

Crozet Community Advisory Committee*

Special Meeting
Thursday, November 12, 2020

Meeting Minutes

***Note: This meeting was held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A (6); An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the Covid-19 Disaster.**

- Members present
 - Allie Pesch, Chair
 - Shawn Bird, Vice Chair
 - Joe Fore, Secretary
 - Doug Bates
 - Brian Day
 - David Mitchell
 - Ann Mallek
 - Mike Kunkel
 - Jennie More
 - Valerie Long
 - Tom Loach
 - Kostas Alibertis
 - Sandy Hausman
- Albemarle/Government Staff present
 - Andy Reitelbach
 - Andrew Knuppel – County staff
 - Vivian Groeschel
 - Rachel Falkenstein
 - Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk
- **The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm**
- The Chair introduced the participants.
- **Future Land Use Discussion**
 - Downtown Neighborhoods overlay

- Michaela Accardi led a discussion about the proposed downtown neighborhoods overlay, which is designed to help incentivize the maintenance and preservation of natural occurring affordable housing units in historic neighborhoods near Downtown Crozet.
- Density greater than 6 units per acre is possible if the development meets BOTH of these criteria:
 - Development that is in keeping with the prevailing development pattern of the surrounding streets; and
 - Provides additional affordable or workforce housing,
- AND meets one of the following:
 - Conversion of an existing structure to multiple units
 - Addition of an accessory dwelling on the lot
 - And/or infill development that preserves existing housing stock.
- Some members of the CCAC expressed concern about the criteria—particularly the last criteria, which allows for “infill development”. They expressed concern that this could be used to sidestep the main goal, which is preserving existing historic homes and preserving scale and design of historic neighborhoods. They thought this could amount to a loophole that would allow for historic homes to be torn down and replaced with larger, multi-unit buildings that didn’t fit the spirit of the overlay. The members believe that preservation/renovation of existing structures is the whole point of the overlay.
- Some members expressed concern about the overall idea—that allowing for increased density in these neighborhoods would put too much strain on infrastructure—particularly traffic, pedestrian/bike safety, and school capacity.
- There was also concern that Pleasant Green was included in the neighborhood overlay. The Chair requested an informal poll of committee members to see whether the members supported including Pleasant Green in the neighborhoods overlay. A majority of the committee expressed the sentiment that Pleasant Green should not be included in the neighborhood overlay.
- Middle Density Residential
 - **Michaela Accardi** next led a discussion about the proposed Middle Density Residential category, which aims to provide

increased housing choice and affordability with smaller-scaled development patterns that are consistent with existing neighborhoods and support Crozet's small-town feel.

- The idea is that the smaller units will be naturally more affordable—seeking to incentivize new and creative housing types like bungalow courts. However, there are very limited places in the Master Plan map where Middle Density Residential would be applied—namely, White Gate Farm property.
- The Chair asked for another poll of committee members as to who supported using the Middle Density Residential category for White Gate Farm. A majority disfavored using Middle Density Residential for White Gate Farm.
- Old Trail
 - Lastly, there was discussion of several minor proposed alterations to the land use categories within Old Trail that had been requested by the developer to better align with actual uses.
 - Also, there is ongoing discussion about the possibility of adjusting the land-use category on the NE corner of 250 and Old Trail Drive in light of the proposed Crozet Sports development. Members generally expressed support for the specific project, but they were nervous about any future use that deviated from the very specific Crozet Sports proposal.
- Land Use Recommendations Draft
 - Lastly, the Committee discussed the text of the Land Use Members offered three specific suggestions:
 - In the Guiding Principle text:
 - 1) change the word “welcoming” to “permitting” or “allowing”;
 - 2) clarify what the development will be “compatible in scale and design” to—presumably “compatible in scale and design with existing neighborhoods,” as in Goal 3
 - In Goal 3, add a requirement that new development should take into account infrastructure capacity

- **The meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.**
- **Below is a list of the comments received in the virtual comment box during the meeting:**
- From Jennie More to All Panelists: 06:58 PM
 - That tiny print has made me look into the idea that I probably need reading glasses
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 07:24 PM
 - Totally agree
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 07:24 PM
 - I am watching this but not appearing on the screen. Is that a problem? --
- Sandy H
- From Mike to All Panelists: 07:25 PM
 - According the ACPS data, since the 2018-2019 school year WAHS enrollment has increased 6%. No data is available for the current school year. Similarly, Henley has increased 6.4%, Brownsville ES + 12.3%, Crozet ES -3.1%. All of these schools are already over capacity and the Crozet ES addition has been delayed.

