forward that comment and perspective to the Board.

Ms. More said she did think the issue was important and she respected that this was a controversial issue.

Ms. Firehock commented that they were collectively the Planning Commission, but individuals were telling Mr. Graham items too. Ms. Firehock asked how the unified recommendations got to the Board because they were not discussing but just asking questions.

Mr. Graham responded that he was writing down comments from the commissioners and he would read them back to see how universal their concerns were.

Ms. More said she thought that was important because prioritizing master plan reviews in a timely manner might not be something other commissioners wanted to send to the Board, but that was definitely a message she wanted to send to the Board.

Mr. Dotson said his comments had to do with resources and wanting more information, which he acknowledged took even more staff time to provide. He gave the example that Ms. Firehock asked in terms of what some of the projects were and suggested staff could provide in the future a thumbnail of two sentences to explain to the public and others who may not have the same knowledge as the Board of Supervisors. He noted that it would also be useful to get some sense of the resources demanded for executing such a project. He said he could imagine that the Rio Road Small Area Plan zoning was a very time-consuming project, but he could be wrong. He said it would be useful to have some comparison about how much time that would take versus the Rivanna River Phase 2, noting that the metric for staff resources could be high, medium, or low.

Ms. Firehock said that she wrote that in her notes as well that she could not tell the level of effort, and having that information would help determine whether a priority should be elevated.

Mr. Dotson said he agreed and that if he could see that three projects could get done in the same time as one project, that might change his view as well.

Mr. Keller said a two-sentence description would help because the Rivanna River corridor plan was something the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission was working on as part of a city-county agreement, and the Planning Commission could see that as not using as much staff time.

Mr. Graham responded that this was the challenging part because what drove the time more than anything on these projects was the level of community engagement to go along with it, which could be very difficult to predict. He said an example of this was the transient lodging and homestay study that was raised by the Board, and staff had said it would take at least a year. He stated that the Board was amazed it would take that long and now it was two years later and the county was still not quite there. Mr. Graham said it could be difficult to predict these things, especially as they got into more community engagement to find balanced perspectives.

Mr. Dotson said they did the best they could when the list was made, but then it could be revised. He stated that he believed more resources would be useful, and as someone who had run a department and an organization, there were many things they didn't get credit for because they

didn't show up anywhere. He said he could imagine that Mr. Graham was holding 10-20% for contingency or unanticipated issues that could even stem from questions from a Commissioner. He pointed out that he had asked a question at this meeting that required time on the part of the legal department. He noted that it would help him understand the workload to know how much time was available for issues that pop up and how much time went into staffing the Commission, the Board, the BAR, and various committees such as long-range transportation. He said all of those items consumed time, and it would be useful to understand the order of Community Development's resources.

Mr. Dotson said that on the topic of potential projects, the Commission would often identify issues under new business or as a follow-up item. He asked who maintained the list and didn't see all of the issues that had been brought up -- and maybe some of those issues were short-term that need one conversation.

Mr. Graham responded that if it was a quick-response item that took a month or less, Community Development did not include those items on the list -- and the list was something that would take a minimum of three to six months.

Mr. Bivins said he wanted a point of clarification about the committed projects and mentioned the Rio 29 EDA Private Capitalization project and asked for more information, particularly whether it was related to Opportunity Zones.

Mr. Graham said the item was not related to opportunity zones because most of Rio and 29 was not in an Opportunity Zone, but the item was related to looking for opportunities for funding of projects and helping those projects get off the ground in that area. He stated that it was related to whether there were public-private partnership opportunities that could help a project get off the ground, or tax credits or something else for a very desirable project. He noted that a lot of this item was working through the Economic Development Office, and they were looking for support from Community Development.

Mr. Bivins said that while there were time-limited Opportunity Zones, one of the projects that was just completed was the small area plan. He asked if that would help to facilitate any opportunities that had presented themselves in the Jack Jouett District.

Mr. Graham responded that the southwest corner of the Rio/29 intersection fell within an Opportunity Zone, but the other three quadrants were outside. Mr. Graham said the county was still looking for more guidance from the federal government on tax credits in the Opportunity Zone to see how they would work.

