

**Albemarle County Planning Commission**  
**February 5, 2019**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting on Tuesday, February 5, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., at the Albemarle County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Other officials present were Cameron Langille, Senior Planner; Rachael Falkenstein, Principal 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.

Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum stated that he was disappointed, as he had worked cooperatively with staff regarding the biodiversity revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, which the Commission would see the following week. He said that in November, the forum joined with many other concerned citizens and groups, including the Albemarle County Farm Bureau, the Sierra Club, and Advocates for a Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP) to discuss what they felt should be included or deleted.

Mr. Williamson pointed out that very few of their suggestions ended up making it into the draft plan, but what he was disappointed in was the fact that the staff report for that work session did not include all the comments heard at the roundtables, or the detailed letter/redlined plan he provided. He noted that an email received from county staff earlier in the day suggested, "The Planning Commission reviewed and was generally supportive of the revisions at the 11/20/18 work session. I wanted to remain consistent with the language and intent of the BAP as he presented it to the PC, BOS, and a handful of other groups. I understand the desire to reduce wording overall, and that will be done over time. This revision was initiated using the previous philosophy of using more rather than less explanation and background, so I am not comfortable changing it at this point, especially after the positive feedback at the 11/20/18 work session."

Mr. Williamson stated that staff was not comfortable making changes after the 11/20 work session, yet held a public roundtable on 11/29. He said that to remedy the situation somewhat

and better complete the Planning Commission packet for the following week, he has shared the Forum's information with them, including a cordial letter to staff and constructive criticism. Mr. Williamson noted that he was unable to provide comments from all the groups and all the citizens that participated and believed staff was capturing that data to share it with the Commission – but he was obviously mistaken.

Mr. Williamson asked that the Commission provide its feedback regarding the level of comments they wished to receive from the roundtables and whether they wanted to have staff's perceptions or all the raw comments from the citizens of Albemarle who came out to work on this. He thanked them for the opportunity to speak.

There being no further public comment, 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. Keller seconded for acceptance of the consent agenda, which was approved by a vote of 4:0 (Dotson, Firehock, Bivins absent).

The meeting moved to the next item.

### **Work Session**

#### **CPA-2018-00003 Pantops Master Plan**

Cameron Langille addressed the Commission and stated that he was the Neighborhood Planner for the Pantops Development Area and would be presenting information for the second work session related to the master plan update currently underway. Mr. Langille stated that this was the second work session held with the Commission on the master plan update, with a previous session held on December 11, at which time they looked at changes to several chapters of the master plan. He said that the purpose of this work session was to provide an overview of that process and the public feedback received thus far, with a focus on the Implementation chapter and proposed revisions. Mr. Langille stated that there are three questions in the staff report, and staff would be asking for feedback from the Commission related to those questions.

Mr. Langille reported that the current Pantops Master Plan was adopted on March 17, 2008, and in the Albemarle County FY17-19 Strategic Plan, the update to the master plan was identified by the Board of Supervisors as a strategic objective – and there was a June 2019 target date for the adoption of the revised plan. He said that the public input process began in January 2018, and there had been numerous public meetings held with the Pantops Community Advisory Committee. He noted that staff had also solicited feedback from the public through the County

website and survey forms sent out through email. Mr. Langille stated that staff from Community Development, Parks and Recreation, Economic Development, and Facilities and Environmental Services had been involved with the process thus far.

Mr. Langille explained that the Implementation chapter is Chapter 9 of the 2008 plan, and that chapter recommended 46 total projects that should be completed to realize the goals of the master plan. He said that Attachment A of the staff report was a complete list of the 2008 projects, and they are broken into four overarching categories: transportation, green infrastructure, land use and design principles, and community facilities and services. He noted that since 2008, 11 of those projects had been fully completed – with the status of all 46 projects noted in Attachment A. He said there were five other projects underway; seven projects were evaluated and were determined to be unfeasible, unnecessary, or they had been folded into the work program of another county department.

