

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes August 6, 2019**

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

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Julian Bivins, Vice-Chair; Daphne Spain; Jennie More; Pam Riley; Bruce Dotson; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: Karen Firehock.

Other officials present were David Benish, Interim Director of Planning; Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission; and Andy Herrick.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

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

From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda.

Mr. Neil Williamson with the Free Enterprise Forum said that he wanted to be clear that although the Planning Commission's actions on July 30 were legal, it didn't make them right. He said that two weeks earlier, on July 23, the Planning Commission had a record turnout from the public, mostly supporters of the Southwood redevelopment project. Mr. Williamson said that in his 16 years of his work, this was one of – if not the largest – crowd he had seen at a Planning Commission hearing, noting that hundreds of citizens came out to participate in the process and that there was even a live translation provided by the applicant to ensure the public knew what was going on. He said that after a long public hearing and lengthy testimony and remarks from the applicant and the Commission, the proposed rezoning was recommended for approval by a vote of 6:1. He said that all of the public comments and the Planning Commission deliberations would be forwarded in the board packet, and recalled the positive emotions expressed by the crowd.

Mr. Williamson said that the next step was supposed to be the Board of Supervisors but that Chairman Keller, according to his comments in the 7/30 meeting, had a series of one-on-one meetings with other commissioners, then drafted two Resolutions of Agreement (ROA) for the Planning Commission to consider under New Business. He said that all of the Planning Commission knew this was coming, but the public did not. Mr. Williamson said that he was told that staff was equally blindsided. He said that a representative of the applicant for Southwood was at the 7/30 meeting on another matter but was not informed of the discussion that would take place minutes later. Mr. Williamson said that a week after the citizens regathered to be a part of the public process, in a room as empty as the room was full the previous week, the Planning Commission used a parliamentary procedure to enumerate all the problems they had with the Southwood application they had approved 6:1. He said that the Commission then endorsed – without a single word change on an emotionally charged document – challenging the applicant's integrity and commitment to affordable housing.

Mr. Williamson noted the Free Enterprise Forum did not have a position on this or on any individual project but feels that the revisionist ROA policy was inconsistent with the Commission's stated desire to be transparent with the public, should be called out as double dealing, and ended.

Mr. Keller asked if anyone else cared to speak. Hearing none, he moved on to the first public hearing item.

Consent Agenda

There were no consent agenda items.

Public Hearing Items

ZMA201000018 Crozet Square (Barnes Lumber)

Mr. Keller asked for the staff report.

Mr. David Benish said that the proposal was to rezone approximately 6.24 acres from HI Heavy Industry and C-1 Commercial to DCD Downtown Crozet District. He presented an outline of the property, noting that it shows more than what was being rezoned and that it shows the full size of the Barnes Lumber property which was the location for the full interconnection of the Main Street roadway.

Mr. Benish highlighted some of the major points about the area. He said that there was a county-initiated rezoning of the Downtown Crozet area to DCD in 2008, and that the Barnes Lumber property was intended to be part of this rezoning. Mr. Benish said that Barnes Lumber was actively operating at the time, but the owner declined to participate in the rezoning at that time due to concerns with the potential impacts and implications to his business. He said that the business subsequently ceased to operate in 2011, and the county received the first application for the entire property in 2010 (which was a different applicant than the one proposing the new rezoning). Mr. Benish said that the applicant deferred their request and subsequently, the current applicant purchased the property in 2014. He said that in 2017, the applicant modified the proposal from a proposal on the entire site to the 6.24-acre parcel, and that the applicant had been working with the community and the county to develop concepts that implement the vision of the Crozet Master Plan since the purchase of the property in 2014.

Mr. Benish said that also relevant to this proposal was that the Board of Supervisors approved a development agreement (performance agreement) that provides for some commitments to improvements and construction of a public plaza and roadway network. He said that the roadway network (referred to as "Main Street" in the Master Plan and as "primary street" in the application plan) had received revenue-sharing funding, Virginia State funding, and was currently under design.

Mr. Benish said that since 2014, the applicant had a number of public engagement processes and a high level of interaction with the community in various forms, which had included updates with the CCAC (Crozet Community Advisory Committee) and ongoing work with the Downtown Crozet Initiative group.

Mr. Benish said that in terms of the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for the area, the land

use designations were Downtown (which calls for a mixed-use development promoting commercial employment, office uses, and residential uses) and Mixed-Use Research and Development Flex and Commercial designation (a subset of the Downtown district located on a portion of the property, which makes up a small portion of Phase I). He said that the Downtown area was designated as the highest priority area, or most central area, identified in the Master Plan.

Mr. Benish said that the Master Plan also calls for the construction of a civic green and plaza in the Downtown area and the construction of Main Street. He indicated to the street on the map.

Mr. Benish said that the vision for the Crozet area emphasizes the Downtown area, which was envisioned to be a vibrant place for shops and housing, with employment opportunities, parks and open spaces being key features and amenities, as it would be the largest and most important center downtown.

Mr. Benish said that the DCD district being requested for rezoning was an elementary form of a form-based type district but did possess elements that dictate the physical form of development and arrangement of the uses. He said that the DCD was intended to implement both the Neighborhood Model principles and the specific goals for the Downtown area to be a vibrant, urban downtown area.

Mr. Benish said that the presence of a DCD zoning district, with its form elements, eliminates the need for a code of development typically seen with a rezoning. He said that it also lessens the need for a detailed application plan. Mr. Benish noted that guidelines for the DCD district were attached to the commissioners' reports.

Mr. Benish presented a graphic of the development proposal, with the Phase I development of the entire Barnes Lumber site shown in yellow. He said that the concept at this point in time was to have 58,000 square feet of retail; a hotel of approximately 40,000 square feet; about 29,000 square feet of office; and potentially 52 residential units. Mr. Benish said that the future phases, which were not subject at present time to the Commission's review, were also presented in the slides and provides an indication of what the size may be.

Mr. Benish presented a conceptual layout of the development and said that under the DCD district, there isn't a need at present time to focus on the detail of the building orientation and massing as it was provided by the DCD district. He said that the layout gives a sense of what the applicant was looking at in terms of a block and building form, and that it was generally consistent with what the DCD would require. Mr. Benish indicated to the plaza located in the center, which was approximately 25,000-30,000 square feet in the rendering and could be confirmed by the applicant.

