

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 13, 2009**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing, work session and meeting on Tuesday, October 13, 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, Bill Edgerton, Linda Porterfield, Thomas Loach, Vice Chairman and Eric Strucko, Chairman. Mr. Strucko arrived at 6:16 p.m. Absent were Don Franco and Julia Monteith, AICP, non-voting representative for the University of Virginia.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Loach, Vice Chairman called the regular meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and established a quorum.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – October 7, 2009

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on October 7, 2009.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Loach invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Work Session:

CPA-2008-00003 Village of Rivanna Master Plan - Work session on Draft Plan dated August 26, 2009, also including Resolution of Intent to amend the Comprehensive Plan. (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the executive summary. (See Executive Summary)

The Planning Commission has held several work sessions on the Village of Rivanna with the last one in September. Staff hopes this is the last installment of the work sessions.

The changes made to the Master Plan since the last meeting with the Planning Commission are:

- Removed the larger study area from the map;
- Added information on the number of acres that are available for development in the sense that they are undeveloped or underdeveloped right now;
- Provided a map showing potential for additional units, population information related to it and added density illustrations;
- Removed the asphalt reference in all but one place, which will be done by the next meeting;
- Added the Glenmore recreation areas to the park and green systems map (the equestrian center and the golf course);
- Put in some stronger statements regarding the upgrading of infrastructure prior to approval of any new development by a rezoning;
- Provided the number of units which have been approved in the text and the potential build-out by geographic area for undeveloped land, thereby addressing the population and infrastructure, which seem to be the topics that the community is most interested in;
- Clarified the number of units over and above the additional units that potentially could be served by the sewer system. (It was not clear in the last draft that they had two numbers provided with one being the number of units that had been approved and the other how many more could be accommodated with the sewer system.);

- Clarified expectations that any new rezoning would necessitate the fullest of improvements to Route 250 East, which was in Chapter 5; and
- Acknowledged that Ms. Joseph sent an email with several changes that were not substantive but grammatical in nature, which staff will make.

There have been some questions regarding the number of persons per unit figures put into this plan. Staff is using the U.S. Census figures. After next year, more current figures will be available. One of the residents, Cindi Burton, asked the Commission to consider lowering the density for the rezoned property. The rezoned properties are already at one unit per acre, which is already low. Therefore, staff does not feel that is necessary.

There were other questions received by email about the capacity of the sewage treatment plant which staff answered. There seems to be a misconception that the sewage treatment plant cannot accommodate all of the development that has been approved. Staff is not aware that is the case, and the Service Authority certainly has not said that. The figures show 381,000 gallons per day of capacity, and 121,000 gallons per day are being used right now. There is capacity, but not tons of capacity over and above what has been suggested in the Master Plan. Capacity cannot be tied down to exact numbers because there are a lot of variables that go into the usage of the facility, which depend upon what kind of uses might be in the Village Center itself and whether it is a high or low sewer usage. There does not seem to be tremendous usage by the people who live at Glenmore, which appears to consist of a lot of two person households. Also, they must be good conservers of water.

There was a comment about the need for clearer maps. Staff will get those maps changed at the web site so the public can see more clearly what they mean. That is something staff can do very quickly.

Staff hopes the Commission is ready to set a public hearing. The questions are out there as to when that could happen including the hope that this Master Plan could get to the Board who might be able to make a decision by the end of the year. Staff does not think it is possible for a decision to be made by the end of the year. The Board will need to have a work session and then have the advertised period before their public hearing in time to make a decision. The only possibility in November with the goal of the Commission being able to make a recommendation to the Board by the end of the year would be to hold the public hearing on a night other than Tuesday. The meeting could possibly be held in the Village if they could get a facility for the public hearing. The next available date on the Commission's calendar is December 8. The latest date the Commission could consider is December 15, which is about the latest date for the Commission to make a recommendation to the Board and have this Planning Commission make the recommendation. It is evident that there will be some new Planning Commissioners seated next year.

Staff recommends that the Commission set a public hearing date for November or December.

Mr. Loach invited questions for staff.

Ms. Joseph suggested having the public hearing in November so the Master Plan could get to the Board in December.

Ms. Echols noted that the third Thursday in November is not good because it is a CCAC Forum, which would be difficult to have if they want Mr. Loach or her present. She suggested holding the hearing on a Thursday night if necessary in order to have the public hearing in November.

Mr. Morris asked Ms. Porterfield if she felt it was a time sensitive issue.

Ms. Porterfield said that she did not think it is a time sensitive issue, and frankly she would like to have a chance to review the final draft because she has a number of questions. She would like to have the draft redone and be able to look at it again before they set it in stone. She would prefer that the draft not come back with a lot more pieces to add to it.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that one consideration in the scheduling of this is that there is going to be some level of turnover in the Planning Commission after the end of the year. This is the Commission that has done all of the work on this. He suggested that the Commission try to hold the public hearing and make their decision before the end of the year.

Mr. Strucko arrived at 6:16 p.m.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff can turn the draft around fast enough to get it totally cleaned up so that they could all look at the draft ahead of time. When they have the public hearing, it should be a clean draft so that at that point they are talking about something that appears to be finished.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that once the Commission has a public hearing there may be additional changes which they would need to make before it gets to the Board. Staff could clean the document up so the Commission can review it to make sure those issues have been taken care of before the public hearing without having another work session, but that might mean that the public hearing cannot happen until December.

Ms. Porterfield felt that would be better than trying to rush it along with everything that is in the hopper right now and not doing as good a job as they could with it. Therefore, she would prefer the hearing date to be December 8.

Mr. Morris said that he appreciated her input because she lived in that area. But he was concerned that they have been at this for almost two years and thought that it is time for the people to be able to have the public hearing and move it on. If that means November, then it is November. He felt that the point made by Mr. Cilimberg as to having a reconstituted Planning Commission was a very valid point.

Mr. Edgerton said that he would like to move it on in this calendar year because not only is the Commission being changed but there is a good chance that the Board composition is going to change. To bring somebody else in and start all over again is going to be a nightmare after all of this work. They don't have anything scheduled for the Tuesday before Thanksgiving. He asked if that was a possibility.

Ms. Porterfield felt it would be really wrong for the people in the Village of Rivanna to have something during Thanksgiving week. Many may already have plans which could preclude them from participating. That would be wrong. She asked that they look at another date in November. The Commission previously talked about not meeting during the week of Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Year's since people plan far in advance. She requested to see the draft when it is corrected and completed prior to it just being shown here. It would be nice to have a little extra time in case there are further changes.

In struggling with setting a public hearing date, the Commission reviewed their advance agenda for November 10 and 17 and generally supported holding the public hearing on November 17 even if it meant a 4:00 or 5:00 p.m. start time.

Ms. Joseph suggested that the Commission talk about what kind of changes that need to be made to the document first and then decide about setting the public hearing. The Commission needs to talk first and let staff know how they will need to respond. She saw very few things that need to be discussed because they have done this so many times.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that they proceed with the thought that all changes will be handled and that they can have the public hearing if November 17 works for everybody unless at the end of the meeting they determine that the procedure is not going to work.

Mr. Strucko noted that November 24 would be kept on the table and remains open as an option, but most likely the hearing date would end up on November 17.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that the Commission hear the public comment and then ask questions of staff.