Exactly where do you plan to put the new students that will come from the new, higher density developments that are currently being consider and are already underway?

The supporting services like schools and infrastructure in Crozet needs to match or exceed the development. Approving zoning changes for new development and implementation of higher density zoning types will only further burden our strained resources. I would prefer that my property value not be devalued because our community is too congested.

- From Allie Pesch to Everyone: 07:27 PM
 - Please continue to use Chat instead of the Q&A for comments and questions. Thank you!
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 07:29 PM
 - I'm concerned that we're talking about turning single family homes into multi-family uses and sometimes turning garages into residential units, which leads me to wonder where the cars are going. Having lots of cars parked on a street would detract from the appeal of these older neighborhoods.
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 07:31 PM
 - Hi all, this is a Jojo O'Loughlin. I'm all for ADU's! But I am concerned about the criteria for rezoning and special use permits. Could we see that again or could someone provide a summary or a link? Thanks
- From Marie Westbrook to All Panelists: 07:32 PM

- Are we kicking the can down the road by not addressing the need for sidewalks, curbs and gutters. When would these infrastructure needs get serious attention?
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 07:33 PM
 - I think we need more architectural review than is being discussed. So far the development we have has shown little continuity or done little to try and maintain the feel of our wonderful small town....one of the reasons many have come to Crozet. This is Meg Holden btw.
 - Agree with Tom we must have the necessary infrastructure.
- From Tori Kanellopoulos to Everyone: 07:33 PM
 - Hi Everyone, the following is a link to this evening's presentation. This includes information on criteria for the Downtown Overlay District, and the outline of the process for rezonings and special use permits:
<https://www.albemarle.org/home/showdocument?id=6084>
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 07:40 PM
 - Concerned why homes on Indigo Road are left out of Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay (DNO)? I don't support the DNO, but it worries me that homes are left out and undeveloped areas are left out and then it zooms back in to include homes next to/behind Starr Hill.
- From Mike to All Panelists: 07:41 PM
 - NO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
- From Marie Westbrook to All Panelists: 07:41 PM
 - If you are reaching for clarity, can you readily answer what does the overlay concept promote and what does the overlay concept prevent and the specific criteria that needs to be met.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 07:44 PM
 - To Allie's point, the plan should reflect the wishes of the community it serves not the wishes of county staff and developers....just think we should keep this in mind.
 - Yes Ann.
- From Holly to All Panelists: 07:44 PM
 - No.
- From Erin Rothman to All Panelists: 07:45 PM
 - No
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 07:45 PM
 - No to Pleasant Green being in the overlay
- From Brian Day to All Panelists: 07:45 PM
 - NO
- From Dan Sheets to All Panelists: 07:45 PM
 - No
- From Mike to Everyone: 07:45 PM
 - No on Pleasant Green new development.
- From Joe Fore to All Panelists: 07:45 PM
 - No on Pleasant Green included in overlay
- From Jodie Filardo to All Panelists: 07:45 PM
 - Carolyn, please add me

- From H Sonen to All Panelists: 07:45 PM
 - I agree with it should be just older houses. no including pleasant green
- From Holly to All Panelists: 07:46 PM
 - No. I do not think that the undeveloped portions of Pleasant Green should be included in the overlay.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 07:48 PM
 - Question, who are considered the other stake holders/
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 07:48 PM
 - No on Pleasant Green seeing any increase in density. Surrounding roads are not sufficient to handle any more traffic. I would also ask that Hill Top be removed from the overlay district. I do not understand why it's being included in the first place. I wish we could back up and address the reason for the overlay in the first place. I'm not sure that's been explained -- except to say that someone wants to assure affordable housing. Frankly, I think there will be plenty of that given the proliferation of townhomes in many parts of town.
- From Valerie Long to Everyone: 07:48 PM
 - I think it is fine to include the Pleasant Green property. while the concept will help historic homes and streets, if the overarching purpose is to provide affordable housing and a mix of housing types, it does not seem necessary to exclude this area. The criteria still requires that the project be consistent with prevailing patterns, provide affordable housing, AND meet one of the other three criteria. I do not think it was intended to only be an option in historic areas, but focused on those areas that are closer to downtown
- From Mike Kunkel to All Panelists: 07:49 PM
 - Jodie, can you tell us who the "other stakeholders" are?
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 07:51 PM
 - Valerie - you just said "satisfying all the criteria" but your comment above says "meet one of the other three criteria" Which is different.
- From Holly to All Panelists: 07:52 PM
 - We cannot increase density on Hilltop- the current roads cannot support this. Children and pedestrians using this street would not be safe.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 07:52 PM
 - I agree Allie
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 07:55 PM
 - I agree, Holly!
 - While the small homes on Hill Top might be preserved, the lots are large, and it is likely second homes would be built behind the existing ones. This has been a huge issue in Austin, Texas where it was actually put to a vote.
- From Valerie Long to Everyone: 07:56 PM
 - If we want to encourage more affordable housing and variety of housing types, then that will necessarily require some modest increases in density. This proposal is a way to achieve that on a gradual pace with appropriate protective criteria in place.

- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 07:57 PM
 - I guess I'm not seeing the "protective criteria," and as I previously stated, there is ample construction of new townhomes to provide the affordable housing you reference.
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 07:59 PM
 - what is the housing costs of the two examples - in Wickham Pond Townhomes + Accessory Dwellings and Old Trail Village
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:00 PM
 - The issue w Wickham Pond as well as Western Ridge is that all our traffic to Charlottesville is slow-moving during rush hours because of the 240/250. We can't build more Wickham pond style middle-density before we increase traffic flow, otherwise it's going to take an hour to get to work
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:00 PM
 - Hasn't Old Trail already added middle density???
- From Mike to Everyone: 08:00 PM
 - So higher density in Wickham Pond and White Gate Farm development feeding into a smaller road whereas Old Trail has wide roads with lower density. Huh?
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:02 PM
 - I don't live next to Old Trail but I can imagine same issue exists there I would love to see more development but we need to see the roads and schools improved first because pre-covid schools were already overcrowded too. At some point we have to put the cart after the horse on the metrics of housing units / traffic increase/ School class size
- From Holly to All Panelists: 08:03 PM
 - Sandra, I think that is a great question!
- From Allie Pesch to Everyone: 08:03 PM
 - Valerie, in regards to the intention of the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay, please refer to page 10 of tonight's presentation. While encouraging affordable housing is a goal, the stated reasons for the creation of the overlay ALL are to preserve naturally occurring affordable housing and preservation of historic neighborhoods. Additional density opportunities for undeveloped parcels is not the point of this specific proposal.
- From Jennie More to Everyone: 08:04 PM
 - To Valerie;s point Pleasant Green is already very dense since it is by ight R6 and I don't think they are building any affordable units, even with the density they have
- From Mike to Everyone: 08:05 PM
 - Staff can acknowledge the comments about infrastructure needs but doing nothing about it isn't helpful.
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 08:05 PM
 - Are we talking about entire developments with 24/acre? That is not really consistent with either OT or Wickham Pond, in their entirety. Or this is a mix of density within one development? These are garden style apartment buildings, correct? That is also allowable under the middle density?

- From Susan Wenzel to All Panelists: 08:05 PM
 - I believe Foothills Crossing was noted as middle density. Does that mean more growth can be expected? All of that traffic goes directly through a residential development. Traffic is worsening with vehicles speeding to 240.
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 08:06 PM
 - And the so-called “missing middle density” is not going to be across the county - it’s only going to be in the designated growth areas and two of those - Pantops & Rivanna Village have recently updated their master plans so they won’t have this “missing middle density” It’ll be Crozet that mostly feels the impact of the density.
- From Brian Day to All Panelists: 08:07 PM
 - That is what I was saying - it will be in all the development areas across the county - hundreds of new units in big developments -
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:10 PM
 - Concur w Mike on the argument
 - We’re on density decisions when the infrastructure presentation should be discussed with higher priority than increasing DUs
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:12 PM
 - Agree with Dan on infrastructure concerns should be addressed before higher density is considered. We are already beyond where we thought we would be in our last previous master planning process, growth has sky rocketed
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:16 PM
 - If they build up the property by Sentara then we’re going to have two throttle-points on traffic from all the development having occurred behind Western Ridge, one at Sentara intersection w 240 and then another at 240/250 serviced by a two-lane road and an oversubscribed 5-way intersection.
 - Thank you Allie for pulling up our comments!
 - No to middle density
- From Mike to Everyone: 08:16 PM
 - No middle density without significant infrastructure improvements.
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 08:17 PM
 - I also do not see the clear benefit to Crozet with the new designation of middle density
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 08:17 PM
 - Agree with Jojo
- From Hal Noakes to All Panelists: 08:17 PM
 - three to six
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:17 PM
 - No to Whitegate Farm. Yes to improving 240/250 intersection. Lowest density possible because we’re already oversubscribed
- From Susan Wenzel to All Panelists: 08:17 PM
 - No to middle density designation
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 08:18 PM

