

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes September 14, 2021**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 14, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Julian Bivins, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Rick Randolph; Daniel Bailey; Corey Clayborne; Jennie More; Tim Keller; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: none.

Other officials present were Andy Reitelbach; Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Rachel Falkenstein; Tori Kanellopoulos; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Bivins said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." He said opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting will be posted at www.albemarle.org on the Community County Calendar when available.

After Ms. Shaffer called the roll, Mr. Bivins established a quorum.

Mr. Bivins asked if "COVID-19" should be called something else since we have gone beyond 19.

Mr. Herrick responded that the official name is still "COVID-19."

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Keller moved to approve the consent agenda.

Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

Public Hearings

SP202100011 Field School of Charlottesville

Mr. Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner, presented a map showing the subject parcel, TMP 60-68, stating that it is located on Barracks Road approximately 400 feet southeast of Colthurst Drive and about 750 feet northwest of the intersection of Montvue Drive with Barracks Road. He said the property is 21 acres in size and is zoned RA, as well as having that designation in the comp plan. He presented two additional maps showing the zoning of the property RA, surrounded largely by other parcels zoned RA, with a few parcels to the southeast zoned PRD and R-1 at one unit per acre. Mr. Reitelbach said that in looking at the comp plan, all of the surrounding parcels are also designated RA.

Mr. Reitelbach reported that the purpose of tonight's public hearing is an amendment to an existing special use permit, SP2019-00012, approved by the Board of Supervisors on July 1, 2020. He noted that that was an amendment to an earlier SP, so last summer's was to change the boundaries of the parcel that the SP applied to and the location of a tree buffer. He stated that the original SP approved for the private school use was SP2015-00024, which was approved in March 2017, and he referenced the code section that states an SP is required for a school within the RA district.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that the applicant's request is to eliminate Condition 9 in the existing SP, and the language of that condition is: "If the construction of the private school for which the special use permit is issued is not commenced by February 28, 2022, the permit shall be deemed abandoned and the authority granted thereunder shall thereupon terminate." He said that the applicant is requesting that this condition be eliminated to allow for additional time for the construction of the private school use to commence, since the end of February 2022 is less than six months away.

He mentioned that there is another small part of the request, which is minor changes to the concept plan approved—but this is more of a housekeeping matter that includes revising labels, notes, legal references to reflect a boundary line adjustment recorded earlier this year based on the SP approved last summer with SP2019-00012. He noted that Condition 1 is also being amended, but only to reference the most recently revised version of the concept plan.

Mr. Reitelbach reported that all the other items and conditions of the SP are not changing and will remain at 150 students maximum; the hours of operation are not changing; the layout of the site, including the entrance onto Barracks Road, is not changing. He said that there are minor changes to the concept plan and the major request to eliminate Condition 9. He referenced a concept plan presented as a reminder of what the layout of the school is supposed to look like.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that there are several recommended revisions for this application before it goes to the Board of Supervisors, requesting that the applicant provide additional information in their application. He said that this includes more information on their proposed timeline for construction of this use since they are requesting to amend that condition, and more information as to whether removing this condition might have additional effects on future traffic flow on the surrounding street network.

Mr. Reitelbach said that favorable factors include that there are no enrollment increases requested, no revisions to the site layout, no revisions to the hours of operation requested, and the proposed changes are not expected to impact the surrounding area and are largely expected to remain the same, as has been previously approved with both the original SP granted for this use and the first amendment that was approved last summer.

He stated that there were no unfavorable factors identified, so staff recommends approval of SP2021-00011 with the following conditions and that the previously mentioned recommended revisions are made to the application prior to it going to the Board of Supervisors: reference the most recent version of the concept plan, including the correct dates; conditions two through eight remain the same; and Condition 9 is eliminated. He presented suggested motions for the Commission.

Ms. Firehock asked if the applicant still had to construct the school within a certain number of years for the SP to still be valid, if they eliminate Condition 9.

Mr. Reitelbach responded that they would not have to and could construct it, hypothetically, in 10 years.

Ms. Firehock asked why the original date was put there so it had a deadline.

Mr. Reitelbach responded that his understanding is that the ordinance included in the factors for SPs that there were deadlines, so it was a matter of practice to include them to commence a use, or they would be invalidated. He explained that since then, they have moved away from putting deadlines on SP proposals, including conditions on such proposals.

Mr. Randolph stated that he wanted to clarify the five-year timeframe provided by the Board of Supervisors at the time, noting that the Board wanted to provide a reasonable time period for a capital campaign to be up and operating. He said that he recalled representations by the headmaster that he was confident they would raise the money within a five-year period to raise the money to begin construction onsite. He added that it is important for the Commission to come back to this, and perhaps now in new SP policy or tradition, there is no time limit set—but they might want to talk about extending for the next two years or so a time limit, given the fact the applicant would have had three years to conduct a capital campaign prior to COVID kicking in. He noted that the pandemic completely wiped out any capability to raise money, but in a sense, this is a grandfathered application.

Ms. More asked Mr. Reitelbach if more information about a timeline was not something currently available but that staff was requesting prior to going to the Board, and she said her understanding is that there still would not be a sunset condition.

Mr. Reitelbach confirmed this and said the applicant may have more information this evening as to what their timeline is, so that was included as a recommended revision just to be included in the project narrative so the Board would have that information when they got the report ahead of time.

Mr. Julian Bivins asked for a presentation from the applicant.

Ms. Kelsey Schlein stated that she is a planner with Shimp Engineering and is representing the Field School of Charlottesville in their SP amendment request to eliminate the sunset clause on their current SP. She said that Charlie Skipper, head of school, and Justin Shimp, project engineer, were both present. Ms. Schlein stated that this is simply a request for more time for the Field School to raise the funding necessary to construct their vision and deliver on their promise to their families to realize a permanent home—in a location where they have autonomy over their land and buildings.

Ms. Schlein presented a map showing site context, noting its location just outside of the Charlottesville boundaries and stating that the applicant is not requesting to modify any of the SP conditions, just additional time. She said with almost five years since the original SP approval, it would be helpful to review a timeline as to what the Field School has been working on since then and why the request for additional time is before the Commission.

She stated that in March 2017, the original SP for the private school was approved; the school submitted an initial site plan in April 2017, with the aim to get that in before summer of 2017. She said that it was the school's hope to move forward with construction of at least phase one, which

would be the field, shortly after the approval in 2017. She explained that after submittal of the initial site plan, there was a dispute about a porta-potty spec on the initial site plan, and that was found to be inconsistent with the conditions of the SP, and it took time for the applicant to work that out with County staff—so the critical funding period in summer of 2017 could not be met; after that, the school recalibrated to fundraise and get a new donor lined up.