Mr. Loach opened the hearing for public comment.

Neil Means said he was looking for specific language in the plan that referenced standards for capacity of roads that must be met before approving another project. He thought at the last hearing the Commission was looking for a specific way of judging the road conditions and the level of service or capacity issues of the road so that they could specifically say that roads had to meet some standard before projects could be approved. According to data that was given by the planners during this process if these recommendations for improvements to Route 250 were to be built, the road would still not be able to handle the traffic for the development that has already been approved. He noted that the improvements listed in Chapter 5 will not be adequate to meet the demands of the traffic of already approved development. It won't work the way it is now. He thought that the idea was that they would get some specific language put in the document in order to have a specific test for the capacity of the roads. He suggested that the Commission work on technical language that provides for specific improvement for road standards.

Betsy Baten asked that the December 8 hearing date be chosen to give time for the proper review of the completed draft. Glenmore comprises the large majority of the Village of Rivanna at this point and there are a lot of ongoing problems that are taking a lot of their attention at present. The additional time to have people be able to review the draft would be extremely useful to the majority of the residents. She supported Ms. Porterfield's suggestion to hold the Planning Commission hearing on December 8.

There being no further speakers, Mr. Loach closed the public comment to bring the matter before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Morris said he had not heard anything from the public nor did he read anything that he felt needs to be changed. He thought that most things have been addressed. However, he agreed that they don't have specifics on the road capacity. He did not know if they could hold the plan up in order to get that very nebulous data. He felt that they were ready to move on with a thorough editing of the plan.

Ms. Joseph asked staff if there was anything that could be changed in the language presented that could be more specific on what can happen.

Ms. Echols replied that staff had been very specific that nothing could happen until the road improvements that are listed for Route 250 in Chapter 8 are done. That is about as specific as they could get. The Commission did not want any more traffic on Route 250 until all the road improvements that could be made were done. That is not to say that they were going to get this down to a volume capacity of one or less. It is still going to be over one, but it is not going to be tremendously over one. Otherwise, there are other options that the Commission has explored that they have said they don't want to have related to other parts of the development area. So what staff has put in is nothing else until all the road improvements are done.

Ms. Joseph asked where that was located in the document.

Ms. Echols replied that was located on page 31, second paragraph toward the end, which stated, "In addition to sewer limitations, approval of any development by rezoning will be predicated on the completion of a number of transportation and infrastructure improvements which are identified in the tables of this chapter. These improvements are needed to improve the volume to capacity ratio of U.S. 250 between Route 22, Louisa Road and the City of Charlottesville." If there is a need to state that more strongly, staff can certainly do that.

Mr. Loach asked if this excludes by-right development.

Ms. Echols replied that it excludes by-right development zoned Rural Area because everybody could use their development rights.

Mr. Strucko said that list of road improvements start on page 34.

Ms. Echols agreed that it started on page 34, which includes the Shadwell Interchange, the four-laning of Rte. 250 from the interchange to either the Glenmore Way entrance or Milton Road, the intersection improvements at Milton Road, the bridge over the railroad, and the four-laning of Rte. 250 from Black Cat Road to the County line. The possible replacement of the traffic signal at Glenmore Way with a roundabout and the regional transit would not apply, but all of those other road improvements on Route 250 would.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that it be reworded to make it stronger so to be clearer that the true actual completion means that it has been built in order to proceed with any rezoning. She wondered if the public sitting in the audience realized that staff was saying that they need to improve the roads and then rezone.

Ms. Joseph noted that is not normally what they do. Normally what they do is if someone is going to request a rezoning, then they agree to pay for the improvements.

Ms. Porterfield agreed, but noted that rezonings and improvements go hand-in-glove. She understands that if someone comes in to rezone and does not agree to pay for improvements which have not been completed, the rezoning could be denied.

Ms. Joseph noted that would guide the rezoning.

Mr. Morris said personally he felt what staff read on page 31 is very clear and is fine.

Mr. Loach pointed out having come from Crozet he was very sensitive to infrastructure areas but felt it was well worded. He agreed with Mr. Morris since he was not sure how the wording could be strengthened.

Ms. Porterfield noted that they had one speaker who said that it was not as clear as he thought it was going to be. She felt that was the question. There are a few other places where she felt that the issue could be inserted, which she had marked.

Mr. Loach noted that the question is if you read it and were the next member of the Planning Commission or Board coming in, would it be clear.

Mr. Strucko suggested that the Commission ask Mr. Means to come forward and address whether he is satisfied with this.

Mr. Neil Means said that he was not satisfied with the wording. If they look closely at the data from the planners, that in order to do these improvements as recommended they will not be adequate to even meet the demand of the traffic which will come from things already approved much less whatever might be built under this Master Plan. He pointed out what he heard the Commissioners say was that they were looking for technical language that the road had to meet a certain level of service or some engineering standard for traffic. It did not have to do with specific improvements of four-lanes, six-lanes or eight-lanes in a particular place. It was about saying that the road had to meet some standard for the level of service. Several meetings ago they were talking about the legal precedence in other counties and there was supposed to be some way of doing that by meeting some VDOT standard. He was not an expert on these things, but that is what he remembered the Commissioners asking for.

Mr. Morris noted as he recalled that conversation they were looking at hopefully coming up to a Level C as far as that goes and what the technical ramifications were of the Level C as opposed to a Level B or a Level D. He did not know, but there are technical ramifications. If they say it is a Level C, then it meets the criteria for that particular designation. He thought he saw that in this plan.

Mr. Benish pointed out that this is a more straight-forward approach. Essentially this area is not going to be developed for about 25 years. He did not think that they were going to come up with 30 million dollars to do these improvements. This seemed to be a little easier to understand for most people because these improvements have to be in place. Those improvements do result in a road system that exceeds the volume to capacity, which is just like Route 250 West that already exceeds and will exceed volume to

capacity when Crozet builds out. There are a number of roads that exceed volume capacity at certain peak periods. They will probably in the future never be able to obtain in the environment they are in those capacities. He thought that the result of that is that they don't want to approve any further development until the improvements that they think are necessary to create the best road possible are in place. That is what these do.

Mr. Edgerton said that it is really important that the Commission as a group as well as the public understands what is being proposed. From Mr. Benish's read of the wording here, which he felt was fairly clear, it would mean that there would be no future rezoning anywhere on Route 250 from Pantops out to the Village Center.

Mr. Benish noted that the only areas designated for urban zoning is the Village of Rivanna.

Mr. Edgerton said that this would be a moratorium of any future development in the Village of Rivanna

Mr. Benish pointed out what they would look at based on these Comp Plan recommendations is that they should not rezone land until all of these improvements have taken place and that road system is in its best possible condition to support any future needs.

Mr. Edgerton asked if they have ever done that with any master plan before.

Mr. Benish replied that they took the level-of-service approach with the Granger CPA on Fontaine Avenue in the Southern Urban Area. In going through a rezoning analysis, they found out they have the ability to do 300,000 square feet before they reach the level of service "D." But in the Comp Plan amendment for the Granger property and to implement the Southern Urban Area B Study they put language in the Comp Plan that said those road networks have to function at a level of service "D."

