

**ALBEMARLE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT MEETING
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2009 -- 6:00 P.M.
ROOM 241, SECOND FLOOR
ALBEMARLE COUNTY COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission and Charlottesville City Planning Commission held a joint meeting on Tuesday, December 1, 2009, at 6:00 p.m., in Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Bill Edgerton, Tom Loach, Vice Chair; Calvin Morris, Linda Porterfield, Marcia Joseph, and Eric Strucko, Chairman. Don Franco was absent. Julia Monteith, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Judith Wiegand, Senior Planner; and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

City Planning Commissioners present were Kurt Keesecker, Genevieve Keller, Bill Emory, Mr. Santoski, Dan Rosensweig, Chair; Jason Pearson, and David Neuman, University of Virginia Architect.

Other officials present were Missy Creasy, Planning Manager; and Jeannette Janiczek, ECI/VDOT Program Manager.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Strucko established a quorum and called the Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Mr. Rosensweig established a quorum and called the Charlottesville City Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Joint meeting of the Charlottesville City and Albemarle County Planning Commissions:

Mr. Strucko noted that the following items would be discussed.

- Places 29 with the County and City Planning Commission
- Hillsdale Drive and U.S. 29 between Hydraulic Road and the Bypass – City
- UVA Research Park and other U.S. 29 related matters – University of Virginia

- **Hillsdale Drive and U.S. 29 between Hydraulic Road and the Bypass – City**

Jeannette Janiczek, City of Charlottesville ECI Program Manager, noted she worked with all of the major roadway projects and outlined three Route 29 Corridor Projects in a PowerPoint presentation:

- Hillsdale Drive Extended,
- Whole Foods, and
- Emmet Street/250 Bypass. (**See Attachment 1** – PowerPoint presentation – Neighborhood Development Services Project Overview)

She explained the design goals of the Hillsdale Drive Extended – Greenbrier Drive to Hydraulic Road. She walked through the alignment and explained the various aspects of the design goals of the project.

Missy Creasy, Planning Manager with the City, reviewed the Whole Foods project, which was done in three phases. The first phase had to do with the site improvements. The second phase deals with a segment of Hillsdale Road that is being constructed as a public/private partnership. The applicant will be constructing the road and the City will be working to provide the finances in order to make it happen. This will be the first segment of this road. It is approved and they expect shovels any day now to begin on that

section. The Whole Foods site plan is expected to be done soon and moving forward with construction hopefully in the near future. The ARB design review has been completed on this project.

Ms. Janiczek noted that funding has always been a concern with Hillsdale. They have tried to do as many things as possible to lower the costs working with Whole Foods to try and get this built in segments. That has been an idea throughout the design process. They have been working with the Steering Committee, but also with the individual property owners. The idea is for them to donate the right-of-way and for the City to construct improvements on their land. They would also be constructing sidewalk, landscaping, etc. but then they would be backing up. It would be up to them to maintain the landscaping and various amenities. They have been looking at grant opportunities. They recently received a million dollar grant with half of it from the locality and half of it from revenue sharing from VDOT to move that project forward through the right-of-way stage. They have also applied for a Tiger Grant, which would be a program created by economic stimulus money so that this could actually be constructed in two years. They are currently looking at finishing up preliminary design and having a public hearing this spring in 2010. From there they will be looking to somehow amass construction money. If they get the Tiger Grant they can have this constructed in two years. If not, they are looking at the allocations from VDOT starting sometime after or during 2016 at this point.

Emmet Street/250 Bypass.

Ms. Janiczek noted that another improvement that has been fully funded at this point with primary state, local and proffer money. They have been able to leverage all four of those categories together and create this improvement. It is Emmet Street/250 Bypass. They have been working with the Albemarle Place developers. They are proposing to alleviate the bottleneck congestion area on 29 South at the Bypass where it starts and ends somewhere past the 29/Hydraulic intersection. They are looking at the following improvements:

1. Lane added to southbound Emmet Street between Hydraulic Road and the Route 250 Bypass. Roadway widened in existing public right of way (in median).
2. Lane added to 'Best Buy' ramp leading to Route 250 Bypass.
3. Third lane added along Route 250 Bypass between 'Best Buy' ramp and the Barracks Road off-ramp.

Estimated Construction Schedules

- Hillsdale Drive Extended (HDE) 2016+
- Whole Foods HDE terminus 2010
- Emmet Street/250 Bypass 2011

The presentation ended at 6:25 p.m. No formal action was taken.