Mr. Benish said that regarding the major elements of the development agreement, the agreement calls for the construction of the Main Street roadway, in cooperation and coordination of the county. He explained that this roadway would be from the existing Library Avenue eastward to the existing road network. Mr. Benish said that the project calls for the developer to contribute \$2 million, or the locality's match for the revenue sharing project request, noting that VDOT funds the other portion of this. He said that the county was managing the project and will be responsible for certain aspects of the plaza design that bleeds into the road, such as the crosswalk features and other design elements. Mr. Benish said that otherwise, the road was part of the VDOT system and will be maintained by VDOT.

Mr. Benish said that the civic plaza was the other major component that was identified in the development agreement, and a private developer was the construction contractor for this. He said that the developer was requiring a \$1.6 million loan to construct the project and was responsible for the site plan for the plaza. Mr. Benish indicated on a slide to the county's contributions and noted the matching share of contributions. He said that the project will ultimately be dedicated to the county and will either be operated by the county through contract with another entity, or directly by the county.

Mr. Benish said that the applicant was proffering the application plan and makes a commitment under the rezoning to construction of the civic green and roadway network. He said that the applicant also, through a proffer, was offering to fund a Central Crozet transportation study to evaluate needs for further improvements in the downtown area and to contribute funding towards improvements identified in the study.

Mr. Benish presented the proffered application plan and noted that it was a simple block plan. He said that the DCD requirements would dictate the form of the development, but that the plan did identify the civic plaza and road network being constructed.

Mr. Benish said that staff had found the proposal to be consistent with many elements of the Master Plan and was helping to construct a number of the features and infrastructure elements that were important to Downtown. He noted there will be traffic impacts and impacts to intersections along Crozet Avenue, including Jarman's Gap Road, Library Avenue, and Three Notched Road; however, the overall network improvements being provided through the development, such as the interconnection of the roadway and the funding of the traffic study, were important elements that will address transportation issues downtown in the longer term. Mr. Benish said that he could discuss traffic impacts in more detail after the presentation, if necessary.

Mr. Benish said that there was potentially a school impact if the 52 apartment units were developed; however, staff feels those impacts were minimal, with about 6 elementary school units. He said that Crozet Elementary School was over capacity, but the impact from the potential level of development proposed was relatively limited. He noted that as the next phase of development occurs, if there was an expectation for a higher level of residential development, school impacts will be considered at that time.

Mr. Benish said that affordable housing, which was typically sought after in a rezoning proposal, had not been offered in this particular 6.24-acre portion of the proposal. He noted that no other properties rezoned to DCD were subject to the cash proffer policy and at the time of the county-initiated rezoning, this property would have been rezoned to DCD and would not at that time been subject to the affordable housing policy. Mr. Benish said that staff had concluded that to subject this property to the policy would put the property and its owner at a competitive disadvantage to other DCD-zoned properties in the area.

Mr. Benish acknowledged there may be an additional demand and pressure for parking in the greater Downtown area from the development of this site, which was an ongoing issue now. He said that while parking will be provided for the development, the continued growth and popularity of the Downtown area would continue to generate the parking issue. Mr. Benish said that the development agreement did call for the county to initiate a parking study as part of the Crozet Master Plan update, which was in the process of beginning at present time. He said that over the next year, the county will be undertaking a study of parking needs downtown.

Mr. Benish said that regarding the environmental and historic resources, the site was within the Crozet Historic District and there were no contributing structures in this area. He said that the applicant was working with the community and staff on design guidelines for the site, noting that a portion of the site was within the Entrance Corridor and will be subject to ARB review. Mr. Benish said that there were also efforts underway to work on overall design guidelines in conjunction with the community and county staff.

Mr. Benish said that there had been an initial assessment of soil contamination in the area, and the county had received a grant to further assess these issues and potential remediation. He said that the developer had contributed the match for this grant.

Mr. Benish said that factors favorable were listed in the staff report and that the plan was consistent with the recommendations in the Comp Plan. He said that it was in a priority area where the county was encouraging development to take place. Mr. Benish said that there were a number of improvements to infrastructure in the area that staff feels will address some of the traffic implications generated from the development.

Mr. Benish said that factors unfavorable were traffic impacts and existing conditions there now that were continuing to degrade. He said that there was a potential impact to Crozet Elementary School. Mr. Benish said that the parking issue may continue to grow in the area.

Mr. Benish said that based on the favorable factors, staff recommends approval of the proposal. He offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Spain asked if another example of a DCD could be provided.

Mr. Benish said that the DCD district was only in the Crozet Downtown area. He said that the building (Piedmont Place) with the barbecue adjacent to and across from the library was a building that was built under DCD zoning.

Ms. Spain asked if there was another DCD in the county.

Mr. Benish said that no, and that Downtown Crozet District was specifically identified and developed for the downtown area. He said that what they were considering for Rio-29 would be a similar exercise that would be creating another form-based code zoning district much like the county did for Crozet. Mr. Benish said that the DCD was currently the only example of this form of zoning at this time.

Ms. Spain asked if it might be something that Scottsville or other areas could follow.

Mr. Benish said that yes, this was possible. He said that what staff was investigating for the major priority areas and center areas might be this type of district, moving forward, which was what was being undertaken currently in the 29/Rio Road area.

Mr. Keller asked if there were other questions for staff. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Frank Stoner, a principal with local development firm Milestone Partners and with Crozet New Town Associates (the property owner), thanked staff for their work as they had been meeting

weekly for a year to assemble the development agreement and work through the issues relating to the redevelopment of the property. He said that they were in the fifth year of planning the project and last came to the Planning Commission in June 2014. And at that time, they were seeking rezoning for the entire property. Mr. Stoner said that after the meeting that year, they reevaluated the project and realized that the key to making it work was for the Crozet community and the county to embrace, own, and support it in a vibrant and consistent matter. He noted that small town economics were challenging, and Crozet was a growth area with a growing population. Mr. Stoner said that the applicant stepped back and reevaluated the zoning application at that time and engaged in a number of public meetings and conversations about where the project should go.

Mr. Stoner said that the proposal as currently presented was a result of four years of meetings and that the applicant was proud of it. He said that this was an important step in getting the rezoning of Phase I done but was certainly not the last step in the process. Mr. Stoner said that the applicant will be back for more meetings as the buildings get proposed and constructed.