Mr. Edgerton said that what he was struggling with is that there is a lot of property that they have spent a lot of hours discussing between the Pantops area and the Village of Rivanna along Route 250 where it is conceivable that people will be requesting rezoning on that property in the coming years. The Commission needs to be very clear about what it is they are putting into the language of this Master Plan. If that is literally a moratorium on any future development out Route 250 from Pantops to the Village of Rivanna that they are asking for, then they need to acknowledge that is what is happening. Frankly, some of the projects they considered in the last year could subsequently be reconsidered and would only exacerbate the road conditions more. So why wouldn't it apply to those properties as well.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the reality is that the Commission is dealing with the Village of Rivanna right now. So the language that they are suggesting is about the Village of Rivanna. If there were any Comprehensive Plan changes for those other areas Mr. Edgerton mentioned, that would be the place to again put in that language.

Mr. Edgerton said that review by staff and the Commission in the future would be narrowly focused just on the Village of Rivanna for this requirement.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that this requirement would be part of the Village of Rivanna Master Plan and any request for development through a rezoning in the Village of Rivanna would be subject to this language.

Mr. Benish noted that they should also keep in mind that any rezoning request to any zoning designation other than rural areas is not going to be consistent with our Comprehensive Plan in that intervening period. Staff's suggestion would be a Comp Plan amendment by which they would then set the standards for those areas.

Ms. Echols asked to add something about standards. One of the things that staff found when they went to the Comprehensive Plan that based the levels of service for the Granger property/Sunset/Fontaine area was that when they were working with VDOT that level of service was not as easy for them to use as the volume-to-capacity ratio. So that is one of the reasons they have been talking about the volume-to-capacity ratio. That seems to the direction that VDOT is trying to have us go in terms of evaluating what

the road can handle and how much more volume there is to capacity or how much room there is in there. One of the reasons they did not go down that route of the level of service was in part because of the changing measurements of VDOT. But also it was because staff felt the Planning Commission had made a black-and-white determination in more - no, but what they have got - yes.

Mr. Strucko noted that what the Commission had heard was that perhaps the public wants to see a little more precision. In looking at the charts on pages 17 and 26, he suggested that perhaps they can supplement these charts with additional columns. They have identified the stretches of road that would seek improvements and they have the annual average daily 2007 traffic volume estimates. Perhaps they can add information about that ratio Ms. Echols just mentioned or the volume-to-capacity ratio and what it would have to be in order for the roadway to be deemed appropriate. They are forecasting in the chart on page 26 by comparing year 2007 to year 2035. So they have done some forecasting and they should be able to at least beef up the standards.

Ms. Echols noted that they would end up finding that it is over one. The capacity of the road is less than the volume that would be on there. Staff can put those numbers in there. But if they want to have a 1 to 1 ratio, staff does not think it is going to be possible with the road improvements that they have seen in the studies. As Mr. Benish mentioned, that is not a standard that has been applied throughout the County. There are some roads that carry more traffic than perhaps they were designed for.

Mr. Strucko asked if they have the capacity figures for these stretches of road, and Ms. Echols replied yes.

Mr. Strucko suggested adding a column that simply has the capacity.

Mr. Loach said that if they are going to use that methodology it is fine. Using that ratio is clear and mathematical. It is not as subjective as the A, B, C and D. He did not say how they get to the point where they say it is okay in one spot to go above and they are already above one. He just wanted to be consistent across the board so that they treat all of these and anything new coming in with road capacity issues that they use the same methodology and that same ratio so that they know what it is. If it is over one, then they can use it in the decision making process. By using the ratio it also helps the Village of Rivanna because even though it may be one or slightly over if there is other development going on either upstream or downstream that is going to affect them. It may even with these improvements with the new figures show that it actually has gotten worse. Even putting these improvements in, as he said, would make a difference if only to give them more reason to deny a rezoning. He wanted to see them get to a stage where they have this standard methodology for looking at road-to-growth ratios. He felt what they were talking about is good. He agreed with Mr. Strucko that they should add the columns if possible.

Mr. Edgerton asked for Mr. Kamptner's help concerning proceeding on the premise that the language is clear and that there will be no further development in the Village and if it would narrow the focus to just the Village until these improvements are done as listed on page 34. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Kamptner replied that was correct.

Mr. Edgerton said that one of the concerns he had, which was possibly national legislation, which says they can't require a developer to do off-site improvements. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Kamptner said that rezonings and special use permits are a little different. The kind of restrictions he was thinking about are most directly applicable to subdivisions and site plans. In making the policy decision as to whether to allow a rezoning they are allowed to look at issues such as existing transportation issues.

Mr. Edgerton asked if this would stand up under the current legislation. If they look on page 34 at all four improvements that total several millions of dollars, they are all outside of the Village and are all regional improvements. As such if a property within the Village was being developed or if they wanted to try to develop, would they have the authority to say no based on this.

Mr. Kamptner replied that these are very specific and objective criteria since they have identified specific transportation needs in this area. It should be a legitimate basis to not approve a rezoning within the Village of Rivanna.

Mr. Edgerton asked if it would include rezonings outside of the Village.

Mr. Kamptner replied no, but that there would be other Comprehensive Plan policies that would apply for the rural areas. He could not recall if it was rural areas on both sides of Route 250 between Pantops and the Village. The rural areas plan would dictate that and other elements of the Comprehensive Plan would apply to any consideration of rezonings between Pantops and the Village of Rivanna.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it seemed the Commission was discussing the idea of tying development, specifically rezoning of land that is undeveloped in the Village of Rivanna, to either a set of road improvements or a volume-to-capacity ratio on Route 250. They should probably decide on one or the other. Road improvements are pretty specific. Volume-to-capacity ratio is pretty specific as well. Based on conditions that can occur with economics and driving patterns etc., they could have the volume-to-capacity ratio. Although it is not projected to do this, it would become more favorable and allow development to occur much sooner than basing it on improvements to the road. So they have to watch what they are asking for so to speak. If they feel that it is really more tied to needing these road improvements to be in place that is a definite. That is not going to vary based on how traffic patterns change. Volume-to-capacity ratio could play out much differently. It could play out to extend even further the period of the potential for development or it could actually allow it to happen earlier.

Mr. Loach noted that the only worry he would have with the volume-to-capacity ratio is that someone could change the numbers if the ratio changes in proportion to it. As the condition changes, someone could say well this number has changed and the ratio is now below one. He asked if that is better than saying these have to be in place.

Ms. Joseph said they recognize those as specific needs right now and know that those upgrades have to occur. The infrastructure needs work because of increased volume and age. She felt it was easier see the specific improvements. It would be easier for a developer to have a list and know what has to be done if he came in for a rezoning in this area. It is easier for staff and the next Commission to be able to look at the list and know what is going on. It makes sense to have a list of what needs to happen and the level of service. They have been asking for specifics on all of the other master plans that they have been doing. They have a list for Place29, Pantops and Crozet with what they think needs to happen. Therefore, she felt comfortable with this. It is almost coming at the level of service in a back-handed way in saying that if they make these improvements then our expectation is that the level of service will improve also. That is the way she was looking at this list.

Mr. Loach noted that he was not disagreeing. What Mr. Cilimberg was saying is that there are two ways to go about it. He was not sure what the best way is. They can say "yes" they want these improvements to be put in. He wanted to make sure if they go that route that the same thing does not happen with someone changing the ratio and saying that the conditions on the road are changed and therefore not all of these improvements are really needed to get down to an acceptable level of service and all of a sudden the level of service changed because the same occurrences and situations happen and they now feel there is less level of service needed.

