

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
July 14, 2009**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing, meeting and work session on Tuesday, July 14, 2009, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Marcia Joseph, Calvin Morris, Don Franco, Bill Edgerton, Linda Porterfield, Thomas Loach, Vice Chairman and Eric Strucko, Chairman. Julia Monteith, AICP, non-voting representative for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Mark Graham, Director of Community Development; Bill Fritz, Chief of Current Development, David Benish, Chief of Planning; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Judy Wiegand, Senior Planner, and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum:**

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

**Committee Reports:**

Mr. Strucko invited committee reports from the Commissioners.

- Ms. Joseph reported that the MPO Tech Committee met. They were given a presentation on a reader response to a survey on transit. Mr. Benish offered to email the PowerPoint presentation.
- Mr. Morris reported that the Pantops Master Plan Steering Committee has had two meetings since the open house. They will meet again on Thursday.
- Ms. Porterfield reported that the Historic Preservation Committee met and now has 12 members. They are working with demolition permits to at least have time to survey some of the historic structures that might be getting ready to be torn down.
- Mr. Strucko reported he was a member of the Albemarle County school system's Long Range Planning Advisory Committee. One of the more prominent issues the committee has been working on is the proposal to consolidate three of the elementary schools in the county--Redhill, Yancey and Scottsville--into a single larger elementary school. There has been some significant debate and discussion within both the committee and the public about whether or not this is a good idea.

There being no other committee reports, the meeting moved to the next item.

**Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:**

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

Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum, noted that he appreciated Ms. Joseph raising the transit survey. He encouraged the Commission to review the survey with what he would call a careful eye. There are actually three different surveys internal to the transit survey. One was conducted on the bus as part of the annual survey done with the transit riders. There was a second portion that was a handout pamphlet of self-selected folks, and the third involved telephone calls. After reviewing the questions, he spoke to the MPO and they did change one of the questions because he found it to be leading and they concurred. He thought that the surveys were well done, but as always with surveys he just encourages the Commission to take a good hard look at the data sources. Ridership for transit is up over the last year, which has to do a lot with increased services provided by CTS especially to the UVA students showing their ID and being able to get on for free as well as the GPS bus locator system. Also and not to a small degree, last year at the beginning of the fiscal year ridership was affected by the \$4.00 a gallon cost of gasoline. He thought that all of this combined make the transit system work well in areas that have the density to support it.

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

**Consent Agenda:**

**Approval of Minutes** – November 11, 2008 & December 9, 2008 and April 21, 2009

Mr. Strucko asked if any Commissioner would like to pull this item from the consent agenda.

**Motion:** Mr. Morris moved and Ms. Porterfield seconded for approval of the consent agenda.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

**Work Sessions:**

**Places 29, Chapter 8** The Planning Commission reviewed the revised Chapter 8, Implementation of the draft Places29 Master Plan, as a follow-up to their discussions of the chapter on March 31, 2009 and April 14, 2009. Staff presented the three parts of the Chapter: the text, the List of Implementation Projects, and Appendix 2, Implementation Project Descriptions. (Judy Wiegand)

Lee Catlin summarized the public review plan for Places29 Master Plan. (Attachment A)

The Commission and staff have already gone through a very substantial and engaged public participation process for Places29. It resulted in a lot of comments, suggestions and items that have shaped and influenced the plan very significantly. Staff and the Commission realize that it has been quite some time since the material has been in front of the public for review. So staff wants to talk to the Commission about the public participation tonight since they feel that is a very critical and important step.

In thinking about the public review plan and what they are hoping to accomplish with it, staff feels this really is an opportunity to reintroduce the Places29 Master Plan both to those people who were engaged with the plan during the process of a year or two ago. Also the current public review provides an opportunity for people who are new to the area or who may not have been involved the first time around to become familiar with the Places29 Master Plan. Staff wants to review the significant changes with the public that have been made since the first public participation process. Staff also wants to show how public input has been influencing and shaping the plan. One of the very fundamental parts of a public process involving asking people what they think is to report back on how that input shaped, influenced or is reflected in the plan or, conversely, why the input was not used.

It is also very important to share future opportunities for public involvement. Staff used the word “review” instead of “participation” very carefully in this plan because staff does not see this as an opportunity right now to go out and really roll up their sleeves and put things back out on the table and have a lot of back and forth. The Commission has heard the public’s earlier participation and now has done significant work on it. Staff looks at this as an opportunity to educate the public regarding this work in preparation for the next public hearing by the Commission.

Based on the Chapter 8 implementation plan being wrapped up this evening, staff envisions the future timetable to be as follows:

**August 11** - Places29 Master Plan draft presented to the Planning Commission and released to the public for review.

**August 11 – September 15** – Public review activities including providing opportunities in a variety of venues for people to become familiar with the material. There is an extensive list in the staff report about the materials that staff would provide in a variety of venues including public open houses, website, materials placed in the community through the libraries and being available to any groups or neighborhoods that might want a more personal discussion of the plan.

**September 15** – Check in with the Planning Commission to confirm public hearing.

**September 15 – October 13** – Continued public review activities.

**October 13** – Tentative date for Planning Commission public hearing to get public reaction to the draft plan.

Ms. Catlin pointed out they wouldn't really be soliciting a lot of feedback on September 15--they would be directing the input it toward the public hearing. If staff heard a lot of interest, comment or concern about a particular issue, they would certainly present that issue to the Commission on September 15. Having been made aware of specific public issues with the Places29 Master Plan draft on September 15, hopefully the Commission would feel ready to go ahead with the public hearing.

Ms. Joseph asked what staff's expectation was for the August 11 meeting. She asked if the draft Places29 Master Plan would be released so that the Commission can read it and prepare comments or is the meeting to be a work session.

Ms. Catlin suggested that Ms. Wiegand and Mr. Benish could give more detail, but she believed that August 11 will be a walk through for the Commission to be introduced to the document. Then the Commission will have the month as will the public to really look through what is there.

Ms. Wiegand pointed out that staff wanted to present the document to the Commission on August 11 and walk them through it, talking about some of the issues that have arisen over the past few months and answering any questions. Then basically as Ms. Catlin noted, the Commission would have the next month to look at the document.

Ms. Catlin noted that in the September 15 through October 13 period, staff would continue public review activities to make people as familiar as possible with the plan. Then October 13, if all goes according to the schedule, would be the Planning Commission's opportunity to hear back from the public for the first time in a long time about what their reaction is to the draft plan. Basically, the outcome of this review process is that stakeholders, citizens, businesses, special interest groups or whomever that consider themselves to be interested in Places29 would have ample opportunity to review and understand the basic concepts of the Places29 master plan prior to the public hearing so that they could come to the Commission with informed and up-to-date comments on the plan itself. This is an overview of what was in the staff report. Staff is present to answer any questions and for any suggestions or comments that the Commissioner might have.

Ms. Joseph asked what the process would be to receive comments from the public once this document is released on August 11. She asked if staff would put the information on the website or broadcast an email.

Ms. Catlin replied that staff would encourage the public to take that time to get familiar with the information and then bring their comments to the Commission at the public hearing. That would be the goal. If somebody is not able to be at the public hearing or is not comfortable with that venue, staff can set up an email and comments can be forwarded to the Commission. Optimally, all comments should be funneled into a public hearing venue.

Mr. Benish pointed out that on August 11 staff will be coming to the Commission with what the PC requested regarding an expansion area to the southern end of the Hollymead Development Area. The proposal for that expansion area will be drafted for August 11. If the Commission sees issues as to how that is presented to the public, staff may need a few extra days to get that straightened out so that the public sees what the Commission wants. That issue might make the official release date of the Places 29 Master Plan a few days later. An alternative is to keep this expansion area completely separate, send out the current draft and then send this out as a possible alternative.

Ms. Catlin noted they don't want to short change the public's opportunity to look at material that they have not seen. That issue is pretty massive and complex. Essentially they would have two months by this schedule to do as thorough a job as possible to give people that opportunity. The Commission would check the progress about a month into the schedule to see if they feel that staff is on track with it and to confirm the public hearing date for October.

Ms. Porterfield asked if the public process involves the business community.

Ms. Catlin replied absolutely.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff was going to have specific meetings with the business community. She asked if staff would enlist the Chamber of Commerce for help in determining those businesses in the Places29 corridor that employ the 40 percent supposedly of all Albemarle County's work force. She asked if staff was going to work with those businesses.