Places 29 Master Plan Presentation

Judith Wiegand, Senior Planner with Albemarle County, presented a PowerPoint presentation to provide an overview of the Places29 Master Plan. (See **Attachment #2** – Places29 Master Plan Board Draft – Joint Planning Commission Meeting – December 1, 2009)

The County has been working on development area master plans. Albemarle's Five Master Plan Areas includes: Places 29, Crozet, Pantops, Village of Rivanna and Southern Urban Area.

Places29 Master Plan -

- One of County's five Master Plans
- Covers four Development Areas
- Coordinated land use plan and transportation plan

The Vision – Land Use

It is important to note that there is no time frame on the vision part of this plan for land uses. When they get to the implementation program it has a 20-year proviso at this time.

Major Concepts of the Master Plan –

1. Coordinates land use and transportation.
2. Recommends walkable neighborhoods with centers/amenities.
3. Recommends a regional, multimodal transportation network to serve drivers, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.
4. Preserves open space and provides connections between these open spaces.
5. Addresses future needs for schools, libraries, and other community facilities.
6. Establishes two Priorities to guide future public investments and land use decisions.
7. Minimizes disruption of existing businesses, provides opportunities for redevelopment, and increase business vitality.
8. Recommends two Small Area Plans to work out the details with businesses and residents.

Staff reviewed the Future Land Use Maps for the North and South.

Transportation Network – It grew out of the offices of VDOT that goes all the way to the Greene County line.

Enhanced Transit Network – This is a project that needs funding.

Five Essential Transportation Projects –

1. Improvements recommended in 29H250 Study, Phase 2, and Hillsdale Drive Extended
2. Berkmar Drive Extended
3. Grade-separated intersection at Rio Road & US 29
4. Widen US 29 to 6 lanes from Polo Grounds Road to Hollymead Town Center
5. Enhanced Transit System

Parks and Green Systems Maps – South and North

Small Area Plans – Rio Road and US 29 and Airport Road Corridor

Potential Impacts on Charlottesville

1. US29: improving traffic flow in the County will help the City
2. Mixed uses will help reduce impacts of increased development, such as traffic
3. Interconnections with City streets require careful planning to avoid cut-through traffic
4. Hydraulic Road grade-separated intersection and related improvements (29H250): County will work with the City
5. County residents work and shop in the City

Implementation Priority Areas

- Priority 1: Transportation Improvements in US 29 Corridor
- Priority 2: Public Investment & Land Use Decision Making

Implementation Challenges

1. Very large area – only one part of the County
2. Backlog of needed road improvements – the multimodal transportation improvements are necessary whether or not there is a Master Plan
3. Lack of funding: local, state, and federal
4. Minimize impacts on businesses adjacent to road improvements

Even if funding is not available for all of the transportation projects, the area will still benefit from the pattern of mixed land uses, walkable neighborhoods, and transportation options.

Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director, continued the PowerPoint presentation on the overview of Places29 Master Plan regarding issues of concern. (See **Attachment #3** – Issue of Concern Places29 Master Plan – Joint Planning Commission Meeting – December 1, 2009)

Many valid issues have come up during the discussion of Places 29 that the public has raised and the Commission and staff have discussed at some length. One is that Places29 in and of itself would create much more traffic demands for the new roads than currently exists. The land use recommendations modify or reduce transportation demands as compared to the current plan as it covers this area. The overwhelming majority of the infrastructure recommendations are already required by existing, approved and planned developments in Albemarle County and along the greater 29 Corridor. They are recognizing that it is not only the County and the City that have a relationship with Route 29; but, in fact the traffic on Route 29 is a product of development that has occurred up and down the corridor in Virginia. There has been an obvious impact on Route 29 through the years that has created many of needs that this plan talks to, which already exist.

Another issue of concern is the plan is not feasible because there is not enough money to pay for the infrastructure. As Ms. Wiegand mentioned, staff feels that the area will be better off with the land use pattern this plan proposes as compared to the current plan for the area for the mixed use aspect, walkability and the transportation options. Even if the road improvements are very limited or significantly delayed or not at all constructed there is still a benefit from seeing land develop in the area as Ms. Wiegand showed. In the evolution of Rio Road East at Gasoline Alley it showed improvements along the road such as better sidewalks, median treatments, street lights, etc. which in and of itself create the opportunity to spur new development and redevelopment in that area that can be coordinated with that transportation concern.