Mr. Cilimberg said that if they list the projects then the only way for staff to use that as a reference in rezoning decisions and for staff to change the projects that they would consider as being necessary would be for the Comp Plan to be changed to drop those projects as being necessary. If they list them in the plan, then until they go through the review process again and decide something differently or do an amendment between now and then, that is the list staff goes from.

Mr. Edgerton said that the third idea would be to decide on an acceptable level of service that had to be made, which gets into what he was talking about.

Mr. Cilimberg said that is the same thing basically.

Mr. Edgerton said that if level C was an acceptable level of service that would probably give future planners more lead in how they evaluate projects. He cautioned locking in to what they think needs to happen today opposed to what might happen in the future. In the coming 20 years, there might be substantial differences in the way people move around. The changed patterns might make the level of service such to make access available east of town. From a planning perspective, they need a certain level of service in this corridor. He suggested that wording is worth thinking about a little bit.

Ms. Porterfield agreed with Ms. Joseph that these specifics truly are needed now. From living on that side of town, she would guess that the transportation issue will only get worse. If what is needed is in black and white, then when someone predicates a rezoning they can indicate what they can do to help out. If they can't contribute, then at least the wording would say that the parcel has to be a part of making the situation better.

Ms. Echols asked to add something about the character of the existing land. A decision to say you can't do anything until a level of service C is achieved is a sword that could cut both ways. It could possibly hold up rezoning of land or the subdivision of land into smaller parcels.

Mr. Strucko asked if they are saying that nothing can be done to the Village of Rivanna unless all 17 million dollars of road improvements are done. He asked if that is the course the Commission wants to pursue.

Ms. Porterfield pointed out that currently there are between 774 and 957 potential dwelling units that can be built as they have already been zoned. The houses are not built, but the property is already zoned. If they work on that and use 2.7 individuals per dwelling unit, they are talking about close to 3,000 people for what has already been approved.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that it was the dwelling units that will be the predictor of traffic and not the number of people. The number in the household is based on current information.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that most of the people in the Village of Rivanna who work are two-car families. If they have a child in driving age, she bet they are a three-car family.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that ten trips per household are already factored into the multipliers used for the traffic generated.

Ms. Porterfield noted that there are a lot of unbuilt homes that have already been approved which will access a road that is currently really functioning badly. When she drove in today, vehicles traveling east were already backed up from the corner of Routes 729 and 250 to the Shadwell interchange. The roads are just not flowing well. There is a lot of traffic, and it is not getting better.

Mr. Loach hoped the public understood that infrastructure that is defined in the plan has to be there before they have more growth. He felt that they have to balance that for the area--whichever is preferable.

Mr. Benish clarified that this cannot apply to existing approved developments that are by-right. They are talking about future legislative acts. This is where they have the teeth to control that. They can't impose a building-permit moratorium on approved rezonings. This is about future approvals being restricted.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that basically they were talking about a provision that will apply to page 23 for 400 additional dwelling units.

Mr. Strucko said that Rivanna Village at Glenmore is already approved, zoned and done. That is going to happen regardless of traffic on Route 250. The residential units that are already approved in Glenmore are going to happen regardless of Route 250. He asked what is left that is contingent.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that it was 300 to 400 units on land that has not been rezoned that they are really talking about.

Mr. Strucko said that 17 million dollars worth of road improvements are only going to hold up 300 to 400 dwelling units.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that based on current traffic math even with those improvements and with or without the 300 to 400 additional units the volume-to-capacity ratio on Route 250 will exceed one. The 300 to 400 units are contributing a very small part of the traffic that would be impacting 250 and causing the need for the improvements identified in the list. These improvements however equate to many millions of dollars. That is kind of the context they are working under.

Mr. Morris suggested that the Planning Commission ask staff to move forward with what they have presented to us. Once they get the draft cleaned up, he thought that it works.

Ms. Joseph suggested that the Commission talk about the schedule.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that the draft incorporate the following comments and suggestions:

- On page 1, Executive Summary under Vision the last bullet might be a place to slide something else about the road improvements or make it more specific with stronger language about the road improvements to Route 250. Adequate infrastructure should reference transportation and sewer. Where it talks about adequate infrastructure reference the table.
- On page 2, first bullet under Transportation – Regional improvements include widening of Route 250 to four lanes add “widening Route 250 to four lanes from the 250/64 interchange to Glenmore Way.” There appear to be some words missing.
- On page 3, Paths the last bullet should be “A **hard**-surfaced pedestrian path” All the paths in Glenmore are asphalt.
- On page 3 last bullet, “...future development should be monitored. . .” and needed road improvements should be added.
- On page 5, third paragraph, third line reads, “to be served by a village center of mixed service...” should be “Neighborhood Service.” This should mirror the rezoning.

Ms. Echols noted that particular section is out of the Comp Plan and should reflect Villages Centers.

Ms. Joseph noted that the Village of Rivanna had its own unique designation of Village Center.

Mr. Cilimberg reiterated that regarding the Village of Rivanna, Ms Porterfield would like the reference to the Village Center in the Village of Rivanna to reflect what the zoning called it, and Ms. Porterfield agreed.

Ms. Echols noted that they reduced that to say 125,000 square feet and not 250,000 square feet of commercial space.

Ms. Porterfield noted that the object was to have businesses that the people who live out there would regularly use.

Ms. Echols noted that the Comp Plan showed it as Community Service and the Planning Commission wanted to reduce that. Therefore, staff took that out altogether. It is not Community Service or Neighborhood Service, but is a Village Center. It is very similar and has its own category for the Village of Rivanna. It is similar in terms of the way it is constructed to Hollymead Town Center, which is a Town Center. For the Village of Rivanna, there is a distinct definition of Village Center. What is stated in here is exactly what the Planning Commission asked for.

Ms. Porterfield noted that she could discuss this one later with staff and that they skip over this one since it appears to be a stumbling block.

- On page 6 the comments from the original first community work shop on July 30, 2007 are to be appended to this document in their entirety. She wondered if that was a useful thing due to the

large bulk being added to the document. If someone wanted to obtain a copy of those comments, they could request it. Therefore, she asked that sentence be deleted that reads, "The comments in their entirety are appended to this document."

- On page 7 in the first full paragraph she would like it to indicate that the Stakeholders have provided additional guidance.
- On page 9, Village of Rivanna Master Plan Guiding Principles, in number 6 Historic Sites in the Village of Rivanna, the Equestrian Center should be included. Also, something should be put in about the Glenmore Golf Course being open/green space.

Mr. Morris suggested that is covered later in the document.

Ms. Echols suggested that the guiding principles were set out early in the process as a basis for the plan and have not been changed. She suggested that it be done later in the document.

Ms. Porterfield agreed and continued her comments.

- The maps and at least the legends need to be made more readable. The road numbers need to be noted, particularly for Running Deer that is Route 808. Since Glenmore is a gated community, those roads should be noted in a different color and the legend should show that they are private roads for differentiation.
- On page 13 have staff clarify unit numbers.
- On page 14 under "Existing Land Use" several entities should be added such as The American Legion Hall, Keswick Hall and The Luck Stone Quarry. There is currently a wine shop next The American Legion Hall. There is no small country store since the Shadwell Store has been torn down. Glenmore Golf Course should be added to the uses in the Village.