Ms. Catlin replied definitely. Staff will be doing some selective outreach to some of those groups. They have the next couple of weeks before August 11 to speak with Mr. Williamson and other folks about the best way to make that happen. They would be doing some proactive things and also be responsive to any group who says they would really like somebody to come and talk to them or who would like a meeting at the County building. That opportunity is always available.

Ms. Porterfield noted that Ms. Joseph forwarded the email from the Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber of Commerce is obviously not in sync on a number of issues. She asked if staff was going to go out and truly work with them because the Chamber is not supportive of pieces of this plan.

Ms. Catlin replied that at this point the intent would be to reflect back to the public, including the business community, the direction that the Planning Commission has given as to where the plan stands. It is really a communication directed to understanding the plan and encouraging any member of the public, business community or anybody, if they are still not satisfied by what they see that the public hearing is the opportunity to express concerns to the Commission.

Ms. Joseph noted that Ms. Porterfield came into this process in the middle. When the Commission first started working with this, staff met with stakeholders. She suggested that an explanation be given as to who the different stakeholders were because there were different elements of the community that staff met specifically with and talked about this. She thought that the business community was part of that.

Ms. Catlin replied that was correct and offered to share some of that background with Ms. Porterfield since she was not here during those several years of meetings. But the business community and some folks in the audience were part of stakeholder groups that met to review the material as it came from the consultant and to have a chance to comment on it and become familiar with it. Staff certainly would continue that conversation. She did not want to set up the expectation that this is going to be a lot of back and forth right now because staff's feeling is that the Commission has made changes and suggestions and given staff direction. Now the public needs to react back to the Commission.

Mr. Morris asked if they need to kick start this again because there seems to be a lot of apathy on the part of the community along the Places29 corridor. That is troubling because the Commission put so much work into this. They have seen the attendance dribble. He thought that there should have been quite a few people here tonight. Last week the Commission had 40 people at a public hearing. He would just love to see staff get the public more involved.

Ms. Catlin said that staff certainly needs to do another campaign to get the visibility back up. One of the reasons staff continued the public process into October is that an August time period is deadly for people. But staff did not want to wait and not get started. Hopefully, the proposed dates will give the opportunity to get people interested and aware again of the plan.

Mr. Franco agreed that people are just tired and have not been reengaged as part of the process. The unveiling of the plan may start to stir the interest especially once they understand how their previous input has been taken and dealt with. He thought that they were going through the right steps.

Mr. Edgerton asked if other Commissioners share his concern that the Places29 Master Plan is going to be an awful lot of information to digest in one public hearing. He questioned if there was an alternative way to do this. October 13 is going to be a long night if the Commission tries to go through all eight

chapters of this plan and take public comment. He was trying to be realistic about how effective that can be and whether it might make more sense to think of doing it in pieces.

Ms. Catlin replied that was a good point. From hearing his concern, staff can give some thought to whether they break the plan up or exactly how they make it so that the public hearing is a manageable opportunity.

Mr. Edgerton said that it would be nice if there was a period of time during which hopefully the reengagement would take place. There might be an opportunity to have additional work sessions during this period that would then lead up to the public hearing if there were particular issues. He would hate to be sitting here at 1 a.m. on October 13 trying to make a decision after having heard a lot of input they had not heard previously due to apathetic response in recent work sessions. The majority of the folks who live in that corridor are not here, and they are the ones that need to be participating in this process.

Ms. Joseph asked if staff has thought about releasing the draft and then holding a Planning Commission meeting in one of the neighborhood schools such as Hollymead Elementary. She also suggested that the Planning Commission could hold meetings in several different places.

Mr. Benish said that once the Commission agrees to this concept, staff can figure out how to best go into the Places29 neighborhood to hold one or more public hearings.

Mr. Edgerton said it might make sense to have multiple public hearings and then have the grand finale in the County building to assemble all of the information.

Mr. Benish noted that staff did not anticipate the Commission to entertain an action after the public hearing, but that a public hearing on the documents is required to meet the legal requirement. He assumed they could adopt sections of the plan, but that multiple meetings set up geographically could be considered.

Ms. Catlin noted that staff's thought was that the Commission has had the document and deliberated on it for so long without hearing from the public that staff wanted to provide an opportunity to let the public into the process at this point. Staff can certainly look at some ways to do that so it does not feel overwhelming.

Mr. Benish said that staff assumed that there would be a follow up work session based on information provided at the public hearing.

Mr. Edgerton clarified that staff was anticipating a public hearing where the Commission would not be expected to make a final decision about a recommendation to the Board and then follow that up with a series of work sessions that would hopefully address the concerns brought up.

Mr. Benish said that based on what the Commission decides to do, they may potentially need to do another public hearing or the Commission can provide a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with changes to the draft that went out to the public. The Board of Supervisors will then start this process all over again with the public hearings. He noted that there are a number of steps for public input in the process.

Mr. Strucko recommended making it as convenient as possible for the people that live in the Places29 neighborhoods by holding the public meeting or a remote event in Southernland or Hollymead Elementary Schools. In the past, the Commission did it for Biscuit Run and the Crozet Master Plan.

Ms. Catlin agreed that was a great idea.

Mr. Franco asked to be informed regarding who was meeting with special interest groups since he would like to attend. If it is a group of residents or business owners in his district, he would probably attend to hear directly from them.

Ms. Catlin said she would be happy to notify the Commission of any schedule of any meetings.

Ms. Catlin noted that at the September check-in, an adjustment can be made if needed.

Ms. Joseph offered that her email address be given out to the public in order to answer questions between the August and September meetings.

Ms. Catlin agreed, noting that staff does not want to offer the expectation that people's comments at this point in time are going to create a change to the plan because staff feels that has to come at the public hearing where the Commission will direct staff based on what is heard.

Ms. Catlin left the meeting at 6:34 p.m.

Mr. Benish gave a brief presentation about the revisions to the three parts of Chapter 8, Implementation.

- The changes made resulted from the last work session in May. The Places29 plan is a vision plan that really is a build-out scenario or long-term vision plan, which is different than this implementation plan which is a 20-year program for improvements that are needed within the corridor. Staff welcomes comments if there are concerns about the Chapter 8 modifications based on the Planning Commission's input.

#### Text changes

- Emphasized that the Places29 Plan establishes an ultimate vision for and future condition while the Implementation Chapter notes improvements/initiatives needed to be undertaken in the next 20 years (page 8-1).
  - Modified "Western Bypass" comments (page 8-3).
  - Clarified relationship between Priority Areas and Small Area Plans (page 8-4).
  - Expanded description of the 29H250 and Hillsdale Drive improvements (page 8-5).
  - Added paragraph (page 8-7) to emphasize relationship and timing of transportation projects.
  - Clarifications of priority and non-priority areas (pages 8-7 and 8-10).
  - Clarification/explanation of cost estimates (page 8-10).
  - Clarification of future Master Plan review (page 8-17).
  - Revised List of Implementation Projects (tables at back of Chapter 8) and new appendix providing detailed information on projects.
  - List of implementation Projects – Simplified to make more readable, user friendly (details of projects moved to Implementation Project Descriptions (Appendix 2). Also added notes to explain purpose and use of List.
  - Appendix 2, Implementation Project Descriptions.
  - New; provides more detail about projects, including illustrations.
  - Further fine tuning/adjustments/clarifications for final draft.
- To clarify the cost estimate methodology, staff did update the numbers to fiscal year 2011, which is the first full year that they anticipate after the adoption of the plan. (Staff hopes the plan is adopted in FY 09-10.)
  - As staff works through this leading up to August 11, staff still sees some fine-tuning points that they would like to continue to add. Most of these are not substantive changes. As staff continues to read the draft, they can continue to think of more clarity which they can put to the project. Staff wants to ensure that they are clear in what their priorities are and what the essential projects are. Therefore, staff has some additional comments to add to the list that make it clearer what the priorities are. Staff will continue to make those changes.
  - There are two project areas or project descriptions that staff will be giving the Commission on August 11. One item that was not identified in the Places29 Plan is some of the secondary road improvements already prioritized in the Six-Year Secondary Road Plan. Profit Road has been prioritized as a road improvement for a number of years. It is prioritized after Jarman's Gap, but was not identified in this document. Proffit Road has long been a priority project, and staff wants to make

sure that it is noted in the plan. Staff has also caught several other projects like that and wants to make sure for clarity purposes are identified in the Appendix.