Ms. Schlein stated that in the fall of 2018, there was a minor boundary line adjustment with the property to the east, and a letter of determination needed to be issued to determine that that could take place. She said that the minor modification request took four months out of their five-year time period to make the determination that the boundary line adjustment could be made. Ms. Schlein said that in March 2019, the property acquisition for the Field School was finalized. She said that in November of 2019, the applicant submitted a SP amendment to adjust the boundary line with another neighboring property and had to modify the SP so that residential property was not encumbered by the conditions of the SP—and ultimately that enabled some revenues to be generated for the school.

Ms. Schlein said at that time, they were still hopeful they could meet the sunset clause in November 2019 that they can have construction underway by February 2022—but in March 2020, plans changed with the declaration of the global pandemic. She stated that the Field School spent a year recalibrating their operations and focusing on serving students the best way possible, ensuring that everyone was safe and that everyone's needs were met. She said that in that time, the applicant was caught in the SP revision to the boundary line adjustment and actually getting to a public hearing. She stated that in July 2020, the SP amendment to adjust limits to the SP was approved. She said that in May of 2021, the applicant submitted the current SP request to remove the sunset clause.

Ms. Schlein reiterated that the applicant's request is to remove the sunset clause because the school has already spent a considerable amount of money and created a significant investment in this property. She stated that the school feels this is the right location and would like to have adequate time to ensure that they can call this place their forever home—but they are also very anxious to get this off the ground, and they asked her firm to submit an initial site plan. She pointed out that it was her firm's recommendation to request an extension of the SP, just so they weren't running up against timelines. She noted that the school has done a significant amount of fundraising but would like to secure more so they can build more of their vision at once, and they are aiming for a two- to three-year time period where they can have a shovel in the ground; however, it is her firm's request to have the sunset clause removed.

Ms. Schlein stated that traffic could be impacted by extending the sunset clause, and the impacts of the school have been considered but as funding for road projects moves forward, this plan is on the table with traffic impacts already reviewed. She said that she is available to answer questions, along with Justin Shimp and Charlie Skipper.

Mr. Bivins stated that he is trying to unlink what was a very thorough project plan to the fact that the pandemic is not related to whether the school has been successful raising funds. He said that the capital campaign to build a project is not necessarily a function of boundary readjustments or the ability to make a decision about where people can use their facilities if they're standing out in a field. Mr. Bivins said that he was hoping to hear something that wasn't "the pandemic ate my homework" and more like "this is why we're not able to make the capital campaign that we've established to build this building."

Mr. Bivins said that VDOT would have to look at any site plan that comes out and determine the

traffic impacts, and he understands that the farm store and the increased traffic flow on Barracks Road and Garth Road—which are likely different than they were five years ago.

Field School Headmaster Charlie Skipper stated that in addition to the factors mentioned, there was a transition of leadership at the school in 2018 as he assumed his position. Dr. Skipper said that such leadership transitions always have an effect on fundraising, but another complication was dealing with COVID—and with a very small school and staff, with the development office being just him and his executive assistants. Dr. Skipper emphasized that it was not a failure of will but more one of timing, and they have raised \$1.5 million for the project. He said that phase one would happen very quickly, and his priority for the next two years was to drive this forward and accomplish the rest of the fundraising goal. He noted that the reason that they brought this request for additional time was to ensure that they didn't run afoul of a timeline when they are in the midst of trying to make things happen.

Ms. More asked Mr. Reitelbach what would constitute a significant amount of activity, because in reading the condition, she doesn't understand what would satisfy a start date being achieved.

Mr. Reitelbach responded that with the enforcement of conditions, the zoning administrator would determine what would be considered a start. He mentioned that Francis MacCall was on the call to provide more information.

Zoning Administrator Francis MacCall stated that they have a definition for “start of construction” in the ordinance, and that includes obtaining an issued building permit for the actual structure—and that doesn't happen until they get the final site plan, which in this case is part of the applicant's phasing. He explained that the actual grading after a preliminary approval, with the proper engineering plans approved for grading, doesn't constitute commencing construction. He said that some infrastructure work might qualify for that, but his office would need to look at that and make that determination. He said that the applicant could commence and run into more financing issues and have the project go dormant for a while, but if it is determined to have commenced, it is a valid special use permit.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification of whether grading constitutes a start.

Mr. MacCall responded that it does not constitute the start of construction.

Mr. Bivins commented that he was struck by Mr. Randolph's comment as to what the Board of Supervisors did when they addressed this in 2017, and he thinks it would be reasonable to extend it at least 2.5 years. He said that this doesn't follow the Board's original intent, it does recognize the change in leadership and health emergency that have impacted the school. He added that the \$1.5 million is a healthy, meaningful start. Mr. Bivins clarified that he would not support eliminating Condition 9 but would support modifying it for an additional 2.5 years.

Ms. More asked if staff could address why it has become common practice not to have that type of clause in an SP, although she does appreciate why it was put in here previously. She commented that if they were starting from the beginning and the common practice was not to have it, she feels more open to not having it at all or having more time that was just suggested—because they have evidence that so much has been put into this and all these reasons to believe there is every intention to move forward, versus another project that comes along and sits for years and years. She asked staff for clarification as to why the sunset clause was removed from SPs to begin with.

Mr. Reitelbach explained that his understanding is that it would run into situations like this where events happened and the applicants or property owners were not always able to commence the use by what was designated in the SP, so they would come back and request an amendment to allow for additional time. He stated that it ended up creating additional applications and gave staff time to process these types of amendment applications.

Mr. MacCall added that he does not have anything else specific to add, but this is something valued with each separate use proposed and what those impacts might be in terms of what might be identified—because it is still in the ordinance, and they could pose that condition if it is found during an evaluation that it may be necessary. He commented that a lot of private schools decide to grow and come back and ask to increase the number of students, as there are associated impacts. He emphasized that these are individual determinations made during review.

Ms. More stated that she is inclined to discuss the option of having no sunset clause, because of the nature of this application and the applicant's commitment—but she is also open to discussion as to why others want to keep it in here. She said that she is sensitive as to why they were not able to achieve it in this timeframe, particularly in light of trying to fundraise during COVID, and she would prefer that they be given a timeline that is similar to the initial one given to the school. Ms. More pointed out that in light of COVID surges and the uncertainty ahead, it might be tough on the applicant to put a more stringent timeline on this.