Ms. Joseph noted that they were discussing institutional uses and could include the East Rivanna Fire Station.

Ms. Echols noted that there were some retail businesses, but they were across the street.

Ms. Porterfield noted that she was thinking about country stores. She also suggested the following:

- On page 15, clarify colors to separate the undeveloped areas from the open/green space areas and clarify semi-public areas. She questioned what semi-public areas means.

Ms. Echols replied that semi-public areas mean that they are not publicly owned.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that police and fire/rescue time and EMS times should be encouraged to meet standards for the development area and not the rural area.

Mr. Cilimberg noted what they have done throughout the County is considered that the first responder per services of the fire companies meets the standards. He reiterated that she would like under the implementation to have police services that meet the standards set out by the Community Facilities Plan for a development area. What she was actually saying was that this should have a higher level of service than any other area of the County.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that they have an EMS truck at the East Rivanna Fire Station if there was an ability to do so.

Mr. Strucko said that he did not really see a problem with having a longer-term plan where there is an ambulance stationed at East Rivanna. They could put an ambulance there with advanced life support.

Mr. Loach pointed out that they were talking about a new fire station at Pantops.

Ms. Joseph noted that there was already wording included that talks about the response time.

Mr. Strucko said that the Comprehensive Plan rural area response time is longer than the growth area response time targets.

Ms. Joseph noted that if you live in the rural area it is going to take longer.

Ms. Echols noted that there was language on page 32 about this particular fire station's time, which has been a challenge. It is an all-volunteer fire station. Getting the volunteers there in enough time has been a challenge.

Mr. Loach noted that it was career during the day.

Ms. Joseph suggested this be amended to suggest that they would like to see an ambulance.

Mr. Strucko said that it needs to meet the growth area standards

Ms. Joseph asked that language to be added under Fire and Rescue.

Ms. Echols noted that right now the Police and Fire use the rural standards because of the location. But if the Commission wants them to use the development area standards then that can be written in. The Community Facilities Plan does not recognize that distinction here.

Ms. Joseph suggested that it be written in. It will be in conflict and the Board will have to deal with it.

Ms. Porterfield noted that the Master Plan does not push putting in a library. She recommended that they encourage a library to be built in the Village of Rivanna at some point. It is 6.4 miles to Glenmore Way from the Charlottesville Library. It is 8.0 miles to Running Deer. There is a considerable amount of driving one would have to do in order to get to a library. Also, parking is not always easy on the Downtown Mall. She noted that Cindi Burton sent an email several months ago with additional statistics.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the wording reflected the existing condition. There is recognition of the need to monitor services out there. He suggested that on page 32 it make a reference to considering providing library services.

Ms. Joseph noted that the wording was adequate in that they were encouraging it to make sure that they look at this as the development occurs.

The majority of the Commission disagreed and asked that the wording not be changed.

Ms. Porterfield said that there is a misconception on page 18 where it says that there are no external connections linking the Glenmore network to destinations outside of Glenmore. That is incorrect. The Glenmore paths do lead to Glenmore Way, which leads directly to what is the Village Center. Glenmore residents can use that as a connecting path to the Village Center when it is built.

Ms. Joseph disagreed with this and said that walking in the street on Glenmore Way was not a pedestrian connection. This is specifically talking about pedestrian and bicycles. It is not talking about people walking in the road. She felt that the wording was accurate.

Ms. Porterfield suggested that on page 23 they add historic sites and green space to recognize the Glenmore Golf Course and Equestrian Center, which are on the underlying PRD as open space. She asked if there was another place if this was not suitable.

Ms. Echols noted that page 23 contains the characteristics of the Village Center. This is where the details the Commission wanted are captured. On page 27 it appears that a bullet is missing because they lost the four lanes all the way over from the I-64 interchange to Route 22 section.

Ms. Echols noted that was a good catch and staff would make that correction.

Ms. Porterfield pointed out that one of the reasons she was concerned about the EMS service implications are that the Railroad Bridge is on the watch list. She understands from meeting with VDOT that it could potentially be replaced within the next five years or rebuilt. The most economical way to handle that bridge repair is to shut it down. If they have to shut it down for six months in order to build it all at once, no EMS service on the east side is going to force kind of a back way to get to people in need on the other side. She asked that the following changes be made:

- On page 27, the third bullet should read "Four-lane US 250 from the I-64/US250 interchange to Rt. 22 Louisa Road, Rt. 729/Milton Road and Glenmore Way." It also was suggested that consideration be given to adding an "eastbound left-turn lane from US 250 at Black Cat Road." Lastly, Ms. Porterfield suggested reworking the text under "Recommended Characteristics of Route 250 East" as some seemed redundant

Mr. Kamptner noted that the top bullet on page 27 refers to the Level of Service C. He asked if that was going to be updated to use the new terminology.

Ms. Echols replied that it would be updated.

Ms. Porterfield suggested on page 28 in the last bullet to add "with the cooperation of the Glenmore Community Association" or something like that so people in the future would recognize that as a gated community it is something both sides have to work out. The spots are shown on the map of potential locations.

Mr. Strucko said that was just access to a gated community. It was having residents from the community cross over the gate into other areas just for the safety of the people who don't live within the gated community. It would be nice even driving not to have the anxiety of the threat of hitting pedestrians. They could certainly put the pedestrian path up to the gate.

Ms. Porterfield noted that there are some spots the Commission has talked about where they would like to see a connection. She wanted to make sure the plan was clear that because as a gated community, it has to be a situation where the community says they would like to have a gate there. Then they will figure out how to manage that gate. She noted that it has been discussed. It is something that should not be absolutely required by the County because it is not something that they can require because it is a gated community.

Ms. Joseph noted that it says that connections to the Village Center should be established linking Glenmore in by residential development. It just means that they put a path up to Glenmore. What goes beyond there is up to Glenmore.

Ms. Porterfield asked to add on page 29 where it says pocket parks should be included in future development within close proximity to homes she took out the "in between." Green space is also provided by the areas having the Glenmore Golf Club and the Glenmore Equestrian Center as well as the Glenmore common areas. She noted that there was a Glenmore map that shows all of the common areas, which would help with the map they had discussed previously.

Ms. Joseph asked if she wanted to take out "with amenities" for new residents.

Ms. Porterfield noted that she thought that pocket parks means there would be amenities in the parks.

Ms. Joseph disagreed because it gives more flexibility to the amenities.

Ms. Porterfield agreed that it should stay in. She suggested on page 30 that the golf course, parks and green spaces could be noted in a different color. It has come up a certain number of times that there are certain things when the original Glenmore development was put in that were classified as open green space. The Glenmore Golf Course is one of them as well as the Equestrian Center. She suggested that it be mirrored here to show that these are different from other Glenmore recreational areas.

Ms. Echols noted that another option would be to call it all semi-public open space. The point is to recognize it as semi-public open space which is not intended for development.

Ms. Porterfield said that the area that is not intended for development is important. She asked that staff correct the reference to Deerwood and make it Running Deer. She noted that the Glenmore Community does recycle. They have a private company that picks up their trash and recycling as of about six months ago. They are recycling and paying for it. She asked that the unit numbers be clarified on page 13. She questioned the number of units on page 13 whether it was 693 or 893. She questioned if the numbers include Leake and Livengoode.