- Today staff received better descriptions of the utility improvements from the Service Authority and will add that clarity to the document as well. There will be a few pieces of new information, but no new major issues. It is just clearer language than what is in the document right now.
- In regards to the Master Plan structure, staff noted that Appendix 2, Implementation Project Descriptions is new and provides more detail about projects, including illustrations. There will also be an Appendix X, General Design Guidelines for Development Areas that will cover some of the general design guidelines for all of the County's Development Areas. That appendix will not be part of Places29. It will be an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan, and staff will be working on it over the next year or two.
- Tonight staff requests feedback and comments from the Commission on Chapter 8 for changes to the text for August 11.

Mr. Strucko asked for comments from the Commission regarding Chapter 8 starting at page 1.

Mr. Loach thought the report was frank but not telling on certain aspects. In other words, it says many of the projects are also dependent on funding that may not be available for several years. He thought that was the way to go so as not to set up false expectations for the public since it depends on funding that might not be available for years. He would hope that this would also be included in the presentation so that there are no false expectations like Jarman's Gap Road that they have been waiting on for over a decade. At some point he would like to see percentages if at all possible. Including the percentage of the funding they don't know where it would be coming from in the presentation would be helpful. In addition in Appendix 2 it would be helpful to identify what staff thinks the percentages are for how much will be publicly funded and privately funded for each project that lists both sources. So essentially they would see the estimated costs and the responsible party/developer with a ballpark figure of what would be the public and private expectations for cost within the plan. He questioned if staff was still satisfied with the data that says the Western Bypass would not serve more than 20 percent at best of the traffic.

Mr. Benish replied that staff thought that data was still accurate. That is the data staff has available.

Mr. Loach noted that it seems the Commission is being pushed from different places to reexamine that. If this is the data that is still good, he felt that was important.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff has any concept how much truck traffic is included in the Rte. 29 North figures.

Mr. Benish replied that there was an estimate of truck traffic.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that would be useful information if the road is going to get a lot of the commercial traffic.

Mr. Morris pointed out when the Commission started this whole planning process for Places29, this Commission requested that the Western Bypass not be considered. Staff was initially looking at considering it. The MPO and Board of Supervisors pulled it off the table. The Commission requested staff and the consultants not to consider it.

Mr. Edgerton noted that it is a little more complicated. In the email from the Chamber of Commerce shared by Ms. Joseph, there is no question that the Chamber wants the Bypass instead of the grade-separated intersections. Right now VDOT is working on a US 29 Corridor Study and is still considering as of yesterday using the southern portion of the former Western Bypass, which has been abandoned by the County, for a parallel route. VDOT is getting a lot of encouragement from the Chamber for using this. As Mr. Edgerton understands, the Bypass would come off Route 29 at Hydraulic and go to the west and use a lot of the land that has already been purchased and would come back in and reconnect with the Route

29/250 Bypass. Frankly this continues to be a political football. In reading this draft, he did not think there was a strong enough statement regarding the Western Bypass. He felt that it was an ill-conceived idea and would not do any good at all. It would run right behind Albemarle High School and would not work.

Ms. Porterfield noted that the email pointed out that the right-of-way had been acquired and X amount of money has been stockpiled for the Western Bypass whereas this draft plan has none. When adding up this money needed for the Places29 plan, it is a huge number. She asked if they truly needed to deep six the Western Bypass.

Mr. Strucko noted that one interest group is bringing the issue back. From the debate 15 years ago, he reiterated that it is a roadway that destroys neighborhoods. It is a Bypass that by-passes nothing. It crosses the reservoir and comes close to a middle school and high school. The Bypass is designed for through traffic not carried on 29 now. He did not think that this road serves the purpose of accommodating through truck traffic that is trying to get to Danville. This project has been debated for decades and because the MPO pulled the money, it is a dead project. He felt that as a community, they need to move on. He agreed with Mr. Edgerton that there needs to be a stronger statement.

Mr. Edgerton noted that the Place 29 Master Plan might be in conflict with the VDOT's ongoing Route 29 Corridor Study unless we were very clear about how the Planning Commission feels about VDOT's further consideration of a western bypass through Albemarle County. VDOT's study is attempting to turn the 29 Corridor into a third North/South corridor in Virginia (in addition to Route 95 and Route 81). One of the strong statements in the plan, which VDOT advocates, is limiting access onto the 29 Corridor. Regarding the truck traffic question, truck traffic was a small piece of the through traffic. Historically, there had been an agreement (about 20 years ago) that a Bypass would only be considered after the Meadow Creek Parkway had been built, after the grade separator interchanges have been built. If it was still needed at that point then it would be considered. That was agreed to by the City, County and University. The only party that has held firmly to the agreement was the County.

Mr. Benish noted that staff has a copy of that resolution.

Mr. Loach noted that in this plan the grade-separated interchanges are based on the policy that came down from the Board of Supervisors. That is why they are in this plan. The Commission is responding to the policy in the plan. The plan has been vetted through the public process and needs to go through the final process.

Mr. Edgerton questioned if it would be appropriate to include the resolution. He felt that a stronger statement should be made regarding the history of what the Board has said and what the county's position is.

Mr. Benish noted that staff could look at what they feel clarifies the history of decision-making on this issue by giving a chronology or history of decision making. That might be a way to give some strength to this section. Also the truck numbers can be added. He was a little worried about jumping the gun on the 29 North Corridor Study analysis of what they are doing. Staff has not gotten a full picture of it yet. But the consultants have given staff some understanding of what they are looking at. They are not looking at a full Bypass, but actually looking at two tandem improvements. There is a variation on the theme for the interchanges at Hydraulic Road and Emmett Street as one of the ways to balance the traffic on 29 North. Again grade separations are involved just like the Places29 plan calls for, but also it involves extending the parallel road concept all the way into the North Grounds. He was not sure that they have a Bypass in mind. He understands the concern that the alignment being used and what it may involve into means that they need to continue to be clear about what staff and the Commission's expectations are about the Bypass. Until they actually see the new concept, they just need to be clear on what the history is of the Bypass.

Mr. Edgerton said that this is not a strong enough statement based on the history of the County's position of the so-called Western Bypass. He liked staff's idea of referencing some of the history. He suggested

rather than restating it, they provide a chronology and the final determination made by the Board against using this Bypass including all of the reasons.

Mr. Strucko agreed that writing the history in the document would show that there has been long-standing policy and agreement on this issue since the document was signed in 1992 by the university, county and city. The inclusion of this history would show that while there may be lingering opinions about this issue, the argument did not prevail back when it was duly considered. There seems to be a strong enough opinion on this Commission still that that particular view should not prevail.

Mr. Benish noted that the agreement is 19 years old, but identifies the history of the Bypass up to the most recent information and where the community is in regard to the Bypass.

Mr. Strucko noted that the Board would review this document, and it would be appropriate to ask them to review the policy. The Commission has the ability to make recommendations on changes to policy to the Board.

Mr. Franco suggested leaving it as is to get out to the public to solicit comments. He was not here when the process started on Places29, but it is his understanding that the Places29 study was directed not to study it. He would hate to have to bring in all of those components to qualify it. Therefore, he suggested that the draft be moved forward and those discussions could come out in the public hearing in October.

Ms. Joseph pointed out that it was her understanding that this was looked at one more time by the consultants.

Mr. Benish replied that the consultants evaluated previous information and looked at what the implication of certain linkages would be. But they did not remodel the Bypass.

Ms. Joseph noted that it was considered. She said that Mr. Morris was right that when it came before the Commission initially, they all asked that it be removed completely. At that point, VDOT said no because they had an investment in the Bypass and they wanted it still in there and would take this under consideration and use the information they have to compare with other routes and other improvements. So it has been something that the Commission has looked at.

Mr. Benish noted that staff used the information they had. Additional funding was not spent on detailed assessment. They used the prior information that was available and compared it to the impacts they saw through modeling and an arrangement that was consistent with the MPO's direction not to have a Bypass.

Ms. Joseph agreed. She noted that it was important for everyone to realize that not all of the properties have been acquired.

Mr. Benish pointed out that he believed there has not been any money stockpiled for construction.

Ms. Joseph favored putting the chronology in so that people will understand how the Commission got to this point and how they came to this conclusion. It is important that this Commission not seek public input so much but to listen to the public and say they are not in favor of the Western Bypass.

Mr. Benish reiterated that the emphasis he heard was to place the chronology in and summarize the position on the Bypass as a definite sort of conclusion.

Mr. Loach asked that the conclusion be included based on the data on the part of the county.

Ms. Monteith suggested that the resolution needs to be pointed out with a statement at the conclusion of the chronology.