Mr. Stoner said that the applicant was excited that both the county and VDOT had chosen to partner on the project, and that it was a sign of how important the project is. He said that the applicant understands this importance and was committed to getting it right.

Mr. Stoner said that given the comprehensive nature of the staff report, he did not have a formal presentation to give, but offered to answer any questions for the Commission.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak. Hearing no comments from the public, he turned the meeting over to Mr. Keller.

Mr. Keller asked the applicant to come back to answer questions from the Commission.

Mr. Dotson asked about the long public involvement process the applicant went through. He asked if the applicant felt that based on the fact there was no one from the public present in opposition of the proposal, if this indicates there was consensus achieved, and what the result of their last meeting had been in terms of agreement.

Mr. Stoner said that he last met with CCAC in June, just before the board met to consider the development agreement. He said that his impression was that it went very well. Mr. Stoner said that the community had been watching this evolve for quite some time, and that there were signs posted in Downtown Crozet with the conceptual diagram on them. He said that he believes that the public was ready for something to happen, and that they have done a good job in engaging the community. Mr. Stoner said that he just attended a DCI meeting that day to provide an update on the project. He said that they and CCAC meet on a monthly basis, and that Ms. More was active in monitoring those activities.

Mr. Dotson said that perhaps in the discussion, Ms. More could discuss this from a citizen's perspective.

Ms. More asked for clarification on the timing of the improvements on the square, which she acknowledged was not the applicant's project. She said that this was part of the NIFI funding that the community chose to push into a project that needed improvements, and that there were existing businesses along the square. Ms. More said that it was not just a matter of reconfiguring the traffic there, but there were drainage problems, and it was a bigger job than just changing the

way that traffic flows. She said that part of what makes sense with the applicant's project was that this would connect to Oak Street and the proposed Main Street. Ms. More asked what the applicant could say about timing in regard to how the reconfiguration of the square would happen, and with Oak Street and Main Street.

Mr. Stoner said that the project had a technical committee that meets every other week to discuss the coordination issues between the square improvements, the applicant's road improvements, and the plaza as they were all interconnected. He said that the timing on the square looks like it may be slightly ahead of where the applicant is, primarily due to the fact that they will need to obtain some waivers from VDOT for their road design. Mr. Stoner said that the intent would be to ideally have those improvements constructed concurrently, as there were utility connections and drainage issues. He said that Kimley-Horn was the engineer for the county's project and Timmons was the engineer for the applicant, and that they have been in constant contact over design elements of the square and the plaza. Mr. Stoner said that the exact timing was unknown and was contingent upon VDOT approval (the timing of which was also unknown).

Ms. More said that she believes the community appreciates the way the project was being approached, as there was a need to create a transition and flow from the older space that needs road improvements into a newer space that makes sense. She said that this was something the community had seen as a sensitivity on the applicant's part as far as determining how to locate existing, older family businesses into a new space with an architecture that makes sense. Ms. More said that the way the plaza will look and operate had been a major part of the community's engagement, and what makes sense financially. She said that regarding the roads, it makes sense to tie in the timing of the square and that this did cause a delay.

Mr. Stoner said that this may or may not cause a delay, and hopefully they would know more about the timing in about 30-45 days. He said that their "30%" plans have been submitted to VDOT, and that a number of items have been identified. Mr. Stoner said that there was a meeting scheduled for the following week in Culpeper with county staff to discuss the issues and ensure that VDOT truly understands what the project was trying to achieve.

Mr. Benish noted that there were some technical issues about where utilities were located (communications, wires, stormwater) that tie the two projects together, and that there would likely be coordination of how they were constructed.

Mr. Stoner said that the county will manage both projects, which would aid with coordination.

Mr. Bivins expressed his hope that the applicant was allowed to build the roadway as designed.

Mr. Stoner said that they were pushing for a grade crossing, as Crozet needs one.

Mr. Bivins said that he hoped this would be built.

Mr. Bivins also addressed a note about affordable housing – that although it was not included in Phase I, he was sensitive to the fact that under the Board of Supervisors' strategic plan for revitalizing aging urban neighborhoods, the contention in Crozet with all its new citizens was causing some discomfort with the people who have been living there. Mr. Bivins asked, if it was at all possible, for the applicant to consider creating residential spaces for some of the existing residents to be able to relocate into a place that they have fond memories of. He acknowledged this wouldn't be a part of Phase I, but expressed hope that in future phases, there would be

housing options for these individuals. Mr. Bivins said that a whole group of people at Mountainside, for instance, were now being displaced, and that consideration should be made as to how to keep it vibrant as it was an example of an aging, urban neighborhood.

Mr. Stoner said that their residential focus would be in Phase II, and this will require either a Special Use Permit from the county, or perhaps a change to the DCD district. He said that he believes this would be an appropriate place for a variety of housing types and values that were hopefully affordable.

Ms. Riley asked if there was a timeframe for the dedication of the plaza from the developer to the county.

Mr. Stoner said that if all goes well, they were considering starting the construction of roads sometime into Q2 of 2020. He said that construction of the plaza would start before the end of 2020 and would take a year to develop, along with the two buildings on the west side of the plaza, which were the highest priority buildings. Mr. Stoner said that the county's estimates and the consultant's estimates from UNICAP would suggest that the loan for the plaza will likely be repaid in 5-7 years, based on a fairly modest growth projection. He said that this could happen faster, but 5-7 years was the best guess and at that point, the county would take full ownership of the plaza.

Mr. Carrazana noted the mention of Phase II being when the residential development would take place. He asked if Phase I was not intended to be a mixed-use development.

Mr. Stoner said that it was intended to be mixed-use, but the focus was more on retail and commercial, as the site was located in the heart of downtown. He said that logistics of residential were more challenging in this environment and that the applicant would still like to build some units in Phase I, but that it isn't a primary focus. Mr. Stoner said that Crozet needs residential rooftops and apartments within easy walking distance of Downtown. He said that he sees them as a critical feature in order for Downtown to be successful, but there was tension between the community desiring a central core with retail, office, and employment. Mr. Stoner said that mixing all these components together, at least in Phase I, will be challenging. He said that Piedmont Place, for instance, had been built as residential with then most of it being leased for commercial, as the demand for commercial was so high. Mr. Stoner said that he anticipates between 30-50 residential units in the first phase, but the logistics of creating affordable housing in that environment were very challenging. He said that residential in Phase II would allow them more to work with.