Ms. Echols said that 761 is the number of units now, which is on page 13. She would double check the two numbers. There has been a range between 631 to 804 new units, which is on page 15 that have been approved. The total range including existing and currently approved would be 1,392 to 1,565. If everything is built as approved at the low end it gets up to about 1,400.

Ms. Porterfield noted that there was a potential of another 300 to 400 units.

Ms. Echols replied that was correct. She asked how the Commission wants staff to deal with the suggestions and when to schedule the public hearing.

Mr. Loach said that the majority of things were corrections. He did not think that there was anything that was so substantial that it will take a long period of time.

Ms. Echols noted that staff will need some time on the maps. The maps will take the most time. If the Commission wants another version done before the Master Plan goes out, then they should go with the December date.

Mr. Loach noted that the public hearing would be on December 8.

Mr. Strucko asked if the Commission wanted another work session.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that he was not hearing that. He heard that the Commission at most wanted to see the document in its new form with the understanding they would schedule the public hearing.

Ms. Echols said that the document would be sent to the Commission and make it available to the public at the same time. They have to do that with the advertising. It is about 2 to 2 ½ weeks out before it actually goes to public hearing that it would be in the form the Commission would be holding the public hearing on.

Mr. Strucko suggested that they hold it on November 17.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that the draft would have to be ready the last week of October in order to hold the public hearing on November 17.

Mr. Strucko said that is 2 ½ weeks from tonight. He asked what changes the Planning Commission wants made since it is not a lot of time.

Ms. Echols noted that the text could be accommodated, but it is the maps. Right now staff could make the maps more readable by making the legends bigger and using the same maps. But if they want the changes to the maps that Ms. Porterfield would like to see, staff will have to have more time to be able to do that.

Mr. Morris said that time is far more important than redoing the maps completely to go where they are going.

Mr. Strucko questioned if the December 8 Planning Commission public hearing means what kind of date for public hearing for the Board.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that realistically the currently constituted Board of Supervisors will not be reviewing this plan. Even if the Commission has their public hearing in November, they are not going to be able to consider it. The Board would not be seeing it for the first time in December and take an action in December. It is too late for them. If they had a hearing and had gotten things squared away this month, then possibly they could. They have one meeting in November scheduled right now and he knew of one in December and maybe two. But they have not been involved and so would have to get the plan from the Commission and most likely the Board would want a work session before holding a public hearing.

Mr. Loach noted that he was hearing from Mr. Morris to go early and Ms. Porterfield to go to December 8.

Ms. Porterfield said that since the Commissioners feel strongly because this board has done this, then let's put it together and do it right. It is not going to get to the Board of Supervisors anyhow until the New Year. She suggested that the Commission put it together and do the maps right and do the rest of the verbiage and make sure it is right when it goes.

Mr. Strucko agreed that it has to be right. He did not think they would get any argument from anybody here on that. He asked what the changes to the map were and what the ultimate outcome was. It is simply readability or are they changing some designations that have materiality to them.

Mr. Morris pointed out that it was colors and so on.

Mr. Strucko asked if it was things that were just nice to have versus essential.

Ms. Echols noted that the Planning Commission has to determine that themselves.

Mr. Loach asked if there was some way they could go ahead with the public hearing on what they have now with the knowledge that the maps, since the changes are not substantial but mostly for clarification, could go to the Board of Supervisors later on.

Mr. Morris agreed with that.

Ms. Porterfield asked what they are achieving.

Mr. Strucko replied that they were achieving with the color changes.

Mr. Loach noted that they were trying to get the Master Plan to the Board before the change-over so that the Board who has been together could at least get to look at it. To him the changes that she had been asking for on the maps were not substantial changes and more for clarification than for change.

Mr. Strucko agreed with Mr. Morris.

Mr. Loach said that as long as the maps eventually get to the Board of Supervisors in the final packet with the verbiage it would be acceptable. The Commission understands what they are when it comes back to us for the public hearing. He questioned whether he was missing something.

Ms. Porterfield noted that Mr. Cilimberg had stated that this was not going to get there anyhow. She questioned why the Commission could not just finish it completely.

Mr. Strucko asked if the current Board of Supervisors would at least have a chance to look at it and weigh in, but maybe not get to the public hearing.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the Board may schedule a work session, but he was not sure it would be time enough for them to have the work session. He noted that he did not deal with the Board's schedule. It is also possible that with the change, they would not want to have a work session since the next Board would be taking the action.

Mr. Strucko suggested that the Commission give the Board those options to make their decision.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that he just wanted to let the Commission know what the circumstances are.

Mr. Strucko said that he did not want to hamstring the board with a decision here. If they could get this out early and let the Board decide how to proceed, then that would be the way he would like to go.

Mr. Loach asked how they were going to get this to the Board for them to make a decision on whether they would have time to review it.

Mr. Strucko suggested that if the Commission holds the public hearing on November 17 that gives it to the Board within November. If the Board chooses to hear it, then wouldn't that afford them more time to make that decision.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that he could only answer that question by talking to the County Executive and the Clerk to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Joseph noted that they were making the assumption that the document is done right now. The document is not done because they still have a public hearing. She suggested the Commission go with the November 17 public hearing and let the comments come in since the document may change as a result of the public comment before it goes to the Board of Supervisors. Therefore, this document is not done. They are fooling themselves to think that it is done and it needs to be absolutely perfect before it goes to the public.

Mr. Loach asked how many of the Commissioners agreed with holding the public hearing on November 17 with the document as it is recognizing that there may be more changes.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission (5:1) to hold the public hearing on November 17 on the existing draft document with the text changes and whatever map changes that could be done recognizing that there may be more changes. (Ms. Porterfield disagreed.)

Ms. Porterfield asked if the revised draft would be available a week ahead of November 17.

Ms. Echols replied that the revised draft would be available on the day that it is published in the paper. So it would be about 2 to 3 weeks in advance.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the first run of the ad would be November 2.

Ms. Echols said that is when the draft would be available and copies would be distributed to the Commissioners.

Ms. Porterfield asked if there would be two weeks available for them to review the document, and Ms. Echols replied yes.

Mr. Edgerton said that the public could review what has been drafted so far and get about 98 percent of the essence of it. He had not heard anything tonight in all of the conversation that is substantially changing what is being recommended by the Commission. There are some suggestions of wording and order and changes in maps, but he had not heard a substantive change from the Commission.

Mr. Loach said that the public hearing had been set for November 17. Staff will bring back the revised Master Plan draft incorporating suggested text changes at least two weeks prior to the public hearing acknowledging that further changes/clarifications to the text and map could occur after receipt of public comment.

In summary, a work session on CPA-2008-00003 Village of Rivanna was held to review the Village of Rivanna Master Plan Draft dated October 6, 2009 and to reach an agreement to proceed to a public hearing.

In a PowerPoint presentation, staff reviewed the proposed draft document dated October 6, 2009.

The Planning Commission provided input on the draft master plan and noted some areas for possible clarification and changes including making the maps clearer and easier to read. Staff will bring back the revised Master Plan draft incorporating suggested text changes at least two weeks prior to the public hearing (November 2) acknowledging that further changes/clarifications to the map and draft could occur after receipt of public comment.