Mr. Edgerton asked where this resolution resides.

Mr. Benish replied that technically the resolution resides in the Clerk's Office.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that the resolution be an addendum and referenced as being the position of the county in 1992 which has not changed. That way the public can read it for themselves. This plan is for the whole community and not just the businesses along Route 29 North.

Ms. Porterfield noted that by including this documentation, it at least gives the Places 29 Master Plan a reason for advocating grade separations and not something else. The reader could understand the history.

Mr. Loach suggested adding the LOSs for the worst intersections – the ones that are failing now or will fail in the near future. The Plan should indicate where the failures will occur without the improvements listed in the Plan. It is important to include that data so the reader can understand the priorities because those would be the worst intersections.

Ms. Porterfield noted the land use and development process in 8-3 is based on the Neighborhood Model. The question is can everything be redone into the Neighborhood Model. She wondered if they need to be a little more flexible because so much of this will be redevelopment of pieces of property and not everything in a certain area.

Ms. Joseph pointed out that in the review of rezonings and special use permits, the Commission looks at the redevelopment and realizes that there are some aspects of the Neighborhood Model that can't be met. She felt that the Commission does take what Ms. Porterfield said into consideration with rezonings and special use permits. The Commission gets the list of the ten priorities and staff will note which ones can or cannot be met and recommends what is reasonable to be met. In her opinion, she felt it was okay that this stays in because the way staff and the Commission have been using it is reasonable.

Mr. Loach agreed that it should stay in.

Mr. Strucko noted that the 12 principles of the Neighborhood Model is a standard and reflects the values of the community. He encouraged any development to abide by those principles.

Ms. Joseph asked if it is possible to put wording in that explains that if something comes in as a reuse or a re-adaptation that the Commission will look at these things in a less stringent manner.

Mr. Benish replied that they could do whatever the Commission feels comfortable with. But he felt that the way the Neighborhood Model is structured, it says that. It makes the point that it is not "the model" but is a larger model that is based on the principles. He noted that what they intended to do is call it the Neighborhood Model principles. In the development review process, they measure how well it is met, how well they can meet it and what is appropriate. Staff will add principles to the end of Neighborhood Model. Also a statement could be added that implies the flexibility staff uses.

Mr. Edgerton said that he would rather not redefine the Neighborhood Model because this will end up being part of the Comprehensive Plan. He would rather have it found in one place. The second word provides the flexibility Ms. Porterfield is looking for in the recommended land use that refers to the Neighborhood Model. If they go back to the Neighborhood Model, it certainly defines itself. If they start modifying it here, they may be tripping up on it later on. He preferred to leave it as it is.

Mr. Benish noted that the consensus of the Commission is to leave it as it is and to add principles to Neighborhood Model.

Ms. Porterfield asked that the third bullet on page 8-4 be clarified. The bullet says most population and employment growth over the next 10 years can be accommodated in developments that have already been approved. Therefore, will any other development receive approval?

Mr. Benish noted that the intent of the statement was that the capacity that they need is within those already approved developments. If the market is going to address the need, the capacity is built into

those existing developments. The language was to reflect that they need to address projects already approved and the impacts of those projects.

Ms. Porterfield noted that when reading this passage, she was thinking about the people who cannot move on with approved projects because they themselves have gone out of business. She suggested that it could be reworded.

Mr. Strucko noted that the market affects supply and demand. There might not be demand for an approved project.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff would provide more information next time about the piece of land that is not in the development area north of Berkmar Drive.

Mr. Benish replied that the Commission will get a draft amendment showing an expansion area with recommendations for land use and triggers for when that area should be developed either to be included in the Plan or be rezoned in the area between Rio Mills Road and the existing development area boundary. The Commission can review and decide whether to make changes or include it in the Plan distributed on the 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Cilimberg arrived at 7:20 p.m.

Ms. Porterfield noted from reading the past minutes she wondered if they are trying too hard to create a shopping/eating area near the airport. She suggested that they should look at that area with the idea of businesses of light industry and heavy industry due to the proximity of transportation.

Mr. Benish replied that they were now emphasizing to focus what they were going to do with the Uptown as part of the small area plan. Staff hears what people are saying, but this area probably is pretty distant. Staff hopes the small area plan will give better guidance on how to stage that area, and maybe the Uptown will need to be in a completely different place. Staff did reduce the area somewhat to reflect some of the concerns from UREF. Staff left the idea of the Uptown in the plan so that it will not be lost.

Ms. Wiegand noted that was put in there as a reminder that this is a vision plan. While the current economic situation may mean that things do not happen there now or they might not happen as fast as expected two or three years ago, it is still something that could happen in the future. As part of the small area plan, they would like to figure out how that could be staged or phased so that people can come in and use that site and eventually it could be an Uptown that serves as a hub to the area.

Mr. Benish noted that the small area plan covers the whole area to the intersection of US 29. There is also a possibility that the whole area could be massaged based on what comes out of that small area plan.

Ms. Porterfield noted concern because the Places 29 Master Plan is based on redevelopment, and they were probably going to be working with properties that don't have the same owners so how were they going to create good open space and make these things happen. It could be very piecemeal. She asked if there was anything that could be done to encourage interaction between neighboring properties so that people start thinking in terms of the end result and not what they need next year. Her main concern is what this redevelopment of not only the properties but the roads is going to do particularly to all the businesses in the area.

Mr. Benish replied that the improvements that are proposed in the US 29 Corridor under this concept for the majority of the length of the roadway don't significantly widen the roadway. It is based on a 6-to-8 lane section. The interchanges are intended to be designed to minimize those sorts of impacts and maximize the opportunity for redevelopment. There is always an issue over time as to whether the existing use can sustain itself based on that final plan. But certainly from a land standpoint, the intent is that those lands will continue to be viable to the economy in providing options for commercial development. The ring-road concepts and the access concepts are ones that are intended to try to foster that opportunity.

Mr. Porterfield suggested that staff write some reassuring words to indicate to businesses that their accesses will not get roped off when the bulldozers show up.

Mr. Benish noted with areas like the Rio Road interchange, what they hope is that a small area plan, which is one of the fine tuning things mentioned, can and should be funded. That is where they can get down to more detailed plans and work with the community in that area and let them see what the impact is and understand what the opportunities and constraints are with that ultimate design. That is an essential first step because it is difficult. He wants to be honest with people in this plan because they cannot assure 100 percent that there will be absolutely no impacts to properties when doing a grade separation. Obviously there are things that get impacted. But he felt that the plan really intends to minimize those impacts. There must be recognition that with conventional type of improvements even with an alternative road system there is a question as to whether interchanges would have been needed, as an example, whether a bypass is there or not. Businesses have to be aware that with any kind of road scenario, there could be impacts to those areas. Staff will reread this to make sure to be as straightforward about what the intent of this concept is in terms of minimizing impact to properties.

Ms. Porterfield noted that in one sentence it says it would take 10 to 12 years to build one of those grade-separated intersections. She asked staff to flush that out a little bit with some reassurances.

Ms. Wiegand pointed out that there was an explanation about the 8-to-12 years in chapter 4 where they talk about the transportation network. Staff will consider referencing it or moving that into this chapter. It is not construction through that whole 8-to-12 years, and staff can clarify that.

Mr. Franco said that his focus is that there has been a lot of public review of it to date and he would like to get it back to the public for review. He felt that the big changes he was looking for have been made, especially with the implementation aspects and the tables, and it is easier to read and process. It is now clearer to understand and he would like to get this thing to the public for a full review.

Mr. Morris pointed out that staff has come a long way with this and he felt that it was well done. He was surprised that the Western Bypass came into play, but they have already vetted that.

#### **The Planning Commission took a break at 7:29 p.m.**

#### **The meeting reconvened at 7:39 p.m.**

Ms. Joseph noted the following concern: On page 8-2 she was also concerned about the grade-separated interchanges taking 8-to-12 years to complete. She asked for a clarification of what staff was really saying there.

Mr. Benish noted that design to construction will clarify that. It will be about eight years for construction.

Ms. Joseph asked that staff add the date of Tech Memo #7 to text. She was confused in paragraph 2 that the site plan itself will be considered as part of the master plan.

Ms. Echols replied that staff needs to revise that wording a little. Staff consults the master plans and the Comprehensive Plan when they get site plans in. They have a new process where the long-range planners look at the current development projects that are coming in to see if anything being proposed has a relationship to any of the plans. That is where they were headed with that, but staff needs to refine it a little bit.

