

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
September 15, 2009**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting, work session and public hearing on Tuesday, September 15, 2009, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Other officials present were Lori Allshouse, Manager of Strategic Planning and Performance; Judy Wiegand, Senior Planner; Lee Catlin, Community Relations Manager; Ron Lilley, Project Manager of Department of Office of Facilities Development; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

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

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. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – September 9, 2009.

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on September 9, 2009.

Consent Agenda:

Approval of Minutes: July 14, 2009

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

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

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Strucko noted that the minutes of July 14, 2009 were approved.

Presentation:

County Strategic Plan - Annual Progress Update Data (Lori Allshouse)

The Planning Commission received a presentation from Lori Allshouse on the annual progress update data on the County Strategic Plan.

Ms. Allshouse presented a PowerPoint presentation and explained the process and outcomes of the County's Strategic Plan. The written data and information will be available for distribution to the public within the next two weeks. The Strategic Plan's Role is as a "Comp Plan Connector" to the funding process or Annual Budget Process. It is used in Funding decisions of the County. She explained the status and progress of the Strategic Plan Objectives, the adjustments to the resource adjustments and how it relates to the vision, mission statement and plan goals of Albemarle County. The goal is to develop a Comprehensive Funding Strategy/Plan. (**Attachment: See PowerPoint Presentation**)

This year staff is going to be bringing information to the Board at their fall, 2010 retreat. The Board will be setting their priorities at that time. Staff will then be bringing forth some recommendations for priorities this year. There are three objectives from the current plan that will be moving forward.

In summary, the Strategic Plan does play an important role in our organization. The Board and staff work hand in hand in our Strategic Plan with an annual renewal process. Progress has been made in many areas. The plan does drive resources. They have connected the plan very strategically with the funding process. There are millions of local allocations involved this plan including grants and donations. There is at least 2 million dollars that staff identified in the presentation in grants that are helping to support the plan, which does not include the 6 million dollar grant the schools just pulled in. It is the connector between the Comp Plan and the Five-Year Financial Plan. There are really challenging times ahead. Resource reductions last year really affected the Strategic Plan. Staff anticipates decreasing revenues in the future as well. That basically summarizes the report for this year.

Mr. Strucko invited questions for staff.

Mr. Morris said knowing the Baldrige criteria is extremely demanding and national in scope what are the two fantastic organizations within the County that have received certification.

Ms. Allshouse replied the Department of Social Services and the Human Resource Department. They have received the State Award not the Baldrige Award.

Mr. Loach noted that national unemployment is about 9.7 percent. He asked what the state unemployment level is.

Ms. Allshouse replied it was around 7 percent.

Mr. Strucko thanked Ms. Allshouse for her presentation. The Planning Commission took no formal action.

Regular Item:

CCP-2009-00001 Pantops Fire Station (Station 13)

This is a review for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. (Va. Code 15.2- 2232) for a potential fire station in the Pantops area within Peter Jefferson Place (Rebecca Ragsdale)

Mr. Benish presented a PowerPoint presentation and explained the proposal. **(Attachment – See PowerPoint presentation)**

The Pantops Fire Station (Station 13) is identified as the next priority station in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) needed in the County and would serve the Pantops urban area. The Office of Facilities Development, in conjunction with Fire Rescue have been working to find potential sites for a station within Pantops, which includes an area of 2.3 square miles based on the Development Area boundaries.

A potential site in Peter Jefferson Place for public dedication has been identified and is under consideration with the landowners. The first step towards discussing the project further with the property owner is to find the site in compliance with the comprehensive plan. Pursuant to the Virginia Code, the Planning Commission must find public facilities, including fire rescue stations, in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan, and in this case also the Pantops Master Plan.

PURPOSE OF REVIEW

A Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan Review (or “2232 Review”) considers whether the general location, character and extent of the proposed public facility are in substantial accord with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. It is reviewed by the Planning Commission and the Commission’s findings are forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for the information. No additional action is required of the Board.