Mr. Bivins said he wanted to add to Ms. Riley's comments related to affordable housing and workforce housing. He said he had been in many economic development task force meetings and one of the things employers were having an issue with was that if they want to relocate here, the entire range of their staff couldn't afford to live here -- so that took Albemarle out of

conversations with firms that would like to be here because of the nice mix of skill sets. He said if Albemarle was committed to economic development in a way that felt like Albemarle County, having workforce housing would go a long way in convincing a number of potential employers. He commented that affordable housing and workforce housing were a package that needed to be handled by the Board of Supervisors in a way that would advance opportunities in the county.

Mr. Graham asked if he could translate that to be an interest in including workforce housing as part of the affordable housing policy update that would be synergistic with the economic development strategic plan.

Mr. Bivins said that was why Mr. Graham was the director.

Mr. Graham said not for much longer.

Ms. Riley asked for more information under the work program and specifically asked for a description for what the zero lot line work was going to be.

Mr. Graham said it should be a fairly simple exercise, and it was a recognition that there had been situations with zero lot lines wherein a neighbor had recognized that someone had built something with a zero lot line but the person could not maintain their property without coming onto the neighbor's property. He stated that the work was to make sure that Albemarle was not allowing this unless there was some sort of an easement that assured they could maintain. He noted that this was intended to be a fix to a problem with the ordinance and a request from the Board of Supervisors based on some problems that had come up.

Ms. Riley asked for information on the interstate interchange plans, an item on the potential project list.

Mr. Graham said that was a project that came right out of the Comprehensive Plan and that the county had an interchange policy that was in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Graham said there had been a long interest since 2010 to look at the policy and see if there was an interest in changing the level and type of development activity the county wanted to permit around those interchanges.

Ms. Riley said it was difficult for her to state what she thought should be a priority unless she knew how involved it really would be as a process, but she said the interstate interchange policy would be topically important as they reviewed and implemented the Comprehensive Plan. She stated that her final question related to the Entrance Corridor update because sections of roads in her district had been taken off the list, and she had hoped it would be something the Planning Commission would fix soon, rather than have it listed as a potential project.

Mr. Graham said what Ms. Riley was referring to was a separate issue that isn't even on the potential priorities list because they didn't yet have an understanding of what they could do. He

said the item on the priority list reflected a longer-term interest by the Architectural Review Board to come up with more corridor-specific guidelines and one where they may provide more flexibility and particular guidelines for corridors. He stated that there had not been the time to get back to do that.

Ms. Riley asked if that was something was going to be happening without being on a list.

Mr. Graham replied that the issue was just on the sidelines, but if the Planning Commission believed that was something for Community Development staff to focus on, this was the time to let them know so it got relayed to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Riley emphasized that she wanted that issue to be focused on.

Mr. Carrazana said he was new to the Commission and said he was appreciative of the work session because it was helping him understand the process and everything that the county did. He stated that he had questions related to affordable housing and around the prioritization. He said he looked at the project list and noted that the blue items were related to the Board of Supervisors' strategic plans. He asked if affordable housing was a priority.

Mr. Graham responded that it ranked low and didn't make the cut for priorities, but they had recognized that they had a strong interest in affordable housing regardless of what the strategic priorities said.

Mr. Carrazana asked what the county's initiative on affordable housing was and if it was something Albemarle was doing alone or if they were partnering with the city or the University.

Mr. Graham responded that Albemarle was partnering with the city and the University through the Planning and Coordination Council as well as the regional housing efforts at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission. He explained that the goal was to get the regional study completed, and that should help them understand supply and demand from the regional perspective and a county perspective. He noted that this should drive a lot of the decisions in terms of where the county should put its focus as it updated its affordable housing policy, which was 15 years old. He said the new data was needed to be able to make good decisions, and he expected the direction from the Board would be to either reestablish a housing committee or to establish some sort of a staff panel that would include reaching out to a lot of the stakeholders in affordable housing to make sure that the county had received good representation from all the affected parties.

Mr. Carrazana said the University was increasingly interested in affordable housing for a variety of reasons, but one of the most important was for workforce housing. He said there was affordable housing outside of the county, but the problem was the drive time and that many employees at the University of Virginia and the hospital lived outside the county because they couldn't afford to live in Albemarle. Mr. Carrazana said it was an important topic for the

University, and the new administration leadership was interested in this -- with the community being one of the legs in the three-legged stool in his strategic plan. He said he thought it was unfortunate that the county did not have affordable housing as part of its strategic plan, and he hoped that would be revisited in conjunction with the city and the University's strategic plan because Albemarle could not go at it alone. He encouraged the county to think about the topic strategically.