Another issue of concern is that Route 29 will become a major expressway. They would hope certainly that would not be the case. Places29 Master Plan does not call for a dramatic widening of Route 29, but recommends a comprehensive regional transportation network coming improvements to sections of Route 29, grade-separated interchanges that minimize ramps and a parallel road system to provide options for local traffic. This is a concept for how the Rio Road/29 area will be treated in the future with the overpass of Rio Road over 29 and with a circulation system of parallel roads that can feed local businesses as well as the people making the various turning movements going onto Rio or 29.

An issue of concern is that the County's central business district will be destroyed. In actuality the plan calls for minimal destruction of existing businesses and opportunities for redevelopment as property owners feel market conditions warrants increased business vitality by improving access through multimodal transportation systems. Staff feels that the plan presents real possibilities and not barriers to the businesses that exist along 29 and not the detrimental impacts that are feared by some.

An issue of concern is that Places29 created the concept of grade-separated interchanges. Many of the transportation concepts recommended in the Places29 plan, including interchanges at Hydraulic Road and Rio Road, were proposed many years ago and approved as part of earlier plans and agreements.

An issue of concern is that Places29 would eliminate the possibility of a Western Bypass. Places29 works with or without the western bypass as a future scenario.

An issue of concern is that Places29 is hiding the real costs of infrastructure. In reality cost estimates have been provided in current year dollars and will be reviewed with each five year review of the Plan – detailed cost figures will be determined when projects are finalized for construction as part of the County CIP and VDOT 6 Year planning processes.

Places29 Status & Next Steps

- Began May, 2005: consultants working with County, VDOT, and TJPDC staff
- Public Input process throughout
- Planning Commission reviewed individual chapters, with public input
- Planning Commission held Public Hearing October 27 and recommended Plan to Board
- Master Plan now forwarded to Board of Supervisors for consideration and adoption

The presentations were given for informational purposes only. Representatives from the University of Virginia, City of Charlottesville and County Planning Commissions made comments and asked questions regarding related issues to Places29. No formal action was taken.

David Neuman, representative for the University of Virginia, pointed out when the City did guidelines the consultant looked at Emmett Street from the Inn at Ivy to the City limits. Some of the things that were done in Photoshop are very similar to what has been shown here. He suggested that would be a resource that is not too old, less than five years, which the City probably has recorded somewhere. It has almost a duplicate image of an enhanced median that made it easier for pedestrians to cross as well as added landscape improvements with mixed use on that site as a goal. There is a substantial issue already noted about the intensity of use required for rail. The fact is that they don't have enough density along the corridor even though there are plenty of cars. There is not the quarter mile of walking distance to major residential areas that would support it short of something that was just a transit focused thing.

Julia Monteith, representative for the University of Virginia noted the reality of the width of the road sections and the fact that they go from the width of the road section north of Route 250 and just keep getting smaller and smaller. Part of what he was talking about is the aesthetics and mixed use and that kind of thing, but the reality of building that area up is that they still need to be able to have vehicle access. The more that they try to build something to put a rail system in they are taking up more right of way to do that. The one thing about BRT is that if allowed a lot more flexibility it would permit a much lower reduced cost.

Mrs. Keller, City Commissioner, pointed out that the City will be revising its Entrance Corridor regulations during the upcoming year and perhaps there are opportunities for places like 29 to have more unified guidelines. Both jurisdictions are looking for ways to make the process easier for architects and developers and maybe there is an opportunity to cooperate so that it does not appear to be any difference when passing from one jurisdiction to another. It might be a good project to work on together.

David Neuman noted that the University has property on Emmett Street and 29 and would be willing to be part of the group. The idea of having a uniform appearance for the length of that road section with all of the different sequential events that are happening would be beneficial.

Other representatives present from the University of Virginia were: Tim Rose and Fred Missel.

Fred Missel noted that when the University Research Park develops they are seeing the Airport Road Corridor become more and more important. As the plans are being developed over the next months they are anxious to be part of the discussions.

Mr. Strucko thanked everyone for their attendance. He suggested that these joint conversations be continued in the future.

The City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

The County Planning Commission took a short break at 7:27 p.m. and reconvened at 7:31 p.m. to the regular meeting.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Strucko called the regular meeting back to order at 7:31 p.m.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Strucko invited committee reports from the Commissioners.