Mr. Randolph stated that having done institutional fundraising, he can say that nothing gathers the attention of a community like when a government steps in and says, "You need to get this done by this time period." He said that having it loose and extending it over a period of time actually hurts the school; it does not help it. Mr. Randolph noted that the primary body responsible within an independent school for fundraising is not the headmaster—it is the board of directors of the school. He said that the dynamics have been unique, but their work should have continued for this key strategic project. Mr. Randolph stated that he feels that the 2.5-year timeframe will help focus their institutional resources and manpower, especially within their board, to raise funds. He said that they had three good years and a major leadership change with the founder leaving, and he feels that they are helping the school by extending this to August 28, 2024.

Ms. More said that she would support a longer timeframe than 2.5 years, and as a person who has fundraised in the nonprofit sector for the past 35 years, she can tell them that there is the time period where you need to look for grants and support—which sometime take a year to cultivate—and they are still in the middle of the pandemic. Ms. More stated that she would feel much more comfortable giving them five years, as this is a major capital campaign, and a lot of funding has dried up because donors have redirected their funding to health. She emphasized that fundraising now is a lot more difficult, and she feels they should be more sympathetic to this. She added that five years is a reasonable period of time, and the project itself has not changed substantially.

Mr. Clayborne stated that he supports Ms. Firehock's approach and is a nonprofit CEO, so he comes from that position. He said that strategic plans today are about three years in length, and this gives the school another chance to do one and ensure that it is front and center within that vision. Mr. Clayborne said that he would support a five-year term just based on that logic.

Mr. Bailey stated that it seems they are coalescing this around not removing the sunset clause, as current SPs are handled, and he is still struggling to understand the downside risk if it is

removed. He asked for clarification of the impacts of the timeframe and the risk profile of number of years, respectful of what Mr. Randolph said about the board's role.

Mr. Reitelbach responded that as Ms. Schlein mentioned, the use has been approved, and whether they started construction immediately or a few years from now, the use would stay the same, and the traffic generated by the specific use would be expected to stay the same. He said that the background traffic would likely grow as other parts of the county and city would continue to grow, so that would add more traffic on Barracks Road. He pointed out that VDOT would review any traffic requirements at the time the site plan is submitted—so whether it took the applicant a few months or several years to submit a site plan, VDOT would review it based on the traffic at that time and determine what was needed, such as turn lanes, traffic lights, etc. Mr. Reitelbach noted that a lot of this would be addressed at the site plan review phase.

Mr. Bailey thanked him for the clarification and said that given that, he would probably be more lenient because there are checks and balances downstream for this special use. He stated that he would agree with Ms. Firehock and others as to a longer timeframe.

Mr. Keller stated that this has been an interesting discussion and he can see both sides of the argument. He noted that they have examples of SPs that have been dormant for a long time, and policies and controls have become less stringent—yet the current Commission is held to those older standards. He asked counsel if that were going to be the case with it and if it were, whether they could put a condition on it that says they will have to meet current standards at the point in time at which they enact the SP.

Mr. Herrick responded that the proposal that has come forward has proposed retaining the other eight conditions so they would still be in effect, and the proposal would still be subject to the zoning ordinances of the county. He reminded the Commission that the conditions that are fixed to a special use permit are intended to address specific impacts of a proposal, so unless there's some sort of impact that's time sensitive, it seems to him that the condition for a time restriction isn't needed. He said the other eight conditions would still be in effect and would still govern, and the default is for SPs to run with the land.

Mr. Keller said that if they feel they have this at the point they want it, he is not sure what is gained from the timeframe—and it seems to him that if the supervisors are concerned about a timeframe, they would add that to it.

Mr. Bivins asked him for clarification.

Mr. Keller explained that he could support this but could also support the 2.5 or 5 years, if that is the pleasure of the majority.

Ms. Firehock stated that she would not be concerned about the timeframe for this particular application, in terms of it being extended indefinitely. She said that she was trying with five years to give them enough time to raise their fundraising goals but also respect the fact that the supervisors felt the need to put a timeframe on this. She noted that as to why SPs have timeframes, she has been involved with some that came with concerns regarding the detrimental impacts of delays in the context of present conditions. She added that she does not know why the Board put a timeframe on this one, and while she is trying to give deference to that, she is also fine with having none at all, as staff made good points about traffic and other factors that would be addressed as they got closer to implementation.

Mr. Bivins commented that he is not trying to negate anyone's fundraising expertise, but nonprofit fundraising is very different from health and education institutions, and independent schools have a particular timeframe in which students roll out. He stated that from the conception of this project, one would assume that the school's board was engaged in some serious or deep thought about how they were going to fund this, and as far as the timeline, there was only a hiccup last year—and that was not enough for him to eliminate Condition 9, but it was enough time to modify it.

Mr. Bivins said that he would really like to see this project in place, as Barracks Road and Garth Road have become the alternative route for coming in from west of town, so it would be good to know those traffic patterns now and not five years from now. He added that he would struggle with five years because they have already had four and a half years until they got to this point—removing last year, that's still three and a half years, and he does not think that giving someone eight years is keeping with the original purpose of the SP.

Mr. Keller asked if Mr. Bivins would make a motion.

Mr. Herrick suggested that Mr. Bivins make the first motion and then say at the end, "With an amendment to Condition 9 to extend the timeframe of Condition 9 to..." and then provide the date he is recommending.

Mr. Bivins moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP2021-00011 Field School of Charlottesville with the revisions as recommended in the staff report and the additional modification of Condition 9 to having it be completed in three years, or August 2024.

Mr. Herrick asked if he meant three years or three and a half years.

Mr. Bivins clarified that he meant three and a half years, so extending it an extra year.

Mr. Bailey seconded the motion.

Ms. More said that she is no expert for raising money for nonprofits or educational institutions, but she did not see it as her job as a Planning Commissioner to put a date in that she felt would help the applicant. She stated that she appreciated what counsel had advised regarding impacts, and while she appreciates Mr. Bivins comments about traffic in that area, she would still like to be more generous with the timeframe.

Ms. Firehock stated that she concurs with Ms. More.

The motion passed 6-1, with Ms. More dissenting.

Mr. Bivins thanked the applicant and asked that he point to some of the issues raised here as they prepare this item for the Board of Supervisors.