Mr. Keller said that affordable housing was on the top of his list, and the Planning Commission had held an educational process several years ago, so it had been a priority for them. He said it was interesting how affordable housing was currently arising as a topic in many different arenas.

Mr. Keller stated that his second comment was related to trying to consolidate some of the different pieces, and he mentioned the small area plans. He said these were areas that often had to compete with other items such as fire engines in the Capital Improvement Program, which had meant the small area plans had gotten out of synch. He stated that there had been a number of successes such as the completion of the Rio Road 29 small area plan and the ongoing work with the Pantops Master Plan. He commented that he did not want to be negative and that things were starting to roll.

Mr. Keller said he supported the idea of Mr. Dotson's idea that there be two sentence descriptions of items on the work plan that show what the county had done and what needed to be updated, and Mr. Keller said that the county needed to think about how rural area planning would work, in light of comments from people in the rural area. He asked if it would be east, west, north, or south; or if it would be tied to adjacency to the development area; or if it would be underneath some other approach. He noted that rural planning needed to be part of something the Planning Commission thought about on a regular basis. He commented that the city, county and University needed to all be included in the planning mix so that everyone was aware of all the pieces, especially regarding affordable housing.

Mr. Keller said he thought the small area plans were important to everything and that the community advisory committees were set up. He stated that some groups were not as enfranchised as others because the focus had been on the development areas. He said he encouraged Mr. Graham as the director because he had the institutional memory, he could put these pieces into context, and he could organize that better than anyone else. Mr. Keller noted that Mr. Graham could also point out to the Supervisors where the successes and drawbacks had been and how those could be fixed. Mr. Keller said that Mr. Graham had indicated that this would answer a lot of the issues the Planning Commission had talked about, adding that it would spawn further discussion about entrance corridors and affordable housing/workforce housing in the places where people were going to live closer to their employment.

Mr. Keller said he had two smaller issues that had come up consistently with the Planning Commission. He stated that since there was starting to be more GIS ability on staff, it seemed that it was time to go back and look at areas of special visual quality within the county that

residents and visitors alike had indicated were important. He commented that there were examples of new parks that were coming online that provided access to that, with one example being the new park on the South Fork Rivanna that would be visible as you crossed the bridge. He stated that Montalto was another example of Monticello preserving something, but there were places where the visual quality was being lost because of changes that were occurring, as Mr. Firehock had noted when mentioning dark skies. Mr. Keller said that some of these were outside of the purview of the Planning Commission, but as the county began to see more ridgetop development, it was time to revisit steep slopes to see if that ordinance was answering some of the visual negative impacts of houses that were being built in points of topographic high visibility.

Mr. Keller stated that a subset of this was historic resources, and there had been a number of developments -- lots of them in Crozet -- that showed a potential loss of historic resources. He said that Mr. Graham had talked about a modernizing county and a changing county that had become more developed, and that historic resource protections at the local level should be a high priority. He said that it was hard to place other priorities when the Commission knew how important it was to have area plans, but if the budget was going to be straightened out in a way that small area plans would be part of the budget so they didn't have to compete, then maybe some of the other priorities that were important to the overall future of the county could be addressed sooner rather than later. With staff and Commission priorities identified, he then asked if any members of the public had comments.

Mr. Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum said that the first part of the movie "Peter Pan" said that all of this had happened before. He stated that there had been a fee increase in 2010 and that the Free Enterprise Forum had created a report called "The Cost of Complexity" for regulations in Albemarle that came up with an index. He said that his organization had concluded then that the process was broken and needed to be fixed. He said that the idea that staff had called out was a big idea, and there was a big labyrinth of regulations that was very difficult to move through. He stated that he had recently spoken with someone who was building a house in the rural area and did not want to hire a third party to do his permitting, but then realized the complexity of the process. Mr. Williamson said this person was a rather educated person who thought he should be able to do the work.