For clarification, Mr. Carrazana said that there were still some opportunities for residential in Phase I.

Mr. Stoner said that yes, and that he fully expects residential to be built in Phase I.

Mr. Benish said that this was a use that was by-right within DCD, so future owners will have that option.

Mr. Keller asked if Mr. Stoner could reflect on the process and the significant transportation component that plays through it, including the Main Street concept slowing down traffic and the connectors. He said that in the last several weeks, there have been people from Route 250 East and from Rio Road who have voiced significant concerns about when projects come forth and

yet, this proposal would have significant impacts beyond the subject area that were reflected in the staff report and there were no objections being voiced from the public. Mr. Keller asked if this was due to the length of time of the process, or how the process had been handled, and what the Commission could learn from this.

Mr. Stoner said that Crozet had significant transportation challenges, and that VDOT was concerned about how they were going to solve the longer-term transportation problems and less concerned about how many vehicles will be arriving to intersections on opening day. He said that the entire network needs to be reevaluated, and there need to be significant improvements made over the next 10 years. Mr. Stoner said that the applicant had agreed to fund a transportation study that looks at the longer-term problems and proposes solutions to the problems that hopefully VDOT and the county would work on as the project develops. He said that one of the things that was perhaps relieving some of the pressure was that the connector road will facilitate traffic from the eastern neighborhoods that currently have to take a different route either out on Route 240 or down Park Road. Mr. Stoner said that with the connector, these people can come directly downtown. He said that while traffic was being added to the street, they were likely taking traffic off of Route 240, which relieves pressure at the intersection of Route 240 and Crozet Avenue.

Mr. Stoner said that traffic was a complicated puzzle in the area and more than anything, people want a transportation network in Crozet that works, and that this was the first step. He said that the original Master Plan called for a divided avenue from Downtown to the eastern neighborhoods, and what the community decided they wanted was an integrated network of streets Downtown. Mr. Stoner said that there was a disconnect that this will help to alleviate, but it will be important overtime to connect the network they were building to the greater network. He said that people have to have other ways to get around, and the biggest problem in the area was there was only one way to get where one needs to go.

Mr. Benish added that as Mr. McDermott had pointed out, the analysis contained in the report was based on a 2016 study that assessed the impacts of the development without the connector. He said that what was lacking currently was an analysis of the network that would provide the connection to Hilltop Drive. Mr. Benish said that what staff had assessed as impacts isn't based on a true understanding of what happens when the interconnection was made. He said that staff feels there could be potential benefit because of the eastern access that vehicles will now have to the road system back to Route 240. Mr. Benish said that the future study would look at the impact of the connector.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing and moved forward to discussion and action by the Commission.

Ms. Spain expressed her concern that they were talking about some of the same issues they did with Southwood in terms of community engagement, affordable housing (although there was none in the proposal), traffic and the difficulties that will emerge. She noted that public transit to this area hadn't been addressed. Ms. Spain said that the county seems to be supporting this project with very little challenge in a way in which Southwood was not ultimately supported. She acknowledged that the commissioners individually try to be fair and try to do the best thing, but that with the juxtaposition of this application with Southwood and with Belvedere Boulevard in terms of traffic impacts, and in terms of who benefits versus who loses, she finds it frustrating to be in the decision-making position due to having to reconcile these. Ms. Spain said that she had no issues with the project and that she would vote for it, but that it was difficult for her to reconcile the ideas.

Ms. Riley said that the proposal seems to be consistent with the Comp Plan and Master Plan and appears to be well planned. She expressed her appreciation of Ms. Spain's comments and wished that every area had the amount of time the community had taken to attend a redevelopment proposal. Ms. Riley appreciated that while it had been noted there will be increased traffic, there did seem to be a solution as was described by the applicant, which was encouraging to her.

Mr. Bivins said that under factors unfavorable in the staff report, it stated the rezoning request would potentially add more students to Cale Elementary.

Mr. Benish said that this was a mistake, and it should read Crozet Elementary.

Mr. Bivins said that as he had lived in the area for several years, the Barnes Lumber area was an area that he had walked to and it seemed like a place that was "wanting to happen." He said that he was thrilled that it would happen, and again expressed his hope that the applicant would get a crossover, whether it was a grade or something else. Mr. Bivins said that during a time when Crozet had experienced an incredible movement of new people to the area, he knows that there was a sense of displacement among the Crozetians. He said that as with the Southwood project, when new development comes into a place that was an icon across many generations, he hoped that the applicant would be sensitive to determining how to invite the Crozetians in who have been there for many generations and ensure they don't feel as if they were being displaced from a location that they have a deep connection to. Mr. Bivins said that while he was supportive of this, he feels there had been a different kind of embracing of the community that may be helpful here. He said that perhaps as this and as Southwood develop, they will become two icons of how revitalization was done right and not in contention with each other, but in concert with each other.

Ms. More addressed the traffic issue, and that having the Crozet transportation study was an important step forward. She said that she believes the community was frustrated with current traffic conditions, not assuming any impacts on what the proposed development may or may not produce. Ms. More said that she also believes the community was longing for a comprehensive look at real solutions rather than band-aid fixes that create other issues. She said that taking the time to give the issues a hard look and coming up with solutions was something the community appreciates. Ms. More said that specifically, the intersections on Crozet Avenue that experience a great amount of backup and pressure during peak hours have been acknowledged to be existing conditions. She said that while the intersections aren't currently failing, there was a great deal of pressure on them, and some of the turns don't operate correctly, causing drivers to sit for a long period of time. Ms. More added that during peak times, the only way to get out often times was for someone to nicely let you out.

Ms. More said that living and driving in the area, her bigger concern was impacts affecting those intersections such as the 126 apartments going in very close to Downtown. Ms. More said that while this was a good thing, as it creates walkable dwellings Downtown, the 126 apartments plus 200 or more units breaking ground at Pleasant Green will cause the intersections to experience potential failure before Barnes Lumber will generate traffic that would create impacts. She expressed hope that with the study and other measures, the county can come up with solutions before getting to that point. Ms. More said that it's important to realize that these were projects that don't come before the Planning Commission because they were dense, by-right projects. She said that they were seeing more and more in applications sections where traffic was a problem, and it was becoming a serious, more frequent issue. Ms. More said that while she wanted to acknowledge this, the applicant was taking on the initiative to come up with solutions and

recognizing the issue, and that while traffic was an issue they already have and the project would add to it, it was important to acknowledge the effort.