Mr. Langille referenced Attachment B, the list of the updated recommended implementation projects – a table that mirrored the 2008 format generally, stating the project name and a general description of the work that would be part of that project. He said there was also a column that had the general cost estimate and possible funding sources for those projects. He stated that the final column of “Timing” was a targeted date for project completion, with 23 projects from the 2008 plan that had not yet been started or evaluated. Mr. Langille said that staff had folded those under either a new project included or a standalone implementation project, with new projects added to the list based on public feedback received, as well as some new staff-recommended projects. He noted that the list was organized into two categories: Transportation and Roadway Projects; and Parks, Trails and Greenway Projects.

Mr. Langille explained that the Timing column was a fairly critical part of the implementation list, with three classifications for the timing under the Transportation and Roadway projects and were identified either as a catalyst, long-term project, or long-term/concurrent with redevelopment project. He stated that catalyst and long-term were terms borrowed from the recently adopted Rio/29 Small Area Plan, with catalyst projects being main priorities – projects that should be targeted within the first 1-8 years after adoption of the master plan. He said these were basically big projects that helped realize the goals contained in the other chapters and were the most important. He explained that long-term projects were also important but were things that should take place further down the road, so long-term meant they should be targeted for completion eight years out or beyond in the master plan life cycle.

Mr. Langille stated that the third category was long-term or concurrent with redevelopment, meaning that it was a project adjacent to some properties that could be redeveloped from a private development standpoint basically at any point during the master plan life cycle. He said that if a development proposal came through and was adjacent to one of those specific implementation projects, there may be an opportunity for the developer to take on part of the project if not the whole thing. He said that if the project did not become part of a new development proposal, it would ultimately be a long-term project – so eight years out. He

commented that the implementation list in Attachment B received unanimous endorsement from the Pantops Community Advisory Committee at their November 19, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Langille referenced Attachment C in the staff report, the new and improved implementation project map. He said there was a version of it in the 2008 plan, but it was relatively difficult to read and wasn't really clear. He referenced a map that identified the 18 proposed transportation and roadway projects via letter – letters A through R – which corresponded to the leftmost column in Attachment B. He noted that there were also six recommended parks and greenway projects, and where possible they were labeled by name, with some overlapping with each other due to their location in Pantops. He stated that they were still working on refining the map so it could be very clear to identify where each project was located.

Mr. Langille reported that the first question before the Commission, related to just the Transportation and Roadway Projects, as found on pages 1 and 2 in Attachment B – with estimated costs, project descriptions, and timing for completion. He said that the first part of the question was whether the Commission suggested any revisions to any part of the list; the second part of the question was whether there were any projects staff did not include on the list that were recommended to be added or removed.

Ms. More said that with Attachment B, stating that she understood catalyst versus long-term but the projects were not in any particular order on the list.

Mr. Langille responded that they were not organized by catalyst by priority, so project A was not necessarily more important than project D, for example. He said that the current organization was based off of the biggest projects in the 2008 plan that were still not underway or completed, and staff listed them first with the understanding they may have new components added.

Ms. Riley said it seemed there were two potential Rivanna River crossing alternatives and asked if there were multiple crossings for bike, pedestrian, and vehicle traffic.

Mr. Langille replied that at this point, multiple crossings could be a possibility, and ultimately the Rivanna River Corridor Plan – which was underway as a joint effort between the City and County to make recommendations for development, transportation projects, and environmental protection that corresponded with the Pantops Development Area boundary. He said there was the opportunity to potentially have multiple crossings or separate crossings for pedestrian and bike, and crossings just for vehicles, or there may be just a crossing for vehicles. He noted that this was being discussed with the technical committee that was part of that plan, comprised of both County and City staff, as well as TJPDC staff. He pointed out that the phase one of that project was the only thing that had been completed thus far, and phase two was about to begin, wherein they would start looking at specific recommendations in areas where capital projects could take place.