Ms. Joseph noted that on page 8-4 under implementation priorities it says regional transportation needs are more acute in this part of the county than any other area. When considering Pantops she wonders if that is true. On page 8-5 in 1a they talk about Best Buy which might not be there in the future. She asked if there is any other landmark that could be given so people will know where that is located. On page 8-12 funding strategy in the second paragraph it says that the full report is available on the Thomas Jefferson Planning District website. She asked if that is going to be on the website five years.

Ms. Wiegand noted that staff is going to be putting a bunch of these in a separate document that will be available to people who would like to read them. It will not be in the appendix, but will be put in a place for future reference.

Ms. Joseph said that the maps are effective tools. She made the following suggestions:

- Maps - label a, b, c and d that is given in the description on the map illustrating the improvement; and
- Add road names for reference in a larger font.

Ms. Porterfield asked that staff add a legend that describes the colors used in the illustrations and to fix the two shades of green for open space since they are indistinguishable.

Ms. Joseph questioned the recycling center and if they could consider paying some of their haulers to pick up some of this stuff. At one point in time they had the haulers come and pick up like is done in the city where the haulers separate them.

Mr. Benish noted that there is a regional study underway long term on how to deal with recycling. This is a place holder on what they have based on current policy, which is to provide for recycling locations. What could evolve out of the regional plan for solid waste management could be curbside collection. They still might need strategic drop-off centers. Since it was questionable, staff felt it was worth noting that they still have a plan to provide for a recycling center in each of their development areas. But that one is certainly subject by the next update of the plan to change. There is a proffer in the Places29 area for one acre for a recycling center that is part of the Hollymead Town Center. So they do have a potential site available. How they do solid-waste management in the county may be subject to a pretty significant change over time.

Ms. Joseph noted that they might have more people involved with it if they did have curbside pick up. With the CIP, they have a certain amount that they have determined would be the project cost.

Mr. Benish replied that there is an estimate of what that project cost would be which is where they get refined numbers depending on the level of study that is underway for any particular project.

Ms. Joseph noted that they also go out for bids for that. That always was confusing because the County sort of gives these competitive bidders a number, and then they come in with as close to that number as they can.

Mr. Benish said that is a very strategic issue about the CIP. It is sort of all about that when he tried to qualify his statement before. Many times in the CIP they still have a very general cost estimate subject to a study process that refines what that project cost is. They go through this with schools all the time because they are such difficult site to find and the location policies. If they have an assumed number pretty much prescribed times two what the cost of the property is going to be.

Ms. Joseph questioned if they hurt or help themselves by putting down a project and what it does to the bidding process.

Mr. Benish noted that the CIP is a five-year process. They have to balance the issue of acquiring land and the implications of putting dollars out there in laying out their needs so the Board of Supervisors can understand the costs.

Ms. Joseph questioned project #57 for the new elementary school where it says the site should be purchased in 2013 and then says no land cost.

Ms. Wiegand replied that this was a project where there were three possible locations. At this point they don't know until they see what development takes place and where the children actually are in whether it will need to be in Crozet, the Biscuit Run area or in North Point. If the school goes into the northern development areas, they do have the site at North Point and there will be no land cost.

Mr. Benish noted that it might be better to take this out of this description because there is no land cost for this particular document. The way it is structured in the CIP is different, but in this plan there will be no land cost because they have a site in hand.

Ms. Porterfield questioned the numbering and order of the projects. She suggested that it would be better to have the high priority projects first and maybe cross reference them. There are projects that hook to the high priority ones. She felt that the high priority ones should not get mixed in and should be right at the beginning to indicate the major needs and then list the pieces that go with each.

Ms. Wiegand noted in the list at the end of the chapter the high priority projects are flagged. Particularly for the transportation projects, the projects are listed in the order the consultants wanted the projects to be done in order to keep the flow of traffic as smooth as possible. The non-transportation projects are put in the order they are in the CIP chronically as they would be addressed.

Ms. Porterfield noted that she had a little trouble in working with this listing.

Ms. Monteith made the following comments.

- She looked at the document from the perspective of a planner and specifically where people will get confused. On the first page of chapter 8, it describes that this is first and foremost a vision plan, which is excellent. Then staff goes on to describe that this does not really have a time frame, but really was more related to the implementation. Then in the fourth section in the first sentence it refers to a 20-year implementation time frame. For some people, that might be confusing to say it does not have a time frame and then on the same page refer to a time frame. She asked if that could be unscrambled a little bit or maybe the language is such that it does not have an exact time frame but just for the purpose of planning they need to apply some type of time frame so that becomes more generalized.
- On the implementation project description along with others she felt that this was much improved and really readable and very understandable. She had two concerns. Regarding Ms. Porterfield's concern, she found the mix of projects very unusable. There were some planning projects and some implementation projects. She had trouble understanding the order. She suggested that staff in the text on the first page discuss the rationale on the order they are in and perhaps discuss a little about the mix of projects. A sentence with an explanation of why the order used was chosen would be helpful. For example, to keep the flow of traffic flowing smoothly, but keep the planning ahead to support the planning projects as a general comment.
- Regarding the estimated costs that have been discussed in other venues, she did not understand that costs would be spoken about in three different ways. What they talked about was how they would be escalated or how they would or not be escalated in VDOT's format versus another format. She did not think it is easy to unscramble in that they are talking about cost in three different ways. She suggested talking about the costs differently. It is unusual to have costs that are pertaining to a comp plan. She suggested that the costs represent an order of magnitude but not specific design costs. She suggested putting less emphasis on this to make the language leading up to the discussion of these costs talk about them more in terms of the magnitude of cost and acknowledge that these are generalized costs or a cost guideline and not a cost estimate.
- Delete the reference to UVA on project 24 and 56 since UVA is not a part of RTA.

Ms. Porterfield suggested using one cost with current dollars based on a specific date. She questioned whether they need to repeat the UNJAM document.

Mr. Benish said that information could be taken out if it was the consensus of the Commission. From the last conversation, staff was going to include it as additional information. Staff will be happy to take it out and say there are other documents that have other cost estimates. He agreed that the costs represent the order of magnitude and the final cost estimate will be a result of final engineering design. If the Commission agrees with Ms. Monteith's suggestion, staff will make sure to provide additional clarity about that.

Ms. Joseph agreed.

Mr. Edgerton noted that there had been a lot of anxiety expressed about the costs. No one knows how quickly this can happen or who will come in first. It is a vision plan and the real essence of the plan is the vision on how to solve the problems. It is important to stress the implementation and this is the ideal situation in the way they prioritize the projects. He did not know if the costs could possibly be accurate especially if the consultant left out the right-of-way values. They can only come up with the number now, but cannot be sure what kind of escalating costs will occur. There may have been a lot of accurate information out there last year or the year before, but it may not be accurate now.

Mr. Loach said that they need an overall number because they are going to make a decision on how to fund that based on the funding sources available. They need to have some estimates on what it will cost so policies can be made on how to get that money in lieu of the situation in Richmond. The implication of these dollar values may become important because of the local taxation that may occur because of them.

Ms. Monteith pointed out what she was saying was just a suggestion, but she recognized that the costs give one an understanding of relative value. It seemed that they needed to have some language that really describes that. The other thing that might be helpful to do is to explain that it is unusual to tie costs to a comprehensive plan because of the uncertainty, but explain the rationale for why they did in this Plan. It just seems that if so much of this explanation is there, that it would alleviate some of the anxiety and focus that they have had on this to date given that it is kind of an unusual approach.

Mr. Benish said staff can make the reader understand these are not specific design costs. These are estimates based on various approaches in a preliminary process and they ought to be considered more as order-of-magnitude costs so people can understand that a few of them have some analysis on them for capital projects, but are subject to change. He suggested that they might want to define estimated cost as the order of magnitude based on multipliers or something like that.

Mr. Edgerton noted that he was struggling with the back and forth.

Mr. Franco agreed with some of the discussion. He has always understood that what is unique about Places 29 is that it is not just a comp plan, but it is also a transportation plan. It is a blended thing. As such he did not have a problem with numbers being in it. He agreed with Mr. Loach that the numbers were in there to address existing problems. He felt that most educated readers would understand that the numbers are cost estimates and not exact numbers. He was not here for the CIP discussions. But is it any different than CIPs that are forecasted ten years out. The numbers are the best guess that they have. That is just the nature of the beast. So he was comfortable the way it is set up at this point. He would love to have additional information on right-of-way and things like that. But it will get refined over time. He suggested having some extra words at the beginning talking about the Places29 Master Plan being a transportation plan as well. This would help to explain some of that on why the numbers of there and talk about the validity or accuracy of those numbers.