SP202100001 Crozet Master Plan Update

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein stated that she is joined by Tori Kanellopoulos to present the update and receive the Planning Commission's recommendation on the draft master plan, as well as to receive public comment through the public hearing. Ms. Falkenstein said that their agenda includes a quick overview of the planning process to develop the master plan, an overview of the

plan content, and the Commission discussion.

Ms. Falkenstein said they have organized the planning process into four phases. She said that phase one began in September 2019, with a series of in-person public workshops with discussion focused around a vision for Crozet; at the completion of that phase, they had updated guiding principles for the master plan document. She stated that phase two began the discussion of focus areas where the county received input on goals and draft strategies to address the identified guiding principles from the first phase, and this shifted from in-person gatherings to virtual meetings; they began hosting master planning meetings during the virtual CAC meetings and relied heavily on online engagement through publicinput.com, the county's engagement hub.

Ms. Falkenstein said that in phase three, they began to refine goals from phase two and develop draft maps and plans from each of the chapters, such as trails maps, land use maps, and the future streets network; they also drafted written recommendations to support the guiding principles and goals. She stated that they are in phase four of the planning process now, and this involves developing draft chapters based on previous input, as well as a focus on implementation where they brought all recommendations together and received feedback on which the community prioritizes.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would clarify how they use community feedback throughout the process, as staff has received feedback that how they've used input has not been clear and has led to some confusion, misunderstanding, and frustration—especially for community members who have participated in the planning process but do not feel their opinions are fully represented in the draft. She presented a diagram of their feedback loop and how they outlined using community input and conducting engagement on this project. She said that she would describe it as an iterative process in which they solicited feedback from members of the community, stakeholders, partners, and elected and appointed officials, then compiling the feedback and making recommendations. She said they would then bring the recommendation back out and listen to more input, then aggregating that feedback and continuing the loop.

Ms. Falkenstein presented a list of Commission and Board meetings, noting that the process was designed to be heavy toward the end of the process so they could share the feedback received. She stated that the final decision and plan adoption ultimately lies in the Board of Supervisors' hands, with the Planning Commission recommendation based on content developed by staff.

She shared some recent feedback, stating that they had a July 14 draft of the document that went to the Board, with the draft before the Commission last revised on August 20; the changes between those two drafts are fairly minor and are mostly clean-up and finalization changes. She stated that the current master plan draft has been online since August 25, with several hundred views of the project page since that time but very few people participating in the online questionnaire or leaving comments. She noted that they had 20 participants, and 17 people left comments; those who participated online gave low markings on how well the draft content met the guiding principles. She noted that they have also had email comments received from the community, and an August 11 CAC meeting in which they discussed some aspects of the document.

Ms. Falkenstein shared some themes from the feedback as summarized, including accessibility for walkers and bikers, especially along Route 250 and around schools. She said there has been concern expressed about the relationship between housing and employment in Crozet, and there is a statistic in the plan that indicates less than 6% of commuters live and work in Crozet. She

stated that they have also heard feedback about the engagement process, including some criticism of how it was conducted, as well as commentary that staff has not listened to community or CAC feedback. She noted that a more recent change, which happened in May 2021, was a change to the land use map based on Board of Supervisor's feedback. She explained that the change was to properties along Tabor Street, where they applied Middle Density Residential land use designation, and feedback received indicated that the change was made too late in the process and was something they should consider with their next update. She said that there were also concerns about traffic and school capacity with increased growth.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that many of the themes have been heard throughout the master planning process, and she said that Ms. Kanellopoulos would share some master plan content.

Ms. Tori Kanellopoulos stated that she would provide an overview of the master plan document, including the main changes since the 2010 plan and a brief summary from the Board's August work session. She said that the Transportation, Land Use, and Conservation chapters each begin with the overview and background for those topics, including challenges and opportunities; each chapter also includes more detailed narrative, recommendations, and maps and plans that support the recommended projects and policies within the chapter. She said that each chapter ends with the guiding principle for that topic and the goals and supporting projects. She noted that the Implementation chapter brings those recommendations in the three chapters all together, with the recommended projects, plans, and policies.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that the Introduction chapter includes a brief summary on community engagement and drafting this plan, with more details found in the appendix, and it has the guiding principles for each chapter; historic context, including history of people, development, industries, and schools in Crozet; data and demographics, including more data on recent growth; and key challenges and opportunities, which highlight some of the major themes included in the subsequent plan chapters.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the Transportation chapter includes the future bike and pedestrian network for connecting neighborhood centers and districts; the future street network, including planned future connections such as Eastern Avenue; and potential smaller connections where local streets nearly connect today and may be able to fully connect in the future. She said this chapter also includes street typologies, which provide recommendations for the designs of streets to accommodate capacity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers; and proposed intersection improvements, which are focused on the downtown and Route 250 areas, based primarily on the EPR transportation analysis; and opportunities for future transit improvements and recommendations from the downtown parking study, conducted by Kimley Horn.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said the Land Use chapter has the future land use plan, which also includes centers and districts, as well as land use categories applied to the plan—included recommended uses, densities, building form and massing, and prioritized design principles for each category. She said the appendix also includes more detailed guidance for the Middle Density Residential category, specific guidance for centers and districts—with focus on the Downtown Center, as it is the only town center in an area of significant importance for community members. She said there is a section on housing choice in Crozet, urging more options for designs that also are compatible with existing scale and smaller and more affordable unit types. She stated that there is a section on other areas in Crozet—those not designated centers or districts but still areas of importance based on community feedback, such as rural edges.

Ms. Kanellopoulos reported that the conservation chapter includes the parks and green systems plan, with connections between recreational areas, schools, neighborhoods, and centers, as well as areas with sensitive environmental features to preserve. She said that it includes major parks and trails and supporting recommendations and improvements, recommendations for other county-owned properties that are not major parks and schools, such as the county-owned stormwater wetlands on Crozet Avenue. She stated that the biodiversity, natural Resources, and green systems sections include water quality, stormwater management, steep slopes, and tree canopy. She said there are also cultural and scenic resources with opportunities for continued and expanded heritage and cultural tourism, as well as connections to the nearby rural area, national park, and other regional amenities.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that Implementation starts with an overview of the types of projects, how they are categorized and prioritized, and some options for funding. She said there are catalyst projects that reflect community priorities and are expected to be completed or have substantial projects within 10 years; future projects are those expected to be completed within 10-20 years. She noted that each catalyst and future project has a description, cost estimate with a range, and realization timeframe; these projects are based on recommendations from the Transportation, Land Use, and Conservation chapters. She added that there is also a list of ongoing projects at the end of the chapter that are expected to happen with development or redevelopment, or just to occur with regular ongoing county programs and maintenance.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that the appendix includes a glossary of terms found throughout the plan and a more detailed summary of community engagement, continued from the Intro chapter. She said that it includes engagement opportunities and the feedback curve within each phase, and there's additional guidance on Middle Density Residential, included recommended heights, building footprints, and unit sizes by housing type. She noted that there is also the full Downtown Crozet parking study and the EPR transportation study.