Ms. More said that as far as Ms. Spain's comment about having more mass transit, that will be a conversation they will have moving forward. She said that they do have the autonomous Tony (is this the correct title? If not just delete Tony and leave shuttle) shuttle that had launched to move people around the community, and also Crozet Connect, which was about getting people from Crozet to Charlottesville. Ms. More said that these were two important things happening in Crozet to alleviate traffic concerns.

Ms. More said that regarding parking, which was listed as an unfavorable factor, that it was always a topic of conversation in Crozet. She said that Downtown Crozet had always been a balancing and sharing between businesses. Ms. More said that parking for Piedmont Place had been successful, and a lot of overflow for it occurs on the applicant's property. She said that when Phase I develops, it was recognized that this was where many people park to patronize businesses at Piedmont Place. Ms. More said that the applicant had always had parking at the forefront of discussion over the years, and the community had been listening for creative solutions as it was something that must continue to be discussed. She said that perhaps in Phase I, parking was pushed into the next space, but that it was going to catch up with them eventually. Ms. More said that with Piedmont Place, patrons park in the library's lot, and then library patrons don't have anywhere to park. She said that this was an ongoing conversation that the community takes parking very seriously, and a bigger solution will have to be created going forward.

Ms. More pointed out that in 2014, she was present at the Planning Commission meeting as a citizen and spoke against the original applicant's vision for the property because it was a residential focus. She said that the DCD supports a secondary residential focus, so she (as well as others in the community) was not supportive of the previous application's vision. Ms. More said that she wished many of those members from the public who had previously come out to speak had attended the current meeting. She said that the Commission looked at the old application unfavorably, and the applicant went to deferral, explained his thoughts, and revisited ideas with the community. Ms. More said that she had been worried the applicant would not come back, but she had been pleased with the way the applicant had engaged the community and was happy with the phased approach, as it was a critical part of the way Downtown develops. She said that this was one of the core principles in the Crozet Master Plan that Downtown was the most important center. Ms. More noted that looking at the map, there was not much more that can be developed, and that the subject property was a big part in developing what they have, as the way it develops was critical. She said that the overall engagement had been impressive, and she noted that members of the public have been supportive. Ms. More said that she supports the project, and that perhaps engagement was the reason why there was not a crowd present from the public.

Mr. Dotson echoed Ms. Spain's thought process. He said that he had hoped there would be members of the public present to help him understand the project from the point of view of the people who live there. Mr. Dotson said that he didn't anticipate it would necessarily be people turning out because they oppose something. He said that he had been in hearings where the neighbors presented the proposal because they had achieved consensus and were able to answer questions as to why they could accept impacts, how they worked out issues, etc. Mr. Dotson said that this community involvement gives credibility to a proposal when the public sticks with it. He said that in some ways, he was disappointed in this.

Mr. Dotson said that he was surprised, given the number of unknowns, that there hasn't been

concerned expressed about those. He said that for instance, the Crozet Central transportation study hasn't been done yet, but the staff report said that it would be positive to have the answers. Mr. Dotson said that studies on parking and the market will be done, but they haven't been done yet. He said that architectural designs will be developed, and street and plaza designs were being worked on, but haven't been finalized. Mr. Dotson said that there were a number of loose ends and perhaps what was being found was that the county was turning a corner in that more development was perhaps going to have development agreements or participation agreements involved, which was not something the Commission was used to thinking about and sequencing at a detailed level. He said that maybe it was not the Commission's business to be deeply involved in those concerns but at the same time, it's been a package of the ZMA plus the performance agreement that was the total project. Mr. Dotson said that he didn't believe the Commission was well prepared at this point to judge performance agreements but that he would discuss this later.

Mr. Dotson said that similarly to Southwood, he believes the project was good, it requires a leap of faith, there was risk involved, and the risk was acceptable. He said that for these reasons, he was prepared to support the project.

Ms. More expressed her appreciation of Mr. Dotson's comments and noted that there was still work to be done. She said that because of the way the zoning was written for the DCD, there was more reassurance than one might think as the DCD prescribes what was supposed to happen there. Ms. More said that they had struggled with the idea that in the Master Plan, originally there was a sweeping road across the property that was drawn when the property was identified as being important to Crozet continuing to be a vibrant place where people come to walk, bike, and work. She said that what happened when the community was engaged was the creation of a gridded network. Ms. More said that there was contention between what the Master Plan showed versus the community's desire, and that there was some flexibility in this. She said that the reason why some of the specifics haven't been shown was because of what the DCD did and did not allow, and that changes to this in the future (such as a residential focus) would happen per a Special Use Permit.

Ms. More said that she feels comfortable moving forward and that there was likely more certainty about the plaza that was being shown, as this was not what the Commission was being asked to rule on. She said that she had seen some specific designs and that there was a fair amount of certainty about how the plaza will actualize itself, and that going through great detail in the Commission meeting was not what the applicant was asked to do but should do, though the applicant would be capable of doing so if asked.

Mr. Keller said that echoing Mr. Bivins point (and in some ways, responding to Ms. Spain), discussing performance agreements would more appropriately fall under New Business. He said that he feels that there was new partnership with Economic Development and UVA, and that both this project and Southwood would stand as models the county can be proud of. Mr. Keller said that Mr. Dotson's four points were well taken, and he concurs on them.

Ms. More added that the nature of this performance agreement was different than that which the county had with Southwood and said that she thinks it was a great example of something she hopes the county moves towards in the future, and was a good opportunity for the county to invest in. She said that this was a smaller-scale example that could be done on a larger scale in the future, and perhaps to try out a public-private partnership. Ms. More acknowledged that she expressed frustration before – not directed at Southwood, but about seeing applications with failing intersections and yet the Commission was asked to approve more residential units. She

said that there was great amount of money that the county didn't match that goes away each year, and on this project, the developer was matching the county's dollars and the VDOT dollars will actualize a critical road that the community needs. Ms. More said that the community knows this was happening and it's an important part of the creativity in making the project move forward.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of ZMA201000018 Crozet Square (Barnes Lumber) Phase I, with proffers, for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller asked if there was any further discussion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 6:0 (with Ms. Firehock being absent).

Mr. Keller thanked staff, the applicant, and the community members who were involved in the project.