Mr. Strucko agreed with Mr. Franco.

Mr. Benish reiterated that they would continue to use estimated costs in the description at the top of the list and go back and look at the estimated cost description in 8, making sure that it is clear in how preliminary these numbers are in order of magnitude costs as opposed to detailed cost estimates.

Mr. Strucko noted that the Comprehensive Plan gets amended every five years and they should look at those dollar amounts every five years.

Mr. Franco suggested using planned budget rather than estimated cost.

Mr. Edgerton suggested rounding off the numbers.

Mr. Benish noted that staff has everything they need. He noted that there are several fine-tuning changes. For example, on page 2 of the list within the high priority areas one of the things they were going to do is define what the essential first steps would be.

Mr. Strucko opened the proceeding and invited public comment.

Bob Brugh said that he lives off Georgetown Road on Terra Road. He came tonight to make the Commission aware of what their plan does for some of these side streets. To go left he had to go right and go to the next street and turn around and come back in the direction he wants to go. He thought that the more improvements done to Route 29, the more traffic it pushes over to these side streets. Right now from the Airport Road down the back way to the Stone/Hydraulic Road to Georgetown Road is actually the 29 Bypass. He was asking the Commission to keep Georgetown Road as a residential street. He asked that the Commission and staff keep in mind what effect all of this has on some of these side streets. He felt that people should use Route 29 instead of using Georgetown Road as part of the Bypass.

Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, commended staff for the organization of the chart since it was much easier to read. He noted that having the costs included was important. He requested again the tabulation of short, mid-term and long-term goals and how much those will cost in total. They have agreed to disagree with regard to the inflation factor. He felt that more information was better than less information regarding the Western Bypass. The main point is with regard to priorities. He was reviewing a memo the Commission received from Greg Kamptner the other day with regard to a specific project and considering that with looking at the bottom of page 8-7 regarding priority areas. The Free Enterprise Forum was opposed to the establishment of priority areas in the Pantops Master Plan and has been opposed to it in others. The language in here says if the infrastructure needed to support a proposed development outside the priority area is not in place, the proposed development should not be approved. He thought that is in direct conflict with the memo that was sent by Mr. Kamptner. If they have a zoned area for commercial development or any other development and the infrastructure is not there because of a failure by the County to provide the infrastructure, the County has no right to refuse that plan under existing zoning. Under a rezoning, he could understand that infrastructure could be a mitigating factor. But there is a certain responsibility or burden that Albemarle County must retain for providing infrastructure. It is not just Albemarle County, but also the Virginia Department of Transportation as well. He thought that this specific line on page 8-7 should be removed. He had no problem with the idea of focused public spending on priority areas within the development area. He thought that makes good sense and is good policy. But to suggest that developments that are following the zoning that exists would not be approved is incorrect and perhaps illegal.

Jeff Werner, of Piedmont Environmental Council, suggested that they be careful with the specificity. They are talking about projects without any drawings. He noted that there is no hidden money anyplace for the Western Bypass nor have all of the right-of-ways been acquired. He suggested that they balance the argument here a little bit. If they included the specific cost estimates, he feared that the public was going to come in and say that they can't afford the Places29 Master Plan. Then what type of recommendation could the Commission forward to the Board? He suggested that the Commission be very specific and clear that these are cost estimates and they have no idea what it will cost between now and 20 years since they don't know the final design. He noted that the most important thing the Commission needs to do in this is to establish a new transportation policy that allows an effective and efficient use of transportation dollars or funds. Status quo is not working.

Morgan Butler, on behalf of the Southern Environmental Law Center, added his voice to some of the praises given to staff for the changes made since the last version of the chapter. He made the following suggestions:

- They remain unclear why the Uptown is included in priority area 2 north. There is a helpful sentence on page 8-12 that explains the reason for designating priority areas, "By focusing the limited public funds that are available for the northern development areas on these priorities the county can address the existing infrastructure backlog, provide infrastructure for approved but not yet built developments and encourage redevelopment." It is not clear how focusing on the Uptown area advances any of these three goals. Conversely, it seems to undercut them by ciphering limited resources away from the existing needs and using them to facilitate the creeping of development further north.
- They are weary of labeling anything as high as the Hollymead Town Center Uptown as a priority. At the very least, they encourage the removal of Uptown from the boundary of priority area 2 north. It is

important to point out that Uptown can be included in the small area plan without necessarily having to be included as a priority area.

- On page 8-5 under #1 the draft talks about how the Hillsdale Extension would reduce the volume of traffic turning at the 29/Hydraulic intersection. The next sentence says that this reduction would be critically important when the grade-separated interchange at Hydraulic and 29 is constructed. This is a technical point, but they are concerned that this sentence downplays the huge benefits that the Hillsdale Extension would offer now regardless of when the grade-separated interchange gets built. They would not want that sentence to justify delaying the project until plans for a grade separated interchange crystallized. In 8-7 in #1 clarify the relationship between the construction of Hillsdale Drive Extended and the grade separation at Hydraulic and US 29.
- Also in their comments on the first draft, they caution that a transportation tool that is critical for access management had received fairly short shrift in the proposed text in the chapter. The text for access management now appears on page 8-3 and it does not appear that it has been changed from the prior version. They recommend that a new sentence be inserted into that paragraph to make it stronger the text of which could read, "The county and VDOT should review each new development and redevelopment of a project for compliance for the access management plan." This would parallel their statement that is in Appendix 2 and hopefully help clarify that the access management plan is simply not to be put on a shelf when all of this is approved. In 8-6 in the first full paragraph add a new sentence under access management to strengthen (see #2 in Appendix)
- Regarding the Western Bypass, he noted simply put it has been determined that any arguable benefits in the Western Bypass are far outweighed by its cost. It is a huge amount of money that would only serve a small portion of the trips on the 29 Corridor. Even if the Western Bypass is built, they would still have a failing level of service on Route 29 without building the grade-separated interchanges. In short, it just does not make sense especially considering the further build-out that has occurred within the northern terminus of the Bypass.

Mr. Strucko closed the public hearing portion of the work session. He noted that a few questions were posed.

Mr. Edgerton asked the Commission to weigh in on the question Jeff Werner presented. He worried that the specificity of these numbers might haunt the Commission. If 500 people come in and say they can't afford this Plan, does that invalidate the plan? He felt that the Commission needs to think about it since there might be a movement to do just that.

Mr. Loach pointed out that there were two parameters that they are talking about. One has not been addressed except by Mr. Butler. The parameters are functionality as well as cost. If in fact Mr. Butler's comments are correct in Route 29 would still fail despite the Western Bypass, it seems that it is a no-contest on the functionality aspects of the projects. The functionality is what they should be addressing and should be as important if not more important obviously than the cost. They have not heard anything from the Western Bypass proponents about increasing the functionality. It is functionally equivalent to what the interchanges would be. He heard what Mr. Strucko was saying, but he thought they were missing that there are two parameters--functionality as well as costs.

Mr. Strucko said that he was comfortable with the numbers in there because it gives context and communicates all of the necessary information that needs to be out there. It is encumbered upon the Commission to explain to the public that this is indeed a plan, a long-term vision, these are current year dollars but everything is not going to be built next year. These are costs that are spread over decades. They have to determine the priorities and the challenge of the community is to come up with the resources to make the plan viable. He had a professional bent towards numbers, which is the way he looks at and interprets plans.

Mr. Morris hoped that they don't get any more specific in the numbers at all. At best the numbers are a guess and let's not paint ourselves into a corner.

Ms. Joseph noted that what might get people upset is about the reality of what the plan might cost.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that the history of the master plan is that it was the next level down from comp plan planning. They tried to give some reference or frame of reference to what these projects will mean. The project does not come to life until it gets into the CIP. It won't happen until the projects are a vision to be fundable. Even in the CIP the first step is design, and they don't know the costs. It is a frame of reference and not an absolute. The pending years to when the project will get done is probably the most dangerous part of the master planning. The reality is that it is beyond saying they would like to see it happen in 10 years versus 20 years. They don't know when it can happen.

Ms. Joseph pointed out that they don't know what development will occur in particular with NGIS. If they put a timeline of their expectations of when development will happen, they don't know exactly what the settlement patterns are going to be in the future.