Ms. Kanellopoulos presented the summary of changes from the 2010 master plan, with the majority of changes intended to bring the plan into greater consistency with other county master plans and existing zoning—especially for the future land use plan. She cited an example in that many of the green systems designations made were intended to align with by-right development potential per existing zoning districts and better align with updated environmental features mapping such as steep slopes and stream buffers, and other green systems that increase development potential were noted separately during the review process, such as White Gate Farm.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that the overall growth projections remain very similar compared to the 2010 plan based on the future land use designations; the estimated increase in units is approximately 100-500 units based on the updated future land use plan. She stated that the ultimate buildout would depend on what was submitted through the application process. She said that the changes reflect engagement themes heard throughout the process, including scale and form of growth, and focusing on downtown as the main hub of activity.

Ms. Kanellopoulos presented a slide showing a comparison of the 2010 future land use plan and the updated 2021 plan, with a green network still retained throughout Crozet but more clarity between areas designated for public access, shown in the darker green color; other areas with sensitive environmental features like steep slopes and stream buffers, which should be preserved or private open space, are shown in lighter green. She said there are still centers of activity included, but instead of just being text in the plan, they are applied specifically to the draft future

land use plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos reported that there is a new neighborhood service center in Wickham Pond, which was not included in 2010, and this is intended to align with the future mixed-use development approved for that neighborhood with the rezoning for Wickham Pond, and also with recommended bike and pedestrian connections in that area. She noted that the 2010 master plan included downtown, Music Today, Old Trail, Western Park, and Clover Lawn as centers of activity. She said the updated mixed-use land use categories are intended to align with other recently updated master plans and with existing development potential, especially for Old Trail Village, such as the community mixed-use designation.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that staff wanted to review the Middle Density Residential land use category in more detail since there has been significant community feedback around this topic, as well as several discussions on the part of the Board and Commission. She said the 2010 Crozet Master Plan includes Urban Density Residential as a land use category, with a recommended density range of 6-12 units per acre and recommendation for all types of housing—including single-family detached, attached, and apartments. She said that it also recommends non-residential uses of 5,000-20,000 square feet where appropriate, and she noted that the other county master plans have Urban Density Residential at 6-34 units per acre.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the new Middle Density Residential land use category is intended to encourage a variety of housing types, including smaller housing units that are naturally more affordable, and to promote housing choice and affordability. She said that MDR recommends density ranges of 6-12 units per acre, with up to 18 units per acre to allow for additional affordable units beyond baseline requirements, or for construction of small-scale housing types such as bungalow courts, small and medium multiplexes, and live-work units. She stated that it recommends commercial, or retail uses up to 5,000 square feet for the building footprint and office or institutional uses up to 20,000 square feet. She noted that the recommended densities, housing types, and form and scale guidance would be evaluated with any rezoning application, and the MDR future land use designation does not change the zoning districts of any properties where it is applied but would be used for guidance of evaluation of any applications that are requesting to change the zoning of these properties.

Ms. Kanellopoulos presented a slide with maps showing UDR applied to the 2010 future land use plan and MDR applied to the updated future land use plan. She said that MDR replaced the previous urban density residential areas in Crozet, with the exception of blocks 20 and 21 in Old Trail where the Summit Apartments are located. She noted that MDR was also newly applied to the undeveloped White Gate Farm property along Route 240 adjacent to Wickham Pond, and this was previously designated as entirely green space. She said it was also applied to the View properties, as these were already developed, and to the block bounded by Tabor Street, Crozet Avenue, High Street, and Dunvegan Lane—which was previously designated NDR.

Ms. Kanellopoulos reported that the Board provided feedback during their August 4 work session on the full draft of the master plan, and there was support for the majority of the Planning Commission's recommended changes to the Implementation chapter, including shifting some future projects to catalyst projects and vice versa. She said the Board recommended keeping affordable and workforce housing priority review as a catalyst project and recommended that the previous Tabor block as mentioned be discussed during the public hearing process regarding its MDR future land use designation, and the Board directed staff to keep the same future land use plan that it saw on August 4 for the public hearing process, with the Tabor block to be further

discussed.

Ms. Kanellopoulos stated that the next step in the process is a public hearing with the Board on October 20 for adoption of the plan. She said that staff has several motions for the Commission's consideration but would pause here for discussion and questions.

Ms. Firehock stated that this is an outstanding plan that raises the bar for master plans and small area plans for the county, and she recognized staff and the community for their work. She said that in reading this, she noticed that staff had taken prior comments from the Commission and community and incorporated those. She added that she also appreciated that they took time to discuss the community engagement process.

Ms. Firehock said that staff had raised a point about the Commission wanting to discuss the Tabor Street, Crozet Avenue, High Street, and Dunvegan Lane block designated for MDR downtown. She stated that some of the concern for that area is that there are some potential historic structures on those sites, and the county currently does not have an historic preservation ordinance—so if that block were developed, there would be no protection for those structures. She expressed her dismay that the county does not have such an ordinance, adding that she is hesitant to move forward with MDR in that block without any kind of historic preservation in place.

Ms. Firehock stated that when she was a Planning Commission member in Charlottesville, she presided over five new historic districts being created and is a big proponent of them. She explained that one thing they did for some lower-income neighborhoods was to create an historic conservation district, which is "historic preservation lite" that says you cannot tear down a structure but might be able to put in non-historic windows or a less expensive roof—but the structure itself remained intact. She said that she was proposing that they not move forward with MDR in this location within Crozet at this time, until there is an historic preservation ordinance in place.

Ms. Firehock commented that while it may not be politically palatable to some, the county hears repeatedly from constituents who are upset because certain historic structures have come down. She said that to maintain the character of Crozet, she would like to see an ordinance in place before they move forward with MDR in that block. She added that in general, she likes MDR and knows they need more density in Crozet to make the downtown work.