Ms. Falkenstein said that in Attachment B, there were possible alternatives included and there had been multiple studies done by the City and County over the years identifying the different

crossing locations – but no priority had emerged that had mutual agreement, and it was hoped that the Rivanna River Corridor Plan would allow this to happen.

Ms. Spain asked for clarification that another bridge was wanted, in the best of all worlds, and people were concerned that it had not come to fruition. She said that her recollection was that a pedestrian crossing over Route 250 and improvements to the intersection of Route 250 and Route 20 were the top priorities.

Mr. Langille confirmed this, adding that with the crossing of the river, both the pedestrian and vehicular crossings had been popular ideas – but the improvements to the intersection were the other main project.

Ms. Riley asked him to elaborate on Item 11 - CAT project, and what was planned in terms of study.

Mr. Langille responded that there was currently one bus transit route serving Pantops – Route 10 in the CAT system – and in 2018, CAT considered breaking that route into two separate routes to improve service to some of the stops in Pantops, as there was currently just one bus on that route going to every single stop throughout the development area. He said that in order to get people from Pantops to the Downtown Mall in a quicker fashion, they looked at breaking the route into a southbound route in Pantops, then a northbound route.

Mr. Langille stated that this had almost been approved but CAT had to take it back to their board for one final vote, and it had been endorsed through the review process thus far. He said that staff included it here because it meant they could look at existing bus stops throughout Pantops that may need improvements such as a shelter, bench or lighting. He said that if that route got split into two, it would go along streets that did not have any bus stops at all, so there may need to be improvements made to the new stops along the second route. He noted that a lot of members of the Pantops community used CAT and would love to see all the stops improved as much as possible – which could mean shelter, lighting, etc.

Mr. Keller invited public comment.

Mr. Jason Eno Fuentes stated that in Attachment B, items D were very similar projects that looked like one half of a larger project, and he was curious if it would be possible to combine them, as it seemed to make sense to revise turn lanes all the way up the road instead of partway.

Mr. Langille responded that the reason they were broken out into two separate projects was because they were talking about doing specific left-turn lanes along Route 250 that you could take off the road to access properties on either side, as well as installing a median. He said that currently there was a center left-turn lane that was basically an open area, and there was an existing median when getting close to the Route 20 and Route 250 intersection – but it did not go very far down along Route 250. He said that it was essentially the same project, as they were talking about installing a median for the full length of Route 250 up to the Rivanna Ridge/Giant

shopping center, but they had broken it into two different timelines.

Mr. Langille stated that they wanted to target Area D, which would go from the intersection of Route 20 and Route 250 up to where Town and Country Lane as located, near the Guadalajara at the corner with Route 250. He said that the median from that intersection up to the shopping center would come later. He noted that the County could make a SmartScale application for that project, and approval of it would most likely happen if they were two separate projects as the cost of doing the whole thing would be rather expensive.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller asked Commissioners if they suggested any revisions to the Transportation and Roadway sections project of the Implementation list.

Mr. Langille asked if there were any projects that should be added or removed.

Mr. Keller responded that they have been through this before and staff had modified it based on input, so it seemed to be a precise response to that. He said that the technical question asked by the member of the audience was relevant, but the projects were still on the list.

Mr. Langille stated that the second question related to Attachment B, the list, and Attachment C, the map. He said that on page 3 of Attachment B were six projects under the Parks, Trails and Greenway Projects classification – with three being catalyst projects and three being long-term projects. He stated that the Eastern Trailhead Park, Riverside Village Park, and Rivanna Ridge Park were the three catalyst projects. He explained that the Eastern and Riverside projects were currently underway, with Rivanna Ridge being a totally new project that staff was proposing to add to this update of the master plan – with more details in the description in Attachment B.