Mr. Cilimberg said what they will find with Places29 since the projects are already needed is that it is more about what needs to be accomplished over the next five years. At last night's meeting, he heard someone comment that the bottom line is that the projects being listed each have an incremental value added for each one that is done to the Places29 plan. So if they only have X amount of dollars and can only do certain things on that list, there is an incremental benefit from doing that. So in a way the list broken down like it is will give the best shot of what the priorities are and what should happen first. But it may be a case where they find that there are certain monies available to do certain projects that are on that list that can give an incremental benefit just by being built at that point of time. That is a much different scenario than they will find for the Western Bypass because they can't built that road in pieces even if it was something that the community decided that they wanted. But they can build a lot of the transportation pieces or provide transportation services for this Places29 plan in increments. There is a value added to that.

Ms. Monteith suggested that it would make a lot of sense to include that information in the preparatory text. So much of what he was saying would make a difference.

Mr. Benish noted that it was not taking a different direction but explaining it better.

Mr. Cilimberg felt that gets into what Mr. Loach was saying about the functionality. There are costs all over the place here with no order of magnitude or whatever they want to call them. But also explaining that the functionality of Places29 land use with its transportation can benefit through what he described in whatever way they are able to do it. One ring road at Rio and 29 that might be part of a new development or a redevelopment is not a net loss. It is a net gain. Even if they don't ever get that interchange, it is a net gain. So staff wants to explain that and maybe it will help as well and give some balance to what they are struggling with.

Mr. Strucko said that the speakers raised some specific issues. He asked to quickly go through them. Mr. Williamson talked about a statement on page 8-7. He felt that there may be a point there and asked for Mr. Kamptner's direction.

Mr. Kamptner suggested clarifying the sentence that Mr. Williamson referenced. The opening sentence of that paragraph refers to rezonings and special use permits in which off-site traffic impacts can be considered. Staff can clarify the sentence.

Mr. Strucko said that Morgan Butler mentioned a concern that the Uptown area was in a priority area north. He asked if there was any reaction to that.

Ms. Porterfield said that goes along with what she said at the beginning of the meeting. She was really concerned about the area up near the airport. She did not think that kind of area is located near an airport in other communities. Those who use airline transportation do not usually leave the airport between flights. They don't want to have to do the security again. She was concerned about the Uptown because Hollymead is a nearby big development area that is going to offer tourism, restaurants and those kinds of things.

Ms. Joseph said if the UVA Research Park really takes off, it will be necessary. It would be something that would be used. The hotels or whatever went in there would mutually benefit. So it would not be just the folks coming in and out. She worried about that Uptown area as it competes with the Charlottesville Downtown Mall. She thought that it was sort of the same kind of thing. She often wondered if it was too early to put Uptown in there.

Ms. Porterfield said that she could see the hotels, but just wondered if they could give the area some flexibility so that they were not scaring commercial entities away from wanting to be able to locate up there because of the proximity to transportation.

Mr. Benish said that staff was fine with taking it out of the priority area as long as it stays in the small area plan so that they can begin the planning and assessment process for it. It makes sense. Staff has seen it ultimately as a long-term process. The main thing staff wanted to make sure that they were doing now is that in order for something to evolve like the Downtown Mall it sort of has to have the bones for it to develop. It has to have a form that allows it to convert over time. That is the sensitivity to it. But there are many ways that the Neighborhood Model principles address those. He felt that they could take it out of the Uptown area since it addresses some of the concerns of the Commission. He asked if there was replacement area or somewhere they could change the boundary to create some replacement for it.

Ms. Joseph asked if he was saying that they need that growth in that area for the next 20 years.

Mr. Benish replied that what he was very specifically seeing was that they have an industrial area south of the Forest Springs area which they may want to encourage for some of our industrial needs. If as they reevaluate the Uptown area if they see some other opportunities to replace where that growth is theoretically anticipated. He was not guaranteeing that they would make changes. But if the Commission would rather not and just take it out and not change any boundaries, then the Commission needs to say that.

Mr. Edgerton felt that when the UVA Research Park develops they might need it. He asked how many residences have been approved in the Hollymead Town Center. They will have a huge community of people living there that has nothing to do with the airport.

Ms. Joseph noted that the Commission was going to be looking at a rezoning for the UVA properties in the red-striped area adjacent to Airport Acres.

Mr. Edgerton asked what the significance is of it being in a priority area as opposed to a small plan area. He saw value in the not-too-distant future to start looking at a more specific idea of how this could develop. That is what he thought the small area plans were. He asked if there is a small area and a priority small plan area.

Mr. Benish replied no. He pointed out that there were some areas impacted other than those areas designated for Uptown. It also provided an opportunity for other properties in that area for consideration for rezoning for growth. He suggested that they might want to take a look to replace those areas or to leave those areas in and change the boundary a little. If the Commission does not think that is important, the staff can cut the boundary off for the priority area at the uptown area.

Ms. Joseph felt that the industrial and light industrial area is important because many such properties have been rezoned residential. She felt it is important to have that area there near the airport.

Mr. Benish noted that in between the area is the Uptown area and the Commission wants to take it out.

Ms. Porterfield said that she was okay keeping it in, but not to stress the fact that it should become a destination place for people who want to eat or shop. Somebody might come in with a better use of it because of proximity to the airport. The County desperately needs business. The Hollymead area should be able to suffice for that area as far as eateries and shopping options for a long time.

Ms. Wiegand pointed out that under that designation that is here on the Uptown area they could get businesses in there.

Ms. Porterfield asked if they could get light industry.

Ms. Joseph replied no, that was shown in purple.

Ms. Wiegand replied that commercial could go in the striped area and possibly industrial in the one corner. It would not just be restaurants and shops.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that the emphasis should go more toward the commercial than the restaurants and shops.

Ms. Wiegand noted that right now the urban mixed use is an attempt to balance it among all of those things such as commercial, restaurant, entertainment and residential.

Mr. Benish noted that what they were discussing modifying was whether it was in the priority area where they want to encourage our capital or public investments and to encourage development activity to take place. What Mr. Butler was suggesting was that it is an area not ripe yet to become part of a priority area. Staff needs consensus from the Commission. If the area was not in the priority area, that buys time to analyze it to determine the best mix of uses, appropriate timing and location. What staff was initially suggesting actually fits well with taking it out of the priority area. But when they take that area out, there are some opportunities lost in that priority area that he thought ought to be evaluated as to whether they need to be replaced. Ms. Porterfield is indicating she is okay with it in the priority area, but it is just how the area develops.

Mr. Franco noted that he was okay with it staying in there as a priority area. But he would like to build on what he said regarding the level of the small area study to think less about the uses but about getting the bones in place so that it will develop in the right form they are looking for. Those may be transportation bones and things like that. It is devoting the planning effort to it so the planning does not come too late.

Ms. Joseph said that she did not want to lose the industrial land. If they move that boundary, it will not make as much sense as it does now. She hoped that the university is very successful there and will bring in some industry. Then they will have that wonderful connection road from 29 through the industrial park. It just makes sense to keep it in.

Mr. Franco said that he was not talking about changing the proposed zoning or the proposed Comp Plan designation. It is whether it is a priority area or not.

Ms. Benish said that it would give staff guidance as to whether they invest public dollars in that area and how they evaluate land-use decisions in that area. What he was hearing was that the priority area needs to stay in. They need to identify what are the planning steps for that area as a priority first and what are the short-term and long-term expectations and see if that addresses it.

Mr. Strucko agreed that staff had captured the sentiments of the Commission.

Ms. Porterfield felt that the numbers in the draft will cause a lot of confrontation. There needs to be a plan or a way to steer the public comments away from the numbers. Under the current economic situation, she felt that everybody is going to say they can't afford it. The Commission has to be ready to get the public to look at the other pieces of the Plan thinking if they can afford it, does anything in here leap out as being bad or really good because it is a long term plan. Somehow they have to get people to get past the numbers and consider if the plan is affordable, is it what they want as a vision.

Mr. Benish agreed that if they can afford it, they need to know what to do if they have the money.

Mr. Franco noted that if they want to change the existing problems, this is what it is going to take to fix existing problems for the next 15 years or so. It is now time to pay that tab. If the public doesn't want to correct it, then don't pay it.

Mr. Loach noted that in Crozet, the residents wanted to have numbers because they kept asking for the concurrency of infrastructure. At this end of this process, they need to know what it will take to fix the current situation. They also need to know if they can afford to rezone other development area properties in the future.

Mr. Benish indicated that some additional "fine tuning" of the text would be made when changes recommended by the Commission are made.