Mr. Bailey said that the maps throughout the document denote Claudius Crozet Park as "public land," but when he reads the definition of that in the future land use typologies, it is "existing and proposed publicly owned parks and greenway systems." He asked if the park was publicly owned or privately owned and how it should be designated, including whether that might be "public access" versus public land.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that the county has received that comment online, and staff has noted that for the next time this goes before the Board—but the intent is "publicly accessible" or those open to public use versus publicly owned, specifically.

Ms. More stated that she did have comments and wasn't sure what Mr. Bivins' intent was in having her speak before the public hearing.

Mr. Bivins responded that his intent was to have her set the tone and be the voice to share what needed to be said first.

Ms. More said that she has received this question from several community members and hasn't yet been able to answer it properly. She explained that because MDR is a new land use designation, the question has been whether it is a new countywide designation by default or whether they would take a separate vote on the inclusion of it in the plan.

Mr. Herrick explained that the master plan is developed as part of the comprehensive plan, and the comp plan review is a bit further out on the horizon at this point. He said if the Crozet Master Plan were to designate something that did not currently exist in the countywide comp plan, that's okay because it may be something that the Board considers when it's looking at the full comp plan in the next several years.

Ms. More responded that her understanding was that it would be a new land use designation that was beneficial in other areas as well, and she wanted to be able to answer that process question.

Ms. More mentioned that for 2A of implementation, the downtown neighborhood architectural and cultural resource study, she wondered if that was where they were leaving space for the potential to visit the downtown neighborhood overlay—which was an idea raised but may have been too complex at this point, while they're all struggling to meet virtually. She asked if it was still valid and whether it may come out of that resource study.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that a lot of the feedback heard was for more design controls and specifics for density, form, and other features that weren't ready to be included in the master plan. She said that a more likely outcome would be to go straight to zoning changes, with changes there that could be done to implement changes pursuant to outcomes from the study—rather than going back to the master plan. She stated that if they identify changes that are needed for the master plan for consistency, they can go back and do those too, but most likely there would be a zoning step or a design guidelines document for those neighborhoods.

Ms. More stated that this process has been challenging, and she understands that not everyone is satisfied with the final draft. She said that she wanted community members to know that she has listened to all the discussions, read all survey responses, and read all emails that have been sent regarding the Crozet Master Plan review. She commented that she believes that there is an opportunity for the county to examine how this process has gone and identify changes that can help facilitate future community engagement efforts, as well as possible tools to manage community expectations. She said there are several examples of things that could have been done differently, and she has been giving that input along the way and would share these thoughts at a later time if the county wanted them.

Ms. More thanked staff for all the work they've done and recognized that they were able to shift very quickly to an online format so the process could continue. She stated that there are many laudable elements to the plan, and she is very impressed with the layout and the content of the overall plan. She said that in this process, there were two concepts that emerged: MDR land use designation and the downtown neighborhood overlay, the latter of which didn't make it into the final draft but in her opinion still has a lot of potential. She noted that this was a great example of staff responding to community concerns about how infill will occur in the older neighborhoods that surround the Downtown Crozet area.

Ms. More stated that on page 25 in the Land Use chapter, the Tabor Street/Crozet Avenue MDR is identified and explained; this area was originally included in the proposed downtown

neighborhood overlay. She said that late in the process, the future land use designation was changed from what it currently was—with the potential from 3-6 dwelling units per acre—to MDR, which can go up to 18. She pointed out that she does not support this change, and she explained that originally, this area was included in the overlay that was contemplated on how it might offer some protection. She said that this area should be removed from the chapter and set aside for more discussion after they are able to have the downtown architectural and cultural resource study completed, at which time they will hopefully revisit the overlay concept.

Ms. More stated that she does understand this is a future land use designation and something that could happen in the future—and likely with this area it would be the distant future—but from a process and planning perspective, this area needs closer attention and should not be included in this plan. She said that she would like to revisit this at a different time, and she looks forward to hearing what others have to say on this and other issues.

Mr. Clayborne stated that when they last discussed this, they talked about broadband reliability and expansion, and he wondered if it made it in or if he had overlooked it.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that it did not make it in there after the Commission's last discussion, and they had a public meeting with the broadband director and some of his team to talk about what would be appropriate to include in the Crozet Master Plan. She said that they recommended not including anything at this time and that the countywide direction be used instead of something specific for the master plan. She said that the Board has plans to extend broadband throughout the county and felt that keeping it out of this specific master plan was the best approach.

Ms. Bivins asked for clarification that Tabor Street had one type of designation prior to being considered for middle density.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained that in the 2010 master plan, it is designated as Neighborhood Density Residential, recommending 3-6 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing.

Ms. Allie Pesch stated that she resides at 1687 Mint Springs Road and is chair of the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (CCAC). She thanked staff and the Commissioners for their work on this project, noting that she is excited that they are at this point and voicing her support for Ms. More's comments. Ms. Pesch said that it is not the right time to be putting middle density on the Tabor Street property and hopes the Commission will consider removing that at this time. She stated that there are other things that perhaps fellow CCAC members will bring up regarding the order of catalyst and future projects, but overall, she is pleased with it. She expressed her thanks to Ms. Falkenstein and Ms. Kanellopoulos, adding that she was sorry they had to do this during a pandemic.

Mr. Brian Day stated that he resides at 2090 Avalon Way in Emerald Ridge, and he complimented staff for an enormously long and difficult process. Mr. Day said that the one concern he has is that the middle density designation on the Tabor Street block is premature and may be appropriate some time in the future, but not until they've sorted out the traffic problems on Crozet Avenue and figured out whether the county would have an historic preservation ordinance. He added that his read as a member of the CCAC is that the majority of people don't think it's the right place for it. Mr. Day said that if downtown goes and they need expansion space 10 or more years out, that could be a serious consideration, but middle density on that property right now is premature and

not sustainable.

Mr. Joe Fore of 1044 Amber Ridge Road stated that he is vice chair of the CCAC but tonight is just speaking for himself. Mr. Fore said that the plan represents two years of hard work between the community and county staff, and overall, it is a reasonable and pragmatic compromise that balances the concerns about growth that Crozet residents have with the county's growth priorities. He stated that it is a thorough and thoughtful document and urged the Planning Commission to accept it.

Mr. Fore suggested that the plan move all three phases of Western Park to catalyst status, and he said that as a community of nearly 10,000, Crozet currently lacks sufficient public play spaces and sports fields for the many families and children who live here. He said the 2010 Crozet Master Plan listed Western Park as a "focal point" for western Crozet—but it's 11 years later, the park is still not built, and the current draft only lists phase one as a catalyst project, with phases two and three relegated to future park status, which means another 10-20 years away from completion. He said that if staff doesn't think that moving all the phases up is feasible, then he would suggest that phase two be moved to a catalyst project and phase three be reserved for future time periods.