Committee Reports

Mr. Dotson said that he would like to report on the School Division's Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee to acquaint the Commission on the report and some of the ways he believes it could be useful to the Commission and to the county.

Mr. Dotson started on page 9 of the report. He said that often when items come before the Commission, there was an issue or question about the schools. Mr. Dotson said that page 9 answers many of the questions the Commission frequently has. He said that it lists the elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools and provides key information such as year built and the most recent additions (such as mobile units, trailers). Mr. Dotson said that if the Economically Disadvantaged score was above a 1, it means there were more students in that school that were economically disadvantaged than if it were less than 1. He said that it shows what the building capacity is, the current enrollment, and if there was a conflict between the capacity and the enrollment. Mr. Dotson said that this data looks out as far as 10 years.

Mr. Dotson said that the next column, "2045 Population Growth," looks out to the longer-term future, and how much growth might possibly be anticipated in the attendance area as currently defined. He said that it also shows a percentage of the numbers and translates the data into the current need, noting that an "X" indicates there was a current issue, as well as long-term need, noting that more challenges can be seen there. Mr. Dotson said that this was a good summary of what the overall report was about.

Mr. Dotson said that page 10 was the same organization but slightly different information. He said that it shows the history of school attendance in the area and whether a neighborhood was high growth or stable; if there were capacity conflicts; if it was a high, medium, or low-development area; the long-term population forecasts; and capacity recommendations. Mr. Dotson said that the numbers from page 9 were translated on page 10 to work together.

Mr. Dotson said that pages 11-13 show a school-by-school narrative. He said that for instance, looking at Crozet Elementary and Brownsville Elementary, it shows how the schools were assessed currently, at 10 years, and at 30 years, and what needs to be done.

Mr. Dotson said that as much of the data was prepared with CIP, page 14 shows a recommendation from the committee in terms of the long-range CIP, as well as the 6- to 10-year capital needs assessment. He said that using Crozet Elementary as an example, it shows that \$20 million was recommended to the school board for additions and improvements. Mr. Dotson acknowledged that the Board of Supervisors will also have to look at the school requests in August and September. He said that looking down to Item 10 under the CIP, it shows land acquisition of \$4.5 million for an additional elementary school in the future in the area to keep pace with the growth taking place.

Mr. Dotson said that pages 17-36 show each of the individual projects from page 14 in detail, with how the money would be spent, the scope of the project, the justification, etc.

Mr. Dotson said that appendices begin on page 37. He said that Appendix, A did not look at every school in the county, though he hoped next year the committee would look at the other schools and perhaps update the report. Mr. Dotson said that Appendix A was created by Renee Duvall, the routing and planning manager for the transportation system, and that she knows every neighborhood very well, including where kids have been picked up over the years. He said that this data shows, over a 10-year period, the numbers of the students picked up in each of the neighborhoods listed. Mr. Dotson said that one of the questions before the Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee, and what the Planning Commission had observed, was what happens over time to the older urban neighborhoods versus the newer suburban neighborhoods. He asked if there was a cycle where the initial occupants tend to generate more students and then after some time, the neighborhood changes and levels out, but perhaps undergoes another cycle. Mr. Dotson said that next year, he hopes the Long-Range Planning Advisory Committee begins to dig into this so that the county can have a better handle on some of the older neighborhoods as well as the newer ones.

Mr. Dotson said that Appendix B shows details, year by year, of the school division's projections going out 10 years. He said that it was essentially a cohort survival method, looking at how many kids were in 2nd Grade and use that to predict how many in the following year will be in the 3rd Grade, then uses that to predict 4th Grade and so forth. Mr. Dotson said that each of the schools was listed, and this may be something the Commission was interested in looking at.

Ms. Riley asked if this was the methodology, or if it looks at any of the new subdivisions or typology of house.

Mr. Dotson said that it acknowledges high-growth areas and low-growth areas because they do a high and low estimate. He said that if the area was high-growth, they use a high estimate, and if it's a stable area, they use the low estimate. Mr. Dotson said that it was not as specific and concrete as saying a development will generate a certain number of students a certain number of years from now.

Mr. Dotson moved on to Appendix C and acknowledged Mr. Andy Knuppel, neighborhood planner, sitting in the audience. He said that Appendix C reflects Mr. Knuppel's work and was of interest to all commissioners who sit on CACs. Mr. Dotson said that this report was updated periodically, and that the most current one was from July 1, though he suspects the one in front of the Commission was an earlier version. He said that it shows the schools and maps, and a listing of the various developments and how many have been approved, built, or remain to be built, noting that timing was never known on this.

Mr. Dotson said that Appendix D was the long-range population forecast and something he had worked on by piggybacking on data generated in the county in Planning and Community Development for purposes of the Long-Range Transportation Plan. He said that the Long-Range Transportation Plan was based on roughly 140 traffic analysis zones and for each of the zones, county staff gave their best professional judgment and effort looking at zoning, past development, and the development dashboard of what would be the population in each traffic analysis zone 30 years out. Mr. Dotson said that if the population was known, an estimate can also be made on the number of students, and so he used GIS and overlaid the traffic analysis zones on the school attendance area, and they were a good fit. He said that when the report refers to the long-range forecast, this was the data in which it came from.

Mr. Dotson said that Appendix E recapitulates earlier information.

Mr. Dotson said that Appendix F was interesting and important, as it details the demographics of the schools. He said that not only were capacity issues important, but the equity in schooling, and this data adds that dimension.

Mr. Dotson said that Appendix G was about maintenance and replacement.

Mr. Dotson explained how this data can be useful to the Commission and to the county. He said that when zoning amendments come in, such as Southwood (with concerns about Cale) and Barnes Lumber (and concerns about Crozet and Brownsville), this data gives a basis for the thought process and the situation regarding the subject schools. Mr. Dotson said that the data was useful in preparing master plans, citing the upcoming Crozet Master Plan update and noting there will be a new school site needed in addition to expanding Crozet Elementary.

Mr. Dotson read a quote from page 5 that states, "As a growing county, adequate capacity will continue to be a need for the school division. This was supported by the 10-year enrollment projections and reinforced even stronger by the 30-year population forecast. For over 15 years, the school division had been in practice of expanding existing facilities and when necessary, deploying mobile classroom units in the interim, as it reaches a saturation point. Reaching a saturation point where expansion was no longer an option, the division needs to begin developing a long-range strategy of new schools, including potential locations and timing, as well as a plan for purchase or acquisition of sites where needed." He pointed to this as the bottom line.