Mr. Langille explained that during the public feedback meetings in 2018, many citizens expressed support for creating a new park in Pantops that would be located on the south side of Route 250, and the map in Attachment C identified the Rivanna Ridge Park site, which was south of Rolkin Road and north of South Pantops Drive. He said that on the west side of State Farm Boulevard, there was some undeveloped land in that area constrained by environmental features such as wetlands and steep topography – and given that, its development potential was relatively low.

Mr. Langille stated that as part of the land use plan update provided in January, as well as this implementation update, staff had identified the constrained area for a new public park. He said the public really liked that idea because it offers the opportunity for trails and ultimately could make a linear north/south connection down to the Old Mills Trail, which was just across South Pantops Drive. He noted that Parks and Recreation staff felt it was absolutely feasible to create a park that had passive recreation items such as trails, picnic benches, etc., and it would not require any disturbance to existing environmental features onsite. He added that this was the main new catalyst project reflected on the list. He said that the other three projects, which are long term, had been carried over from the 2008 plan.

Mr. Langille asked if the Commission had any revisions to the six projects listed and if there were

any projects not on the list that should be added, or if there were any that should be removed.

Ms. Spain asked if the Rivanna Ridge Park location across from Overlook was the same location slated for the Hampton Inn, or whether it was to the east of that location.

Mr. Langille responded that it was to the east, explaining that the proposed hotel properties had areas identified on the land use plan update as greenspace, and the 2008 plan called for it on that portion of the property. He stated that the Hampton Inn application was not proposing to encroach any of the parking lot or buildings into the greenspace area, and staff had asked those developers about dedicating the land or providing an easement to help correspond with the park location. He clarified that the steep slopes in that area were primarily managed steep slopes.

Ms. Riley asked who owned the land for the proposed park and what the size of it would be.

Mr. Langille replied that the main property was owned by the developers who did the Giant shopping center project, and it was where the main storm water detention pond for the area was located. He noted that some of the park went into property owned by Sentara/Martha Jefferson, and the area referenced by Ms. Spain was a private property owner. He clarified that the potential size for the park was approximately 13 acres.

Ms. Spain commented that this location was the point of contention in many of the CAC meetings because the preference of some of the residents was to have the entire lot designated as park, and they called the Rivanna Ridge Park a “park in a ditch” because of the slopes. She stated that the challenge here was the private ownership, and people understood that now.

Mr. Keller asked if there were revisions or suggestions for inclusion or removal.

Ms. Spain stated that all of these projects had been sufficiently discussed and reviewed over the last year, and there may not be total consensus in the CAC but there was certainly agreement on the priorities and what the CAC wanted to see go forward. She added that she felt this plan did that.

Mr. Keller asked if there was some merit in expanding the size of the Rivanna Ridge Park in the bubble shown on the map, since it was a conceptual area.

Ms. Spain responded that one of the issues was that it would depend on the County acquiring the land.

Mr. Langille explained that the bubble map was the implementation map and did not show the full extent of the greenspace boundaries, which was where they were calling for the park. He referenced the land use map and noted that the green area was the primary piece owned by the developer of the Rivanna Ridge Park, with the blue area representing the storm water pond. He noted the property boundary and pointed out the land owned by Sentara/Martha Jefferson Hospital, also pointing out the location of the proposed hotel site. He stated that it was ultimately

up to private owners whether to sell or donate the land to the County, but the map showed it was not as small as shown on the implementation map.

Mr. Langille stated that the third question was whether there were any projects that should be included as part of the overall implementation and recommendations, noting that there were four categories underneath the 2008 Plans Implementation Chapter. He said that some of those projects ultimately fell under the work program of another County department other than Community Development and were thus not necessary to have in the master plan. He said that in the December work session, it was briefly mentioned by Commissioners that the list was relatively long, so staff identified some of the projects shown in December that may be things mentioned in the specific chapters of the master plan instead of making them a full entry in the implementation list.