The majority of the Planning Commissioners agreed to hold a public hearing on November 17 on the draft document as presented with the agreed to text changes and whatever map changes that could be done prior to the hearing. (Ms. Porterfield dissented regarding the public hearing date.) No formal action was taken on the draft plan.

The Commission made comments and suggestions:

- Ms. Joseph sent an email with several changes that were not substantive but grammatical in nature, which staff will make.

Mrs. Porterfield made the following suggestions:

- On page 1 Executive Summary under Vision, the last bullet might be a place to slide something else about the road improvements or make it more specific with stronger language about the road improvements to Route 250. Adequate infrastructure should reference transportation and sewer. Where it talks about adequate infrastructure reference the table. Mrs. Echols told the Commission that the Vision was what was prepared with the Community and suggested that the changes go in a different section.
- On page 2, first bullet under Transportation – Regional improvements include widening of Route 250 to four lanes add “widening Route 250 to four lanes from the 250/64 interchange to Glenmore Way...” There appear to be some words missing.
- On page 3 Paths - the last bullet should be “A hard-surfaced pedestrian path” Mrs. Porterfield noted that all the paths in Glenmore are asphalt.
- On page 3 last bullet, “...future development should be monitored. . .” and needed road improvements should be added.
- On page 5, third paragraph, include a reference to “neighborhood service.” Mrs. Echols explained that the recommendation in the Plan is not for “neighborhood service” but Village Center. Village Center is a specific land-use designation for the Village of Rivanna. The designation on the proposed Master Plan reflects the approved rezoning which allows for only 125,000 square feet of non-residential uses including the already built fire station. The prior Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Rivanna Village at Glenmore approved 250,000 square feet. The Master Plan now shows consistency between the recommended non-residential square footage and the approved zoning. Mrs. Porterfield asked for emphasis that the scale of commercial would be of a size that supports the residents of the Village.
- On page 6 it is noted that the comments from the original first community workshop on July 30, 2007 are to be appended to this document in their entirety. Mrs. Porterfield suggested to limit the length of this master plan document, the availability of these comments be noted rather than having them included.
- On page 7 in the first full paragraph should indicate that the Stakeholders have provided additional guidance throughout the development of this master plan.
- On page 9, Village of Rivanna Master Plan Guiding Principles, in number 6 “Historic Sites in the Village of Rivanna,” the Equestrian Center should be included. Also, something should be put in about the Glenmore Golf Course being open/green space. Ms. Echols suggested that be done later in the document since the guiding principles were set out early in the process, and Ms. Porterfield agreed.
- The maps and at least the legends need to be made more readable. The road numbers need to be noted, particularly for Running Deer (Route 808). Since Glenmore is a gated community, those roads should be noted in a different color and the legend should show that they are private roads for differentiation.

- On page 13 ask Ms. Echols to clarify unit numbers.
- On page 14 under “Existing Land Use” several entities should be added such as The American Legion Hall, Keswick Hall and The Luck Stone Quarry. There also is currently a wine shop next to The American Legion Hall. There is no small country store since the Shadwell Store has been torn down. Glenmore Golf Course should be added to the uses in the Village as well as the East Rivanna Fire Station.
- On page 15 clarify colors to separate the undeveloped areas from the open/green space areas and clarify semi-public areas, which are not publicly owned.
- Under “Police” on page 16, the last sentence should read: “Response times meet standards for Development Areas (insert appropriate timeframe).”
- On page 18, change the text to reflect that there is an external pedestrian connection linking Glenmore to destinations outside of Glenmore. The rest of the Commission did not agree with this and said that walking in the street on Glenmore Way was not a pedestrian connection.
- Due to the public’s request to see a little more precision the suggestion was made in the charts on pages 17 and 26 to supplement charts with additional columns with information about the volume/capacity ratio and to beef up the standards. After much discussion, it was ultimately decided not to make these additions because the plan said that no new development should be approved without all of the road improvements to Route 250 that were stated in Chapter 5.
- On page 27, the third bullet should read “Four-lane US 250 from the I-64/US250 interchange to Rt. 22 Louisa Road, Rt. 729/Milton Road and Glenmore Way.” It also was suggested that consideration be given to adding an “eastbound left-turn lane from US 250 at Black Cat Road.” Lastly, Mrs. Porterfield suggested reworking the text under “Recommended Characteristics of Route 250 East” as some seemed redundant
- On page 29 add words to emphasize the importance of the Glenmore Community’s open space including the Glenmore Golf Course, Equestrian Center and Glenmore Community Common Areas. This open/green space should also be delineated on the map on page 30.
- Note in Existing Conditions that Glenmore Community residents are currently recycling with individual households paying for this service.
- On page 32, put a recommendation in the plan that Fire and Rescue and Police should meet standards for urban areas rather than rural areas. Commissioners recognized that this is in conflict with the Community Facilities Plan, and the Board of Supervisors will have to deal with this aspect.
- In the VOR Implementation Projects table, correct reference to Deerwood and make it Running Deer.
- On page 28, Ms. Porterfield noted that since the Glenmore Community is gated, an external path/road brought to its border will need approval of the Glenmore Community Association to connect into the community. The rest of the Commission did not agree this statement needed to be added.
- Mr. Kamptner noted that on page 27 the level of service should be updated to reflect the terminology.

The following public comments were received:

Neil Means said he was looking for specific language in the plan that said specific standards for capacity of roads must be met before approving another project. He noted to the Commission that the improvements listed in Chapter 5 will not be adequate to meet the demands of the traffic of already approved development. He suggested that the Commission work on technical language that provides for specific improvement for road standards.

Betsy Baten asked that the December 8 hearing date be chosen to give time for the proper review of the completed draft.

Old Business:

Mr. Strucko asked if there was any old business.

29 Corridor Study – Resolution of Intent

Mr. Cilimberg noted that a copy of the resolution the Board of Supervisors acted on last week was emailed regarding the 29 Corridor Study. As mentioned the vote was 5:1. The one vote against was by Mr. Boyd, which was based primarily on his belief that the western parallel roads, which in part were

intended to follow the Western Bypass right-of-way, should not be removed from consideration. The remaining Board members voted for this resolution as it is provided.

Mr. Loach asked what action the Commission needs to take.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the Commission could act to approve this resolution as it is if that is their desire.

Ms. Joseph noted that she could not approve this resolution which recommends the Eastern Bypass go into another county, through historic districts and adjacent to conservation easement property. It is the same thing they are dealing with in Albemarle County. The Eastern Bypass is going through the Keswick area where there is historic property and property under easement. She could not say go ahead and take it over to Route 15.

Mr. Edgerton asked if she would be comfortable supporting the resolution if that one sentence was taken out.

Ms. Joseph agreed that she would not want the whole corridor removed and moved over to Louisa.

Mr. Morris said that was put to bed 15 to 20 years ago when the Eastern Bypass was taken off the charts. He questioned how it got back on. There has been no discussion of this in any manner. He would not support this in any manner, shape or form unless the Eastern Bypass was completely removed from it. If they want to start from scratch they can, but this is not where we start.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that the second to last resolve on page 2 be taken out.

Ms. Joseph suggested that all that needs to be said was the Planning Commission does not support that Eastern Bypass.