Mr. Dotson added that if it was useful to have fairly detailed population forecasts by traffic analysis zone, and have it translated to schools, he wonders if it couldn't also be translated to other infrastructure as well, as master plans were developed, and implementation chapters were reviewed.

Mr. Keller said that it was very helpful to go over this information.

Mr. Dotson encouraged the Commission to keep the report handy to use often.

Mr. Keller added they should bring it next week.

Mr. Dotson said that he put together some items (included in the Commissioner's package) to jumpstart conversation next week as they discuss the Planning Commission's role in the CIP process.

Ms. More said that the Crozet CAC did not meet in July. She said that there was not enough subject matter to have a meeting, and there were also many people on vacation. Ms. More said that she believes vacations in the summer perhaps could be the reason why there weren't members of the public present about Barnes Lumber. She said that she was in some ways happy that the community members who have put a lot of time into the process weren't in attendance, as she feels there was a less than enthusiastic support for the project that was so critical to Crozet. Ms. More said that they have an abundance of residential and there was finally a project about Downtown, but it was received with an element of coldness that she didn't think community members would appreciate. She said that with this said that, she thinks all committees suffer attendance in the summer months because of vacations.

Mr. Benish said that he distributed the schedule of Planning Commission items for the next three months. He said that he discussed with some of the commissioners the possible need to reschedule one item that was scheduled for August 20 and there was an advertising issue. Mr. Benish said that one possibility would be to call for a special meeting, but that they would not take care of this at the present meeting but rather, first see if there were other options after speaking with the county attorney. He said that he may possibly come back to the Commission with the need to have a possible meeting on August 27. Mr. Benish said that he confirmed they would have a quorum if necessary, but he may find another avenue to do instead. He said that it was the Regent School Special Use Permit for a school being proposed on Reservoir Road that goes to Ragged Mountain Reservoir. Mr. Benish said that the applicant was under a time constraint to get an action by September, which was why he was trying to work to accommodate their schedule. He said that this will be revisited next week on August 13, if another meeting did need to be scheduled.

Mr. Keller asked for a show of hands of commissioners who could be available on August 27.

Mr. Benish reiterated that August 27 could be an option, but he will work with the county attorney to see if there was another option rather than scheduling this meeting.

Mr. Keller said that he had not heard from Ms. Firehock yet about it.

Mr. Benish said that the project was in Ms. Firehock's district and she was not aware of it. He said that he would like to make sure she was available, if at all possible. Mr. Benish added that this was why he wanted to revisit the issue next week instead of at present.

Mr. Keller asked if he would like to see if there was a quorum's worth now.

Mr. Benish said that he did determine that there was a quorum. He said that there were five, if it was necessary.

Old Business

Mr. Dotson said that there was a discussion in the staff report about traffic, and he would like to see the traffic analysis as submitted, or, as a document or report if possible. He said that he trusts Mr. McDermott's conclusions, but that he would like to arrive at the same conclusion himself. Mr. Dotson said that he was unsure if this creates logistical problems or if he was the only Commissioner who felt that way and asked if they could discuss it. He said that if a traffic impact analysis had been done, it seems like it should be part of the packet.

Mr. Keller said that as a follow-up to this, he would like to understand why there was a decision by staff for the transportation planner or VDOT representative to be present at some meetings, but not at others. He asked what determines their attendance and said that for the major rezonings, it would be helpful to have transportation representation there.

Ms. Spain noted that some staff reports contain the traffic analysis and that others don't. She asked if there was a rationale for this, or if it had to do with lead time and how much was involved.

Mr. Benish said that depending on how much the Commission wants to look at with a traffic analysis, it could be volumes. He said that they typically come with a summary assessment, but if the Commission wants to see down to the AM and PM peak volumes and the appendix, staff could provide a summary of this report. Mr. Benish said that the other option was to try to get this information linked in the staff report so that the commissioners can see it without creating a paper copy complexity. He said that the studies can be fairly voluminous, depending on the complexity of the study and at some point, staff would assess how much of this data the Commission should have.

Mr. Dotson said that if staff could provide a link, the commissioners can choose to drill down or not.

Mr. Benish said that he could pursue this. He said that in terms of when they have transportation staff present at the meetings, they do try to do this as much as possible, but that at the present meeting there were logistics issues with Mr. McDermott. Mr. Benish said that the Barnes Lumber project was under a tight approval period and was subject to a withdrawal date of September 5, so staff had to get the Planning Commission and the Board's action on it in August, and it couldn't be scheduled until performance agreements were completed. He said that they ran into a time crunch and the hope had been to have Mr. McDermott present. Mr. Benish said that regarding VDOT, staff usually tries to get them to attend, but they cannot make them attend. He said that while they were usually supportive of staff's requests, sometimes they cannot make the meetings.

Mr. Benish said that if there was any issue in which there was controversy or questions about the transportation analysis (for example, Barnes Lumber's analysis was based on an older study), ideally the transportation planner would be present to answer those questions. He said that having the transportation planner present was judged based on the level of complexity of the comments, and the Barnes Lumber project was one where no one was available to attend. Mr. Benish said that he felt comfortable enough to make the responses himself. He said that staff will try to ensure they were present, and for the Commission to let them know their questions in advance if possible.

Mr. Dotson said that regarding traffic impact analyses and studies, he believes it would be useful to have a work session sooner rather than later on what exactly a traffic impact analysis looks at, to have a discussion on level of service (for example, what "failed" means), and if traffic service levels (A, B, C, D) were more suburban concepts and how these would relate to downtown areas (for instance, would you actually want to have a "D" in a downtown). He said that this would help the Commission to understand what happens in a traffic impact analysis as well as what isn't done, and this would make for a good work session topic.

Ms. Riley agreed, and said that during her time on the Commission, she had seen a range of level of quality and detail in traffic impact assessments and that there clearly isn't a particular standard that had to be followed. She said that understanding what the ideal standard would be, what the range of types of reports are, would be good. Ms. Riley said that she had found that some of the

analyses were either dated, or the assumptions were either inaccurate or don't match with the residential units the developer proposes. She said that there were critical items there that she would hope that staff would point out and provide in some kind of summary, rather than simply state that there would be significant impacts but then recommend for approval. Ms. Riley said that while that didn't always happen, the Commission was seeing this some of the time now. She asked what cases should be pointed out where the assessment was a few years old or that it did or didn't include the other developments that have either been approved or were being built. Ms. Riley asked that the work session would be a way to define the criteria to be reported on traffic analysis in the same way that the Commission was asking for affordable housing units in the staff report.