Mr. Langille cited the example of “establishment of a Pantops Trails Crew,” noting that this was something proposed by Parks and Rec staff to be similar to the group of volunteers in Crozet – the Crozet Trails Crew – which assisted County staff with maintenance to existing greenway trails or other public walking trails that went through the parks in Crozet. He said that Parks and Rec staff would like to do this in Pantops because of the quantity of trails, particularly along the Rivanna River with Old Mills Trail and Darden Towe Park. He stated that during the public feedback process, members of the public had offered to participate, and there was already a list of volunteers.

Mr. Langille stated that staff’s idea was to remove that from the draft implementation list and mention it in the narrative of the Parks and Green Systems chapter as something that would be done and was currently underway, but it did not need to be called out as a separate capital project. He said that in the staff report, they identified eight things they felt didn’t necessarily need to be in the implementation list, but ultimately they were asking the Commission if it would be worthwhile to have a third category in which the projects would be called out as soft projects.

Ms. Riley said that she wondered about the recommendation for a small area plan that seemed to be centered on the location for a pedestrian bridge but expanding beyond just that project. She stated that based on some of the implementation in the Southern and Western plan, she had concerns that there was a need for additional planning that got buried – with tremendous effort required to regained focus on that.

Ms. Falkenstein said that Rio was the first small area plan, and they had established a possible pattern for the community to look at a more focused area for a more intensive design of an area. She said that this seemed like a logical area to do the same thing, and she explained that Rio/29 was an urban development area required by VDOT about 5 or 6 years ago. She noted that the Pantops Shopping Center was also within an urban development area, so this was the second area the community identified as an area for priority for redevelopment. She commented that it made sense in the future to be an area for a small area plan, but staff needed to have a discussion with the Board and Commission in terms of how to move these things forward in the future if the small area plan was a model to be continued, which could possibly be informed by how things

went with Rio.

Ms. Riley stated that this was redevelopment planning, and she was not sure it fit in this list or should be lifted up in a bigger way. She added that it was a significant planning effort, and the product was a plan, so it may need to be represented elsewhere in the plan besides the list.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that staff would contemplate this further, adding that they should also look at where the next priority of small area plans should be so they can identify areas within the master plans that would be good for small area plans and where the priorities should fall out countywide. She noted that the Southern and Western Master Plan calls for a small area plan as well.

Ms. More asked staff to elaborate on the fourth item on their list.

Mr. Langille responded that this was the type of thing that would go under the category of “land use projects” if it was added to the master plan. He said that during the public feedback process for this update, the issue has been raised regarding properties in Pantops with existing designation that doesn’t align with what the 2008 future land use classification called for – which has been difficult with new development proposals that are by right and are completely different than what the future land use classification was. He said that going back to the September work session, staff has identified as many as possible those properties where there have been issues under the 2008 and has tried to make their future land use classification match their existing zoning designation. He emphasized that this was a big question as well, but there had been consideration of doing a comprehensive rezoning at Pantops to match all the zoning districts as best as possible to what the future land use classification called for.

Ms. More commented that this would be a proactive rezoning so the property matches the use, not just the map – because the maps should reflect the future recommended land uses.

Ms. Falkenstein clarified that this was something deemed important to the community, as they felt that what was shown in the master plan should reflect the zoning on the ground – so it would be a proactive rezoning – and staff could make the language clear. She said that staff had left it intentionally vague though, as they did not want to imply that the county would go in and rezone all of Pantops as soon as this was approved. She noted that there were different ways it could play out, including a targeted rezoning in one of the centers.

Ms. Spain mentioned that there were differing opinions as to whether the rezoning would create a positive or negative result for the Pantops area and developers specifically, so there were differing visions as to what it could and should be.

Ms. More asked if the maps would reflect the potential land uses, as people wanted to see the possibilities even if by-right usage was an option.

Mr. Langille responded that they would, as closely as possible.