- No to the middle density for White Gate Farm!
- From Joe Fore to Everyone: 08:18 PM
 - Yes to middle density
- From Valerie Long to Everyone: 08:18 PM
 - Yes in favor of middle density on White Gate Farm. Thank you.
- From Brian Day to All Panelists: 08:18 PM
 - Do not support for White Gate Farm
- From Shawn to All Panelists: 08:18 PM
 - no to middle density
- From Hal Noakes to All Panelists: 08:18 PM
 - no to wditegatge farm
- From Mike Kunkel to All Panelists: 08:18 PM
 - no to middle density
- From Phil Kirby to Everyone: 08:18 PM
 - No to changing density at White Gate. There is no "desire" for middle density.
- From Doug Bates to Everyone: 08:18 PM
 - No to "middle density"
- From H Sonen to All Panelists: 08:19 PM
 - I think it's too complicated- middle density.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:19 PM
 - No, on more density of any type....certainly not without infrastructure concerns addressed
- From Thomas Loach to All Panelists: 08:19 PM
 - We should apply the same density of 3 homes per acre that we did for Sparrow Hill. The master plan calls for density to decrease at the edge of growth area.
- From Allie Pesch to Everyone: 08:19 PM
- Thanks for chiming in, all! No to middle density from me.
- From Holly to All Panelists: 08:20 PM
 - I own a house in Old Trail with a garage rental carriage house (middle density) on the block that Rachel shared. Of the houses that have these carriage houses only a third of them are used for rental. We have four renters in our alley and two older adults whose children live in the primary home. These carriage houses are 400-500 sq feet and most of us have leases that state they are for individuals. I don't actually think these are contributing to density but are rather checking a box for "affordable housing/middle density" for the county. I personally like the option to rent my garage apartment to offset my own housing cost. Perhaps in this indirect way this makes housing more affordable for this block..(?)
- From cliffordfox to All Panelists: 08:21 PM
 - Middle density is a good idea because it allows effective design, reduced lot size and product flexibility. Many properties, small parcels could utilize this effectively to generate income. Site context is important in the tools application.

- From Dick & Robin Miksad to Everyone: 08:22 PM
 - OK so if middle density is removed from white farm might it be applied to other areas? It seemed confusing that this middle density is applicable only to currently built areas as a means of consciously increasing density but it seems that developer would attempt to use it to build larger acreage in higher density.
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:22 PM
 - Concur w Miksads
- From Dick & Robin Miksad to Everyone: 08:22 PM
 - FYI above text from Robin Miksad
- From James O'Leary to All Panelists: 08:23 PM
 - What does community mixed use mean?
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:24 PM
 - What would stop OT from building more units if zoning allows....are there current restrictions on development in OT
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 08:25 PM
 - No to middle density in Old Trail. The line to exit to 250 currently is approaching Northern Virginia levels on school mornings, and the bottleneck on 250 will impact commerce, commute times, and essential services workers
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:26 PM
 - Agree with Jojo, no higher densities.
- From Phil Kirby to Everyone: 08:26 PM
 - So Middle density could be applied to previously planned neighborhood density in green fields at Old Trail once the concept is adopted?
- From Thomas Loach to All Panelists: 08:27 PM
 - if Crozet Sports is approved it must carry the same proffer as the Wakins property, which is if owners of the Sports Complex want to sell, they can only sell the property as a Sports Complex.
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 08:27 PM
 - I'm okay with putting the sports center in, as long as the buffer along 250 is maintained and that we figure out how traffic will be managed.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:27 PM
 - Agree with fears of change in land use!!!
- From Dan Sheets to Everyone: 08:28 PM
 - No to middle density in Old Trail
- From Holly to All Panelists: 08:30 PM
 - I agree, Thomas. I don't think we can blindly change the designation on that property. I would like to see Crozet Sports there but not just anything.
- From Mike to Everyone: 08:31 PM
 - I've been told that Old Trail was supposed to be built as a retirement community. That's fine and all for it. Now look at our school overpopulation. That plan didn't go too well, did it?
- From Nick B to Everyone: 08:32 PM
 - We agree with Allie. We believe we need to encourage commercial development at the central nodes as specified per the original plan.

- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:33 PM
 - Agree, we need to bring this commercial development to downtown take it off of 250.
- From Phil Kirby to Everyone: 08:33 PM
 - Is the sports complex being considered along with the expansion in Crozet Park? Are they providing the same thing?
- From Jennie More to Everyone: 08:34 PM
 - yes to what Ann just said
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:35 PM
 - Where would one put more development into Old Trail??
- From Sandra Hausman to All Panelists: 08:36 PM
 - There will be some overlap between the new sports center and the rec center at Crozet Park, but with so much growth in population -- especially kids -- we can probably use both.
- From Hal Noakes to All Panelists: 08:37 PM
 - No to sports complex or other development along 250
- From Dick & Robin Miksad to Everyone: 08:39 PM
 - When an application is made to adjust land use to concur with present actuality (which might be a result of an exception having been granted) I think would simply encourage other applications for exemptions with the assumption that the county down the road would change the land use to make it coincide with current use. Seems a slippery slope and a back hand way of forcing land use changes.
- From Heidi Thorsen to All Panelists: 08:39 PM
 - having mixed business & residential zoned across the street from existing mixed business/residential makes sense for *future* development. I would also like to see Crozet downtown built out first before Old Trail if possible.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:40 PM
 - Question for David: Do you really think more commercial development in OT is a good idea, with the downtown center on it's way?
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 08:41 PM
 - For Old Trail, if current zoning allows it, why is this request necessary?
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 08:42 PM
 - Agree with Allie and others that Master Plan needs to continue to encourage commercial development in Crozet downtown and discourage development elsewhere. Especially along 250 which is a designated byway.
The zoning put in place in 2005 for Old Trail was pushed through BEFORE the acceptance of the Crozet Master Plan - because the Crozet Master Plan designations would have restricted it further.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:43 PM
 - But it is possible this is what the community wants and is not happy with the zoning that was allowed for OT.
- From Dick & Robin Miksad to Everyone: 08:43 PM

- I have to wonder if the interest of business and commercial development in Old Trails and along 250 because it is taking so-o-o-o long for those business to begin developing in Crozet town center. Why is this taking so very long? I wouldn't want planners to rush, but isn't this now ten years in discussions?
- From Mike to Everyone: 08:44 PM
 - Agree with Robin Miksad.
- From Jojo O'Loughlin to Everyone: 08:45 PM
 - But if the current use was a special use permit? And blocks do matter.
- From Meg Holden to All Panelists: 08:45 PM
 - Downtown is taking long as there are many hoops that have to be jumped through relative to the project, mostly VDOT issues.
- From Nick B to Everyone: 08:46 PM
 - We agree with Allie.
- From Hal Noakes to All Panelists: 08:48 PM
 - if Old Trail is playing hardball on zoning, don't give them any special consideration for extraordinary requests
- From Susan Wenzel to All Panelists: 08:50 PM
 - The White Gate Village developers arranged for a virtual community meeting with WR and Wickham Pond next Thursday, November 19th. Will the County be at this meeting?
- From H Sonen to All Panelists: 08:51 PM
 - wording issue- we want rental inspections? really??
- From Allie Pesch to Everyone: 08:52 PM
 - Susan, thank you, that is good to know. Ann just announced a virtual town hall meeting that night at 7pm. What time is the White Gate meeting?
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 08:52 PM
 - Agree with all 3 Joe Fore's points
- From Jennie More to Susan Wenzel, All Panelists: 08:53 PM
 - can you send me this info at jmore@albemarle.org. I want to be there and I am the PC rep
- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 08:53 PM
 - why say compatible with "neighborhood fabric" rather than just "neighborhood" What does adding fabric add to the meaning?
- From H Sonen to All Panelists: 08:54 PM
 - disagree with community wants rental inspections in growth area
- From Thomas Loach to All Panelists: 08:54 PM
 - When the first master plan was done the population of Crozet was about 2,500. We're going to grow to over 16,000 and if that's not welcoming I don't know what is!
- From H Sonen to All Panelists: 08:54 PM
 - agree with looking more closely at wording
- From Susan Wenzel to All Panelists: 08:55 PM
 - Allie, it is planned for 7pm, as well. Jennie, yes, I will send the information to you.

- From Tim Tolson to All Panelists: 08:55 PM
 - Next CCAC Meeting is Monday, November 30, 2020 at 7:00 PM
Ann Mallek's town hall is November 19 at 7PM BOTH are/will be posted on the CCA website: <https://crozetcommunity.orgtown> built out first before Old Trail if possible.