Mr. Fore stated that he would echo the comments others have made about the Crozet Avenue block, adding that the properties are good candidates for eventual higher density development, and he supported that idea when these came before the Crozet Community Advisory Committee. He said that staff did a good job developing a respectful plan that allowed for increased density but respected the historic homes and the tree canopy—but as a matter of process, this is not the right time and came up too late, with feedback from the Board but not enough time for public input.

Mr. Fore commented that this late addition raised or confirmed for some Crozet residents doubts about how much the county was valuing their process. He said that as a practical matter, landowners have lived on these properties for generations and have made clear that they have no intention of selling. He stated that this was generating some animosity in the community with no real tangible benefit, but he did feel these properties were good candidates for future designation, so he urged that the plan still retain and mention the issue so it can be revisited in the next master planning process.

Ms. Valerie Long stated that she resides at 6617 Welbourn Lane in Crozet and wants to support the plan and the staff, echoing the comments about their perseverance and patience with this process. Ms. Long said that she concurs with Mr. Fore about moving the Western Park second phase implementation into the catalyst category. She noted that when she worked on the zoning for Old Trail in 2004 and 2005, the land was dedicated early, and the money was designated for the park plan—but they are now on the second park master plan and still have zero infrastructure in place. She said that at the time, she had one child and was pregnant with her second, who now is 16 years old. Ms. Long stated that the park is intended to serve western Crozet and they need the amenities there, so this is long overdue.

Ms. Long stated that she believes the Tabor Street block is a good location for middle density for all the reasons staff identified, but it is a practical challenge given that the landowners have stated strongly that they will not be redeveloping. She said that her concern is that there needs to be somewhere else for this, and the reason it was so late in the game is because the CCAC and others rejected other locations for which staff had proposed MDR. She stated that when the Board provided feedback and directed them to find somewhere else to put some, they came up with a good location—but if the landowners are not going to pursue development anytime soon, her

concern is that this is all for nothing, and there are other locations that should be considered. She said that the traffic issues are worth addressing, but if the goal is for pedestrian-oriented development and residences where people can walk to downtown and access amenities, that's a good location. Ms. Long suggested looking back at some of the other proposals that staff had brought forward early on.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Bivins closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Commission.

Mr. Randolph stated that the hour was late, and he would like to suggest that they omit the Crozet Avenue/Tabor Street block from the master plan and not put a land use designation on those blocks. He said that secondly, they should recommend to the Board that they investigate a small area plan that considers the historic nature of the homes and the opposition of the landowners, providing the opportunity for a focused study that includes other community members, staff, a Commissioner, and a Board member. He said that this small area plan would explore the highest and best use for these homes, and after that is done, let the chips fall where they may—but he doesn't want to see a single block in Crozet in a discussion about land use become an obstacle to agreement on this outstanding master plan. He commented that he thought the work on the Pantops Master Plan two years ago was excellent, and this has gone even beyond that.

Mr. Randolph said that regarding the park, that is an issue of the CIP and budget and what dollars are available, and he is not comfortable with the Commission making recommendations about the order of phases and how money will be reallocated. He said that he is comfortable with whatever is in the master plan to date and what the catalyst projects are to date.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Randolph if he were trying to move for an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Randolph responded that he realized there would be continued discussion about it, and he was trying to provide a focus for agreement. He noted that he started out 10 years ago on the Historic Preservation Committee, and they still to date have no historic ordinance for the county. He said that what they need to do is look very carefully at what would be most workable on Crozet Avenue and Tabor Street, and that would be a small area plan.

Ms. More asked for clarification as to whether he meant that very specific block of properties.

Mr. Randolph confirmed that this is what he meant.

Ms. More said that historic preservation is a much larger matter, but what she was seeing in the implementation was a study of the downtown resources and the historic piece to that, which was a larger study identified the overlay that shares much in common with the Tabor block—which was originally included in that. She said that while Tabor is a property on which this could make sense, a lot of other neighborhoods share those same qualities. Ms. More asked if he felt what staff was suggesting in 2A would be sufficient, or whether he was being specific about the one area.

Mr. Randolph responded that he was speaking specifically about just that one area.

Ms. More stated that she had wanted to wait on that one area but wanted to make a clarification in that when there was pushback on the missing middle, none of it was taken away—despite a comment made in that regard as though something was removed, then staff put this in. She said

that to her knowledge, none of the missing middle where it was originally proposed was actually taken away, but staff was directed by the Board to come back with more, and that's when they brought this forward. She added that she appreciated Mr. Randolph's angle in focusing on something smaller, so it can be accomplished without a long timeframe.

Mr. Bivins asked if there were agreement to remove the Tabor Street block from the plan.

Commissioners indicated their unanimous agreement.

Mr. Bivins confirmed that one recommendation would be removing the Tabor Street block Middle Density Residential from the Crozet Master Plan. He asked for Mr. Herrick to help clarify the other piece.

Mr. Herrick stated that when Ms. Kanellopoulos was presenting, she had three suggested motions—the first of which was approval of the plan as presented; the second was approval of the plan as amended, which sounded like what the Commission was intending. He stated that his concern is to be specific about what was being amended from the plan that was recommended by staff, and he was concerned about an area of land going forward with no designation.

Mr. Bivins responded that they were suggesting that the designation would remain as it is.

Ms. More said it has a future land use designation of 3-6 dwelling units per acre.

Staff clarified that it was Neighborhood Density Residential.

Mr. Bivins stated that they were not stripping it of that, and the general consensus is just not moving it up to middle density.

Mr. Herrick said if that's the consensus of the Commission, he would suggest approving the resolution with certain modifications, one of which is that the specified area of land be preserved as Neighborhood Density Residential.

Mr. Bivins stated that the other matter that Mr. Randolph was putting before them was to try to advance the examination of the Downtown District, and he asked staff if the block in question flowed into that area anyway.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that there is a recommendation for a downtown neighborhoods architectural and cultural resources study, which is on Page 16 of the Implementation chapter, and that has been moved to a catalyst project. She confirmed that it would include the Tabor Street block property in question but is not a small area planning effort and is more of an information gathering.