The Planning Commission took no formal action. In summary, the Planning Commission noted some possible clarification or changes to be made, as follows:

<u>Page</u>	<u>Change/Clarification</u>
List & App	Add two secondary road projects to List and Appendix: Proffit Road and Dickerson Road. It will involve renumbering projects.
ACSA	Review descriptions, as listed in letter from Gary Fern, and incorporate information as needed.
Text & App	Consider giving percentages for how much will be publicly funded and how much privately funded for each project that lists both sources.

When giving presentations (and/or writing text?) note that we don't know where the money is coming from yet, but when the money is available this is what we want to do.

Reemphasize the fact that the costs exist regardless of the proposed Master Plan.

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| 8-1 | Clarify the "20-year" implementation comment in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph by relating to the third sentence in the first paragraph.  |
| 8-3 | Note on the Western Bypass. To help the public understand, consider adding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A history of decision making/chronology</li><li>• BOS's final determination, with reasons why</li><li>• Places29 intended to develop an alternative that will work</li><li>• Include the amount/percentage of truck traffic</li></ul>  |
| 8-4 | Add LOSs for the worst intersections—the ones that are failing now or will fail in the near future. Indicate where failure will occur without the improvements listed in the Plan.   |
| 8-4 | Review the 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet to make sure it is clear.  |
| 8-4 | Consider whether the second bullet is accurate.  |
| --  | Redevelopment of land and roads. Chamber members' fear of the impacts on businesses along roads. Strengthen statements indicating that impacts on businesses will not be known until designs are completed. Ring Roads and access management create opportunities. Small area plans will be opportunity to work with businesses and property owners in the area. County and VDOT work to minimize impacts on businesses. |
| 8-2 | Clarify what will take place during the 8 – 12 years some projects will take and that the intent is to minimize impacts on adjacent property owners.   |
| 8-2 | Add date of Tech Memo #7 to text.  |

- 8-3 Second paragraph under Land Use & Development Projects: clarify distinction between ZMA/SP and site plans; indicate that the review of site plans in relation to the Master Plan is “advisory.”
- 8-3 Add the words “principles of the” between “in the” and “County’s Neighborhood Model”
- 8-5 1.a. Find another landmark for “Best Buy” in case that business changes before the improvement is complete.
- Appendix Maps: label the a, b, c, d that is given in the description on the map illustrating the improvement
- Add road names for reference, in a larger font.
- Add a legend that describes the colors used in the illustrations
- Fix the two shades of green for open space; they are indistinguishable.
- Appendix #57. Fix the “land cost” entry.
- List & App Review numbering system and clarify the rationale behind the order. Is #1 more important than # 27? High Priority items are “buried” in the List.
- The List shows the most appropriate order, but note (in the text) that some projects may be funded out of the order in which they are listed.
- List & App Mix of projects is unusual—some are planning, some implementation, some projects staff will clarify.
- List & App Delete the reference to UVa from Responsible Parties in #24 and #56.
- List & App Costs: use only one type, rather than the three listed. Indicate where other estimates may be found. Round to nearest hundred, rather than the level of specificity that’s there now. Clarify that these are only estimates and the level of uncertainty involved in them. Explain what multipliers have been used and their source. Add some extra words to indicate that this is a “blended comp plan and transportation study.” The costs represent an order of magnitude but not specific design costs. The final cost estimate will be a result of final engineering design.
- Try to find ways during presentations about the Master Plan to direct public attention to aspects of the Plan other than the cost estimates.
- Uptown. Leave in both Priority Area 2 and the Small Area Plan.
- 8-7 Clarify first sentence under “Private Development & ...Areas”

Mr. Strucko said that the meeting would move to the next agenda item, which was moved from the beginning of the agenda.

### **Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – July 1, 2009 and July 8, 2009**

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on July 1, 2009 and July 8, 2009.

### **Old Business:**

Mr. Strucko asked if there was any old business.

- The Roundtable on Farm Winery will be held on Wednesday, July 15 at 4:00 p.m. in Room 241. Since more than two Commissioners will attend the Commission will need to adjourn to the July 15 meeting.
- The Planning Commission rescheduled the Village of Rivanna Master Plan public hearing to September 8.

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

**New Business:**

Mr. Strucko asked if there was any new business.

- Mr. Strucko, Mr. Loach and Mr. Morris will be absent on July 21.
- Mr. Edgerton will be absent on August 11.

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

**Adjournment:**

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m. to the Wednesday, July 15, 2009 Roundtable discussion on Farm Wineries at 4:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

---

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

## Attachment A - Public Review Plan – Places29 Master Plan

### **Tentative general schedule –**

**August 11** - Places29 draft plan presented to Planning Commission and released to the public

**August 11 – September 15** – public review activities

**September 15** – check in with the Planning Commission to confirm public hearing

**September 15 – October 13** – continued public review activities

**October 13** – tentative date for Planning Commission public hearing

### **Public Review Approach:**

The focus of this public review process is to provide a variety of opportunities via different venues for stakeholders involved in the Places29 master plan process to familiarize or refamiliarize themselves with the content of the plan in advance of the Planning Commission's public hearing this fall. There has already been a very substantial and engaged public participation process for the development of the plan to date that has influenced and shaped important concepts and sections of Places29. However, it has been some time since the material has been reviewed and discussed with the public for their understanding, and staff feels that this is a critical step prior to conducting the public hearing this fall.

**While the review process is not being designed to solicit additional public input – that should be directed towards the public hearing – if there is significant feedback on any specific issues, that information will be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission prior to the public hearing.**

***Work Product for the public review – Interested stakeholders will have ample opportunity to review and understand the basic concepts of the Places29 Master Plan prior to public hearing.***

### **Public Review Outcomes:**

- Reintroduce the Places29 Master Plan in its current state to involved stakeholders, including the general public
- Indicate areas where significant changes have occurred from the draft plan as a result of the Planning Commission's deliberations
- Indicate specifically how public input was used in developing plan concepts
- Share future opportunities for public involvement in the consideration of the master plan, specifically the Planning Commission public hearing and the Board of Supervisors deliberation process

### **Stakeholders:**

- Residents of the plan area
- Business community
- Development community
- Internal departments
- Affected agencies
- County residents
- Regional partners

### **Schedule of Public Review Activities:**

- Information Open Houses (Dates Tentative)
  - September 8 (Prior to PC meeting) – COB McIntire 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Lobby
  - September 10 (Late afternoon/early evening) – Hollymead Fire Station
  - Others to be scheduled as needed
- Presentations to HOA's and stakeholder groups including business groups upon request
- Information displays at COB McIntire staffed during selected periods
- Review copies of Master Plan available at Northside Library and Community Development front desk

**Materials Required:**

- Master Plan Documents will be available...
  - For download from the County website
  - In printed form for viewing or purchase at the Community Development front desk
  - In printed form for viewing at the Northside Library
  - In CD form by request
- Website
  - Develop a friendly web presence that provides summary information about the overall plan and chapters, displays maps and graphics when possible, and contains links to the document chapters and supporting materials for those who want more detail. Meeting, background and contact information will also be available.
- Educational Materials to support Master Plan document (available print/web)
  - “Top 10 things you need to know about Places29” – 1-page document for those who want to know general information about how the plan will impact the development area. Document will contain links/references to more detailed information.
  - “Get to Know your Places29 Master Plan” – 1-page document with the guiding principles, a brief summary of each chapter, and next steps for plan implementation. Document will contain links/references to more detailed information.
  - “Community Input Overview” – 1-page summary of community input opportunities during the development of the plan and how community input shaped the plan. Could be combined with “Get to know your Places29 Master Plan.”
  - Land Use Map with description of colors.
  - FAQ.

**Suggested Outreach:**

- A-mail
  - Notify residents, businesses and other stakeholders in advance of all PC/BOS activities and community information sessions related to the plan.
- Flyers
  - Email flyers announcing information sessions to neighborhood associations and apartment/condo complexes to post/distribute, post in libraries and schools, distribute to stakeholders.
- Media exposure
  - Notify all local media in advance of public hearings and community information sessions related to the plan.
- Other Venues as appropriate

**The Feedback Loop:**

The public review process is geared towards helping people understand the basic concepts and impacts of Places29 so that they can provide informed comments at the Planning Commission’s public hearing. The public review process will also demonstrate how feedback provided at earlier meetings has contributed towards the plan’s recommendations. While the review process is not being designed to solicit public input – that should be directed towards the public hearing – if there is significant feedback on any specific issues then that information will be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission prior to the public hearing.