Mr. Williamson commented that even professionals found the development review process to be challenging, and it was about to get worse with Mr. Graham and other professionals in the county leaving with institutional knowledge. Mr. Williamson said the idea of simplifying regulation made a lot of sense and would have a positive impact on economic development and affordable housing. He stated that there were studies that proved this point. He said that his organization had hoped the Commission's discussion would focus on the idea of simplifying regulatory barriers and noted that they had talked about a lot of things he would like to further discuss but couldn't fit into his three minutes. He emphasized that simplifying regulatory barriers would be a win-win for the community, and to paraphrase Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton, "Regulate less and smile more."

Mr. Keller asked if there were any more public comments, and there were none.

Mr. Graham stated that he would try go down the list to capture what the Planning Commission had said, noting that he had heard one person express interest in the rural area recreation uses, something that had been on the list before. He said he had heard other commissioners express different perspectives and comments on rural area uses and planning for the rural areas, and there needed to be focus on the rural areas. He noted that this was an excellent comment and that if you look at the Board's most recent strategic plan, it did not had a focus on the rural areas but instead focused on the development area. He stated that he would try to get more balance on protections for the rural area along with improvements for the development areas.

Mr. Graham said the next thing he heard was that the master plans in the development areas were a higher priority and there should be an effort to keep them up to date, recognizing that they would keep the community engaged. He added that it would also make the jobs of staff easier as they kept up with the expectations of the community.

Mr. Graham said he heard that at least one commissioner was interested in looking at net versus gross density in the development areas, and he had heard a very good comment about providing thumbnail descriptions for all of the items.

Mr. Graham said he also heard about the need to describe the level of anticipated work effort that accompanied each item, with each item including the time and effort required for the listed items in the work program -- as well as the unlisted items such as the preparation of executive summaries, which took a lot of time.

Mr. Graham said there were several comments about workforce housing and trying to tie that back to the affordable housing policy and economic development efforts. He said he had heard from several people that there needed to be a better focus on workforce housing. He stated that he had heard a lot about finding the synergy with economic development and the housing policy related to that.

Mr. Graham said that with regard to entrance corridors, the county did not have the current authority to regulate previously established corridors, noting that it was not really on the list but they were looking to add it.

Mr. Graham said he did not want to lose focus on the small area plans, and it was important for those to move forward to set the framework for a lot of other things that were happening. He stated that it was also important to coordinate with the Planning and Coordination Committee under the three-party agreement to make sure that there was a coordinated effort so the three parties did not fight with each other, especially on issues such as affordable housing -- which were regional issues more than just county issues.

Mr. Graham said the new issues he heard included special visual quality, which recognized that there were areas that were incredibly important to the county and served as part of its identity - and they needed to ensure that they were providing the necessary protection. He noted that the final thing he had heard related to historic resources and the need to consider protection of particular structures and areas.

Ms. Riley said she wanted to be clear that the Commission had questioned why affordable housing wasn't a strategic priority and that it should be designated as such.

Mr. Graham asked if that meant affordable housing should be placed higher as a priority.

Mr. Carrazana said he thought there was an opportunity with the city's and University's approach to affordable housing for Albemarle to be engaged in a way they may not have been when the county's strategic plan was prioritized. Mr. Carrazana said he felt there was a moment in place right now that might lead to leveraging partnerships.

Mr. Graham agreed that there needed to be a strong emphasis on affordable housing, especially into the future.

Mr. Graham said if there were nothing else, he would conclude.

Mr. Keller said he thought other commissioners still wanted to comment.

Mr. Dotson said he was thinking that Mr. Graham had come up with a long list of comments, and there was a long list of potential projects -- and for some of those, he would be willing to stumble forward on a case-by-case basis rather than doing a comprehensive study. He said that if they were to go through the Community Development Work Program again, that could be a category for future consideration -- but he acknowledged they were not doing that procedure right now.

There being no further discussion, the meeting moved to the next item.

Committee Reports.

Mr. Keller invited committee reports.

Commissioner Riley reported:

- This would be her final CTAC report because Mr. Keller would begin representing the Commission on this committee. She said they were looking specifically at the long-range transportation plan, and she encouraged commissioners to go to the TJPDC website and look at the information and drafts. She noted that they also reviewed the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan.

Mr. Keller mentioned that they were also available on the website.