Mr. Keller said that using the Rivanna Ridge Park question, if you went from the conceptual to implementation maps, it included more area.

Ms. Spain stated that the session held the previous night that educated CAC members about the differences between zoning, land use, and the Comprehensive Plan was very informative and should be offered as people join. She asked if there were a way to add a disclaimer on the map that said this was not the same thing as zoning, which was the legally binding parameter.

Mr. Langille said that there was definitely an opportunity for that to work, particularly with the future land use map and master plan, and it was really just a formatting issue to fit in the disclaimer. He noted that the 2008 plan had a paragraph in the introduction portion of the Land Use chapter that attempted to explain the difference between by-right development under zoning and what the Land Use Plan called for, but it didn't really convey what it had intended to.

Mr. Keller noted that they could also include the Planning 101 document as a PDF link in the digital file, along with the explanatory information given to the CAC. He asked if there would be a list like this or if it would be dealt with in narrative context.

Mr. Langille responded that there would be a list in the master plan document.

Mr. Keller said that with that being the case, he would encourage them to think about the ordering of them – because they were starting off with essentially a nonprofit partnership and working down to significant work orders. He encouraged them to think about the regrouping of the lists and decide whether they wanted to go from in process to future, larger to smaller, etc. He stated that the Rivanna River Corridor Plan was potentially a big part of this, so perhaps that could rise to one or two on the list.

Ms. Spain added that there was no need for item six, as no one assumed they would not work with the economic development plan.

Mr. Keller suggested that it just become part of the text.

Ms. Riley asked if the format for the list would be the same as Attachment B where there was a timing designation.

Mr. Langille confirmed that it would be, and when the implementation chapter started there would be a written text portion that may have a legend that went into more detail as to what catalyst and long term.

Ms. Spain added that they would need to coordinate their ARB design guidelines with the City, which had plantings on its side of the Free Bridge median – and perhaps that should be specified.

Mr. Keller noted that it was also an opportunity to define a character difference, so having a

discussion between the two staffs regarding the transition would be helpful.

Mr. Langille indicated that this was the last item for discussion.

Mr. Keller commented that it had been interesting to see the work that had been done in the area plans, with Ms. Falkenstein involved in all of them, and each time there had been learning from the last one with more clarity and succinctness. He added that the work staff had done on the various plans had come through in the meeting with the CAC the previous night, and he complimented them on the way they kept this moving.

### **Committee Reports**

The following committee reports were given:

#### **Commissioner Riley reported:**

Ms. Riley stated that she would be making an addition to the report made on 5<sup>th</sup> and Avon Street CAC meeting, as they had a community meeting for a rezoning application in the Woolen Mills Light Industrial Park – a request to rezone .45 acres from preserved slopes to managed slopes.

### **Old Business**

Mr. Keller stated that they should bring forth the item raised by Mr. Williamson regarding the biodiversity Comp Plan Amendment.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that he did not have a response prepared, but he would bring it back to the Commission.

Ms. More asked him to clarify the status of the Homestay/transient lodging the following week, as it was coming back to the Commission as a work session.

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that Amelia McCulley and Bart Svoboda would be able to explain what was left to do, which was essentially three issues. He said they would capture what the Commission had done to date, what had been identified as remaining issues, and any new input.

Ms. More asked if it would move onto the Board after that work session.

Mr. Gast-Bray responded that this was what staff understood, but there had been some fluidity in the process and he did not want to predict what might happen – but if everyone was in agreement, they should be able to finish it from there.

Mr. Keller noted that there was pending legislation that had just passed the state senate, and the delegates' action may also have some bearing on the process.

Mr. Gast-Bray clarified that there was not another work session planned at this point.

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

**New Business**

Mr. Keller invited new business.

Mr. Keller announced:

- The next meeting would be on Tuesday, February 12, 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 6:56 p.m. to the Tuesday, February 12, 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 and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 4.9.19
Initials: SLB