Ms. More said that her point was that she would favor the approach that already exists in the plan, which would allow them to further assess all of the properties that share a lot of the same characteristics—looking at that in a bigger way, rather than beginning a new thing that could get them bogged down. She stated that what the Board would hear from the Commission is that it's listed as a catalyst with some other great things, and it could move forward as a priority. She added that a lot of the Crozet neighborhoods are at risk of infill, so this project is important to push forward anyway and would include the Tabor Street property.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Randolph if he agreed with that approach.

Mr. Randolph responded that it certainly satisfies the objective.

Ms. More commented that she agrees with Mr. Randolph regarding the park and phases, but she is reluctant to open that up, as she may want to rearrange many pieces and would be comfortable just bringing their commentary to the Board, so they are aware.

Mr. Keller applauded staff for the plan and commented that it may be a regional or even state APA project, and he hoped they would consider submission. He said that they have done an amazing job, and many have spoken to that. He stated that he feels strongly that they need to examine these areas and was intrigued with Mr. Randolph's approach to it, but he also understands Ms. More's point and does think that it is more than just that one area. Mr. Keller said that there are several blocks with historic resources, and they have seen from the work staff has done that exploring some prototypes, such as those in the Twin Cities and Portland, that they can raise density without losing the historic character of those resources. He added that he is very interested in proceeding with this the way it is outlined.

Mr. Carrazana asked Ms. Falkenstein for a description of the "catalyst project" as mentioned for the downtown area.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that on Page 16 of the Implementation chapter, the downtown neighborhoods architectural and cultural resources study mentioned intends to do a study of the neighborhoods outlined in a map on that page. She explained that this would be a comprehensive study of the historic resources in all of those neighborhoods, and there was previously one done in 2009 that focused on a smaller area and left out some of the important neighborhoods in this area and in the narrative of Crozet. She said that staff recommends expanding that study, with phase two being implementation and recommendations such as possibly doing an historic overlay ordinance, design guidelines, and other measures that offer historic protections while still offering growth and development.

Mr. Carrazana said that the map shows that it extends into the Tabor neighborhood.

Ms. Falkenstein confirmed this.

Mr. Carrazana applauded the approach of creating a planning effort as a catalyst project out of a master plan, as staff seems to be acknowledging that more information is needed here—and he hoped that traffic would also be a part of that, as development of downtown would bring that along with opportunities. He stated that as they expand into Tabor in the future, it will only mean more traffic, and he hopes that this study will help inform that. He said that Mr. Randolph mentioned CIP budgets in relation to parks, and CIP for VDOT is also going to be critical in terms of how they balance growth and density in Crozet with what VDOT can do in terms of their capital improvements.

Mr. Carrazana stated that UVA has been able to similarly use planning efforts, such as Fontaine, which was a catalyst project that stemmed out of the integrated space plan for the health system. He emphasized that what staff has presented here is a really good approach that acknowledges that the county doesn't have all the information and needs to dive a little deeper.

Ms. More expressed her appreciation for Mr. Carrazana's comments and said that expanding the

purview of the study could extend it interminably, but they know that infill is going to happen in these older neighborhoods that have a historic piece—with a lot of small roads that don't meet VDOT standards, have a hodgepodge of sidewalks and no real bike lanes. She stated that the community has hoped for a study that will help them manage the increased density from infill, because they are working with something older that was never designed to take on that much auto traffic. She said that there were a few residents who had volunteered to inventory some of the neighborhoods to find out where sidewalks existed, and to work with the county to see where right-of-way exists.

Mr. Carrazana stated that Crozet is a challenge from a multi-modal standpoint because of the small size and winding conditions of both the internal and feeder roads, which leads to frustration with residents, and it would go a long way in communicating that the county hears them, if they dive deeper into the traffic issue and work with VDOT on it.

Mr. Bivins suggested that Commissioners dive into the Crozet transportation study included in their packets, as it included an enormous amount of information that was extremely helpful. He said that this has the county pointed in a good direction, and there were a few suggestions related to present conditions that will be helpful in this effort.

Mr. Rapp thanked the Commission for the conversation and the suggestions. He said that there are a lot of people who are eager for the historic and cultural resources study, but the county is about to embark on a comprehensive plan update and a major ordinance update—so there were some capacity issues with those projects that would consume staff's time as well.

Mr. Bivins summarized the Crozet Master Plan update points, stating that they would still have Middle Density Residential designation but not on the Tabor Street block. He asked if there were other comments. He added that he was glad they were having conversations about workforce housing, and he reminded everyone that unless they paid for their house in cash, they benefited from government support in terms of the mortgage interest tax deduction.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Kanellopoulos to bring up the proposed resolution language, stating that the second motion reflects what the Commission has discussed.

Ms. More moved to recommend the attached resolution, Attachment 2, to recommend approval of the updated Crozet Master Plan CPA 2021-0001, with the following list of changes:

- Recommend removal from Page 25, Land Use chapter, "Tabor Street/Crozet Avenue Middle Density Residential," and that this specified area of land be kept with its current land use designation of Neighborhood Density Residential.

Mr. Keller seconded the motion.

Mr. Bailey asked if the discussion around the catalyst projects and future projects is at a later date or if it is to be added to any type of change or amendment at this time.

Mr. Bivins responded that if they go forward with the motion as presented, they would not go forward with any change in the catalyst projects.

Mr. Bailey said that he would request a quick check-in on the emails received from the community for phase two to be moved from future projects to catalyst projects.

Ms. More stated that she is happy to make a change, but she thought they were not going to officially weigh in on that change and that their comments and the input from the public would elevate that to the Board of Supervisors, which would have more purview over that within the bigger budget picture.

Mr. Bailey responded that he is comfortable with that and agrees it is something best left to the Board, but it is important to consider for this area, and he confirmed that he is referencing the western park.

The motion passed 7-0.

Committee Reports

There were no reports.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – September 1, 2021

Mr. Rapp reported that the Board met September 1, 2021 and reviewed the same Agricultural/Forestral Districts that the Commission had, and the Board adopted the form-based code for the Rio/29 Small Area Plan, after several years of hard work.

Mr. Bivins congratulated Ms. Falkenstein.

Ms. Falkenstein thanked him and said it was very exciting for their team.

Mr. Rapp stated that there would be a “very engaged” public hearing at the Board of Supervisors meeting the following evening with RST Residences.

Old Business/New Business

There was none.

Items for Follow-Up

There were no items.

Adjournment

At 8:24 p.m., the Commission adjourned to September 28, 2021, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

(Recorded and transcribed by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 10/19/2021
Initials: CSS