- Ms. Joseph noted that the PACC Tech meeting was cancelled and rescheduled to January. She did not attend the MPO Tech Committee in November.
- Mr. Edgerton reported on the ACE Committee's multiple meetings over the past several months. He noted their discussions have been particularly focused on how buffers along streams should be treated in easements and concern for the diminished funding for ACE.

- Mr. Edgerton reported that the City/County Affordable Housing Task Force has not met since the initial report was issued about eight months ago.
- Ms. Monteith noted that David Benish was present at the PACC Tech meeting at which they discussed the environmental footprint reduction plan being done at UVA.
- Mr. Morris reported that the Eastern Connector Study was presented to the Board over a year ago and that the Committee has not met since. He also noted that the Meadow Creek Parkway Interchange Committee has not met recently, but that the Committee design is in the hands of City Council. He further noted that the Pantops Master Plan Steering Committee will meet in January.
- Ms. Porterfield reported that the Historic Preservation Committee meets most every month. She noted that the last meeting included a celebration honoring Sally Thomas for her service on behalf of Historic Preservation. She also noted that the committee would appreciate any ideas as to where the Lost Albemarle Exhibit could be displayed. Ms. Monteith suggested that the Special Collections Library and the University Museum would be possibilities. She will send contact information for each location to Mr. Cilimberg to forward to the committee.
- Mr. Loach reported that since putting forth the recommendations for the long range regional transportation plan earlier this year CHART has been looking for a direction and purpose. Regarding the Crozet Library Steering Committee, the funding for the library building has been removed from the proposed CIP due to budget constraints. The Crozet Community Advisory Council has been conducting workshops for the revision of the master plan. The workshops will continue until they have all of the primary topics covered.
- Mr. Strucko reported that the CIP Technical Committee has been reviewing the capital budget for the next 5 to 10 years. Due to budget constraints, the CIP that will go before the Board of Supervisors soon will show fundamentally a maintenance budget. The CIP presentation will come before the Planning Commission in January.

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 spoke applauding the increase in the joint meetings of the Planning Commissions, but expressing disappointment that there was not a frank discussion on the lack of progress in planning and/or proceeding with local transportation projects such as the Meadow Creek Parkway. He felt it was a missed opportunity.
- Sally Thomas spoke thanking the Planning Commission for all their work over the past 16 years she has been on the Board of Supervisors.
- Mr. Strucko said on behalf of the Planning Commission he wanted to also extend their appreciation to Ms. Thomas for her 16 years of public service on the Board of Supervisors.

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

Consent Agenda:

Approval of Minutes – May 12, 2009 & June 23, 2009

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

Ms. Joseph asked to pull the May 12, 2009 minutes for additional review time to next week.

Motion: Mr. Edgerton moved and Mr. Morris seconded for approval of the minutes of June 23, 2009 and to defer action on the May 12, 2009 minutes to next week.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Deferred Items/Public Hearing Items:

Agricultural/Forestal District Reviews/additions – Deferred from November 10, 2009 PC Meeting (Eryn Brennan)

**AFD-2009-8; AFD-2009-9; AFD-2009-10; AFD-2009-35; AFD-2009-61; AFD-2009-68; AFD-2009-74
Moorman's River AFD Additions**

**AFD-2009-20; AFD-2009-29; AFD-2009-40; AFD-2009-53; AFD-2009-66; AFD-2009-71; AFD-2009-73
Buck's Elbow Mountain Creation**

Mr. Cilimberg presented a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report. **(Attachment 4)**

- On October 19 and November 12, 2009, the Agricultural and Forestal District Advisory Committee recommended approval of all the proposed Moorman's River additions and the creation of the Buck's Elbow Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District.
- Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of all the proposed additions and new district.

Mr. Strucko opened the public hearing and invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Commission.

Motion: Mr. Morris moved and Mr. Loach seconded for approval of the additions to the Moorman's River Agricultural and Forestal District and the creation of the Buck's Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Strucko noted that that these requests go before the Board of Supervisors tomorrow, December 2, 2009 with a recommendation for approval.

Old Business:

Mr. Strucko asked if there was any old business.

- Mr. Cilimberg noted that one of the agricultural districts the Commission previously saw had to be readvertised. It will come to the Commission next week and the Board will take action on it next Wednesday.
- The Commission was made aware of a resolution of intent for farm stands in the county. There will be a Roundtable held next Thursday, December 10. If more than two Commissioners attend then the Commission will need to adjourn next week to that Roundtable meeting.

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

New Business:

Mr. Strucko asked if there was any new business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m. to the December 8, 2009 meeting at 6:00 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)