Mr. Keller said that another major point that was articulated in an interesting matter was from the Village of Rivanna plan and the fact there were provisions that development should not occur until certain transportation improvements occurred. He said that one of the developers after the last meeting asked (noting he wasn't sure if this was legal) if this was a way the county could direct development in the areas it wanted to by doing improvements in the area and then, similarly to what had been done in Crozet, there was a payback or a portion of what had been paid for up front by the county (whether that was a bond issue, etc.). He said that the developer said that this was a way to develop in a certain area if there was known under-enrollment in schools in that area. Mr. Keller noted that he was not saying he was for or against the idea, but that it was interesting. He said that it would also be interesting to know how many specialty plan areas were in the county and what the ramifications for development in those other areas are. Mr. Keller said that it seems to all come down to transportation and schools.

Mr. Carrazana said that as far as challenges UVA had experienced with traffic analysis, there were some industry standards on failing intersections and grades. He said that where UVA finds challenges was in projections, even though its population was more defined (whether patients, students, or staff). Mr. Carrazana can gauge who will be there, but the challenges lie in other projects, citing a new hospital being built for the health system where they conducted three different traffic analyses prior to the building coming online. He said that the challenges they kept finding were not getting information from other developments that were happening and at the time that the hospital addition was built, they have had four apartment buildings that have gone up in the area on West Main Street. Mr. Carrazana said that those were not forthcoming at the time, and there were no traffic analyses associated with the apartments. He said that the question for the county was how this was being looked at, if there was anyone who had a comprehensive look at traffic as projects were being brought up, and who was gathering the projections information and feeding it into the model.

Mr. Benish said that for traffic studies for particular development proposals, they were scoped with VDOT, and the scoping will determine the range of impacts from the development and the assumptions of growth and what analysis needs to cover the range of impacts from the development. He said that looking at an individual development, there was the process and industry standards for this.

Mr. Benish said that as a backdrop to transportation planning, much of the planning from the network standpoint was driven by the Long-Range Transportation Plan. He said that this data provides for an analysis of what major roadway networks will be needed based on projections in growth. Mr. Benish said that this data and traffic zoning data can be a component of what was looked at in trying to gauge the bigger-picture assessment. He said that when scoping was done for the individual study and zones were assessed, an evaluation of what development proposals

had been approved was done at a local level, and whether there need to be adjustments made to the Long-Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Benish said that it was a matter of making a best-guess judgment of when those developments will come online. He said that it was “crystal balling” because particularly when there was by-right development, when there was a form-based code approved in a DCD district, theoretically the zoning was created as a by-right development, and there was no mandate for a traffic study or analysis. Mr. Benish said that in this case, one relies very heavily on the network analysis to make a judgment about when the development will take place.

Mr. Benish summarized that individual projects go through the process of scoping with VDOT and staff as to what growth was expected to occur to qualify and make sure the projections were as accurate as possible, and the backdrop to overall development in the urban areas was based on the Long-Range Transportation Plan where they make their best judgment where the rezonings and by-right developments were going to take place.

Mr. Carrazana asked if staff was then heavily relying on VDOT and on their models of the network to determine how a particular development will feed into it.

Mr. Benish said that staff relies on VDOT, plus the regional transportation study where the local input plays in. He said that VDOT said that the model was run, but it was done with public input from the planning district Commission and local representation.

Mr. Dotson noted that there was enough subject matter here for a work session.

Mr. Benish said that Mr. Bivins and Mr. Keller could discuss where this could fit into the schedule in the coming months. He said that although there were complexities to it, staff would be happy to discuss with the Commission.

Mr. Benish said that regarding level service “D” had particularly always been an issue, especially in the county, and it had always been regarded as an acceptable level in the urban area, which was consistent with what was typically seen in urban areas. He said that they have struggled with VDOT in the past who had established a more suburban standard or level of service “C.” Mr. Benish said that VDOT was now accepting “D” because of the cost of improvements and the recognition that the characteristics of performance in an urbanized area were different. He said that begrudgingly, slower traffic and more discipline was how a driver maneuvers on a roadway can be good, so level of service “D” was not seen as a bad level of service. Mr. Benish said that all these were items that VDOT and the transportation planner can answer questions to and go over in a work session.

Mr. Dotson said that it seems like the county had turned a corner in terms of public-private partnerships, participation agreements, etc. He said that though the Planning Commission isn’t involved in creating an agreement, but in order to understand an agreement and how it was on a parallel track with zoning, it would be useful to have both the county attorney’s office and Economic Development (and perhaps others) explain funding criteria, EDA’s involvement and where their money comes from. Mr. Dotson said that he would personally like to understand the various mechanisms and, pointing to the future, the form-based code and the ongoing work in the Rio-29 area, the Commission will need to understand more about development agreements and public-private partnerships. He said that he would like to have a study session on this as well.

Mr. Keller asked if these should be proposed as joint with the supervisors, or individual.

Mr. Dotson said that the fewer people present, the more opportunity there was to have a discussion. He said that in this sense, perhaps just have the Planning Commission do it first.

Ms. Riley said that for both Southwood and (to a lesser degree) Crozet, the performance agreements have been negotiated by people who were in a position of authority to do so. She said that they were related to rezonings, but the Commission didn't have any role in them, and yet there was obviously a completely interconnected relationship between the two transactions. Ms. Riley said that this was the question for her.

Mr. Dotson agreed, and said that the Commission would see more of it, and hopefully so.

Mr. Keller said that he and Mr. Bivins would take those points forward and have a discussion with Mr. Benish. He said that they have been waiting for the EDA discussion, and it's timely the topic was coming in at this point.

Mr. Keller asked if there were any other suggestions for special meetings or work sessions.

New Business

There was no new business.

Adjournment

At 7:48 p.m., the Commission adjourned to August 13, 2019 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

David Benish, Interim Director of Planning

(Recorded by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards. Transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

| |
|---------------------------------|
| Approved by Planning Commission |
| Date: 08/20/2019 |
| Initials: CSS |