Mr. Edgerton said that the Planning Commission would resolve that the Eastern Bypass not be considered.

Mr. Morris and Ms. Joseph agreed.

Mr. Edgerton noted that the deadline set by VDOT is Friday. Therefore, the Commission has to do something this evening if they want to express their concerns. He would be comfortable with the suggestion.

Ms. Porterfield questioned why they are doing this. The Board of Supervisors who trumps us has already spoken. This resolution is County policy at this point. The Planning Commission is not the policy maker. Therefore, she did not understand why the Commission is doing a resolution.

Mr. Edgerton noted that they have a responsibility as the Planning Commission of Albemarle County to take a position on issues of this significance that are being proposed by the Commonwealth on our County. He felt strongly that the Commission has a responsibility to do that. If they disagreed with the Board, that is okay.

Mr. Strucko noted that they are an advisory body to the Board and he was comfortable advising them that he felt that they made a bad decision.

Mr. Morris agreed.

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the following changes suggested by the Planning Commission;

- Change all references to the Planning Commission from the Board of Supervisors
- For the Leonard Sandridge Road the Board said that they strongly oppose any of the Leonard Sandridge Road in the final Route 29 Corridor Report for the following reasons.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that the same resolution be used except to change the Board of Supervisors to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Kamptner suggested using Resolve that the Eastern Bypass Study Corridor be deleted from any further consideration.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested the wording to be deleted from the final Route 29 Corridor Report.

Ms. Joseph said that she liked "from any further study" because he was saying just don't put it here, but maybe put it in another study. She felt that this should just go away.

Mr. Morris noted that it had been beaten around for years.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that the Eastern Bypass Study Corridor be deleted from any further consideration.

Motion: Mr. Edgerton moved and Mr. Morris seconded for approval of the 29 Corridor Study - Resolution of Intent as amended.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:1. (Porterfield Nay) (Franco absent)

The Planning Commission asked that the following Resolution of Intent be forwarded by Friday, October 16th to the appropriate persons as their comment for the draft Route 29 Corridor Study.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Route 29 Corridor is a major north-south link for through and local traffic. The Virginia Department of Transportation, in association with the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, the Commonwealth Transportation Board and various state and local elected officials, have initiated the Route 29 Corridor Study which covers approximately 219 miles of roadway between the North Carolina border and I-66 in Gainesville; and

Whereas, the goal of the study is to develop a Blueprint for the Route 29 Corridor that will guide future transportation improvements. The study is supposed to determine the transportation needs and identify recommendations to meet those needs while building on the commonalities of citizen concerns along the corridor. All recommendations should be context sensitive and sensitive to all environmental concerns, including historical and cultural resources; and

Whereas, the Albemarle County Planning Commission is in agreement with many of the concepts in the Corridor-Wide Recommendations, such as controlling access on Route 29, integration of land use and transportation planning, and enhanced transit, as reflected in its Comprehensive Plan, Long Range Transportation Plan, participation in the 29H250 Study, and commitment to integration of land use and transportation planning as reflected in Places 29 and other growth area adopted master plans; and

Whereas, the Planning Commission strongly opposes any of the extensions of Leonard Sandridge Road in the final Route 29 Corridor Report for the following reasons:

- the Southern interchange would still need to be built, an interchange or major intersection with Hydraulic Rd. would be required, and the cut through Stillhouse Mountain would still be necessary, so the cost would exceed \$100.0 million; and
- none of the proposed routes would likely qualify for federal funding and there is no possibility that any of these routes could be funded from the County's modest Secondary Road allocations; and
- the result of leaving these routes on the map in the final report would be to diminish property values and interfere with the lives of a number of citizens for an indefinite period

of years to perpetuate lines on a map that will never become actual transportation projects. This would include residents living in the Canterbury Hills, Colthurst, Montvue, Georgetown Road, Hessian Hills, Old Forge, Terrell, Georgetown Green, Lambs Road, Ivy Ridge Road, Roslyn Heights, and Roslyn Ridge neighborhoods; and

- Route 1C would also impact two churches and take substantial acreage from the four school complex on Hydraulic Road; and
- the current best parallel road system we have to Route 29 is Georgetown Road to Hydraulic Road to Berkmar Drive. What is being suggested is to spend more than \$100.0 million to build a parallel road to the parallel road system that is functioning reasonably well; and
- there is no traffic study that even suggests that any of these proposed roads would take any substantial vehicle trips off of Route 29 or that they would even shorten travel time for people presently using Georgetown and Hydraulic Roads. There would be a significant wait to get the traffic onto Hydraulic Road; and
- for the cost of constructing any of the proposed extension roads, we could complete the widening of Route 29 from Hydraulic to the Route 250 Bypass, add the additional ramp at Best Buy onto the Route 250 Bypass, widen Route 29 from Polo Grounds Road to Hollymead and possibly have funds to build a grade separated interchange at Rio Road and Route 29. If the bypass right of way were sold, we would also have enough funds to build the Hillsdale Drive connector, which traffic studies show will take 8,000 to 10,000 vehicle trips per day off of Route 29 at its most congested point. These improvements have been traffic modeled, are included in the area's Long Range Transportation Plan and will significantly improve the flow of traffic in the Route 29 Corridor; and
- the aforesaid projects can be done as funds are available; the "southern bypass" project is all or nothing. It can't be built incrementally; and
- a recommendation to "study" this issue would result in more money being diverted to a study that will go nowhere at a time that we have little or no transportation funds for actual projects; and
- the MPO removed the study of the "southern bypass" from the area's Long Range Transportation Plan, demonstrating that it has no local support. This vote was unanimous and included the VDOT representative on the MPO.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved that, the Albemarle County Planning Commission commends the consultants and VDOT for their work on the Route 29 Corridor Study; and

Further Resolved that, the Hillsdale Drive connector, the additional southbound lane on Route 29 from Hydraulic Road to the Route 250 Bypass (with the additional ramp lane) and the additional lanes on Route 29 between Polo Grounds Road and Hollymead be included in the report, as they are in the area's long range and six year transportation plans and have been demonstrated through traffic modeling to be cost effective ways of improving traffic flow and safety in the corridor; and

Resolved that, the Eastern Bypass Study Corridor be deleted from any further consideration; and

Resolved that, localities should not be required to include specific transportation projects in their comprehensive plans that are not approved by the locality and/or by the applicable MPO.

I, Sharon C. Taylor, do hereby certify that the foregoing writing is a true, correct copy of a Resolution duly adopted by the Planning Commission of Albemarle County, Virginia, by a vote of five to one, as recorded below, at a regular meeting held on October 13, 2009.

	Aye	Nay
Ms. Porterfield	_____	<u>Y</u>
Ms. Joseph	<u>Y</u>	_____
Mr. Morris	<u>Y</u>	_____
Mr. Strucko	<u>Y</u>	_____
Mr. Loach	<u>Y</u>	_____
Ms. Edgerton	<u>Y</u>	_____

New Business:

Mr. Loach asked if there was any new business.

- The Planning Commission requested to hold a joint meeting before the end of the year between City and County Planning Commissions. Staff will meet with the Planning Commission Chairs and City staff to discuss the agenda.
- Mr. Morris will be absent next week.

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

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m. to the Tuesday, October 20, 2009 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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