Commissioner Bivins reported:

- The Hydraulic CAC had met and had a productive meeting regarding the Charlotte Humphris park, and there was no desire to strip the land -- just a desire to make it accessible and rid it of invasive species.
- The county did not receive any money from the Smart Scale process, but the city received about \$4 million for the West Main Street streetscape.

Mr. Keller said that this was a preliminary ranking, but Mr. Bivins indicated that they had implied that it was a firm award -- with the bulk of the state money going toward the tunnels leading to Virginia Beach.

- The amount of construction taking place at UVA was amazing -- from the hospital, Brandon Avenue, Ivy Road, a sewer project to St. Anne's, the athletic complex, and the research park. He stated that all of this would result in bringing more people to the area, and the concern remained as to availability of workforce housing and transportation. He said that the need for coordination among the three entities was imperative, and it was equally important for the county to be engaged and not just the city.

Commissioner Firehock reported:

- She had attended the Southern Neighborhood CAC meeting, and the primary topic addressed improvements to the Avon Street corridor and blocking it up in various phases, with some disagreement regarding whether and how roundabouts got funded in Albemarle County. She commented that there was some very thoughtful analysis done.

Commissioner More reported:

- She attended the Historic Preservation Committee meeting, with the bulk of the conversation focusing on what the Board had approved: funding for the McIntire local history exhibit; five historic highway markers; and cultural/historic engagement. She said the committee was approached with some examples of another locality that had developed a brochure, and this was just an initial interaction with the committee to see what role they would play -- with criteria for inclusion, structure, public information, etc.

Commissioner Dotson reported:

- The Rio/29 CAC was moving along and gaining momentum as it went along, with two projects reviewed in community meetings, election of officers, and updating of the watchlist of issues and aspirations they generated a year earlier, partly to bring new members up to speed and to get their input.
- He had been working with staff on the Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee for the schools, taking the Long-Range Transportation Plan projections 2015-2045 by traffic analysis zones and overlaying those population forecasts on elementary and other school boundaries to try to create a case to demonstrate the reality that there was a benefit in looking further than the short-term planning the schools do to dovetail with population

projections. He noted that their next meeting would take place in February and he would provide an update after that.

Review of the Board of Supervisors Meeting – January 9, 2019 and January 16, 2019

Mr. Gast-Bray reviewed of the Board of Supervisors actions from January 9, 2018, stating that the field survey the Commission and asked about from the TJPDC would be presented by Siri Russell at some date in the future. He stated that Birdwood had been presented in a work session for the Board. He reported that the public hearings were for the Albemarle Montessori School, which was approved as the Commission had recommended. He stated that the Commonwealth Senior Living items were approved as the Board had recommended.

Mr. Keller said the meeting would move to old business.

Old Business

Mr. Keller invited old business and follow-up items.

Ms. Firehock said she had sent a request regarding purchase of guides on low-impact development for the Commission to review, at a cost of \$130-\$200 per commissioner.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that he had not replied to her, but there was a book budget that would accommodate it.

There being no further old business, the meeting moved to new business.

New Business

Mr. Keller invited new business.

Mr. Gast-Bray reminded them that in addition to the workforce and affordable housing discussion, they were also to discuss how to get more transportation offsite from the developments they typically looked at. He stated that the public had asked at the CAC meetings to talk about the differences between land use and zoning, which was on the program to get scheduled in the coming year for the Commission to consider.

Mr. Keller asked if they were going to have a more thorough discussion of proffers.

Mr. Bivins asked about having a more thorough discussion about special use permit conditions, once the General Assembly finished acting on the proffer legislation.

Mr. Herrick responded that he would be happy to meet with commissioners about it, as the legislature was considering amendments to proffer legislation -- so perhaps they would defer action on it, and it might make more sense to have that discussion then.

Mr. Keller agreed, noting that it was a short GA session.

Mr. Gast-Bray reported that Sharon Taylor would be retiring effective March 1, which would impact the Commission deeply.

Mr. Graham commented that he had tallied it, and Ms. Taylor's service totaled 42 years, 8 months of continuous service.

Mr. Keller announced:

- The next Commission meeting will be on Tuesday, February 5, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. in room 241.

There being no further new business, the meeting moved to the next item.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m. to the Tuesday, February 5, 2019 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m., Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

David Benish, (Interim) Secretary

(Recorded by Stephanie Banton and transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 4.9.19
Initials: SLB