This is not a review and approval of the site plan or specific development plan for this site. It is only that this concept of use in this area is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed station is intended to be a County operated permanent facility, although smaller than others in the system, and would primarily serve the Pantops Development Area. It would be operated as a County facility. It is expected that daytime shifts be covered by career staff and nighttime shifts may be supplemented, if not entirely covered, by volunteer staff. The facility would be approximately 7,500 square feet in size providing living quarters and service space for duty crews. Two apparatus (engine and ambulance) are envisioned to be based at the station, with the possibility of additional apparatus in the future.

The proposed site under review is within the Peter Jefferson Place development. The site area is approximately one acre located within an open space area in an area that is currently developed with a maintenance building and a sewer pump station. The site is located below a fill area that is the fill area for Peter Jefferson Parkway, the spine road through the Peter Jefferson Place development.

In terms of its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and the recommendations of the Master Plan, the Master Plan does recommend that the construction of a fire station on Pantops. The Pantops station is one of two stations that have been identified for a number of years in our CIP. The other station is in the Ivy area. The Master Plan land use recommendations for this area when the Master Plan was developed was intended to be reflected of the approved development plans for the Peter Jefferson Place and the Martha Jefferson Hospital area. It therefore was recommended for green space consistent with that development plan.

The plan also notes, however, that infill development could take place in Peter Jefferson Place in areas not serving as an amenity. This site is designated as green space and is functioning as a passive open space area, but is not serving as an active open space area. That is there are not ball fields or existing trails in the area. It is visible open space. The site is located in an area that has already been developed to some degree. There is an existing maintenance building for the Peter Jefferson Place development. There is also a sewer pump station in the site. There is also a major drainage outfall from the lake at the site. He was not sure if it was an official storm water detention, but has that drainage function to it sort of in the center of the general area. The site area of the station is not in conflict with the open space plan, which is another component of the Comprehensive Plan. The area was shown as forested area, but most of the area that was shown for forested at that time when that plan was developed in 1992 was actually cleared with the road construction and the fill for that site. But there are some portions of the site that are wooded and have a stream and stream buffer. But the area for the fire station will not impact the stream buffer or those wooded areas.

Factors Favorable:

1. The site is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, including the Community Facilities Plan and Pantops Master Plan. The proposed facility in the site area generally will not impact environmental resources in the area and the open space function can still be maintained with the station located on the site.

Factors Unfavorable:

1. The site is located adjacent to environmental features, but the station will be sited in an already developed area and is not anticipated to be detrimental to those features.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission find this potential site in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Strucko invited questions for staff. He asked how the County acquired this property.

Mr. Benish noted that Ron Lilley, of Office of Facilities Development and Dan Eggleston, Fire Official, were present to answer questions. He replied that he believed this site had been offered by the owner of Peter Jefferson Place.

Ron Lilley, with the Office of Facilities Development, acknowledged that was the correct understanding of the memorandum of agreement to that effect right now such that if the site is approved and that they can do a station there that it will be divided off and deeded to the County.

Mr. Morris asked if there are any other sites in the Pantops development area where a fire station could be located.

Mr. Lilly replied that over the past several years the County has been looking for sites and have found a couple of candidate sites where acceptable response times could be provided, but the cost for them is very high well over one million dollars and in some cases over three million dollars. This particular opportunity of essentially a free site came along. It is not to say that there are not other sites that would work, but this site was attractive from a financial point of view.

Mr. Morris noted that staff is aware that the Pantops Steering Committee is concerned that this will take away from the Pantops green space and that green space in the Pantops area is very precious. He acknowledged that it was only an acre or so, but that it was a major concern to that particular body. He felt that it speaks for the entire community. As he recalled the maintenance of green space was the number one priority voiced by the community during the work sessions.

Mr. Benish noted that the maintenance of green space and transportation were the number one priorities voiced by the community during the work sessions.

Dan Eggleston, Fire Chief, pointed out that when they talked to the Peter Jefferson contact that was his concern as well. The configuration of the proposed station would be tucked back behind the maintenance shed so to not disturb any of the open green space and to try to minimize the impact if at all possible. They had some initial assessment done by an architect to see if that is possible and they indicated it was possible and favorable. The goal is to construct the station back behind the maintenance shed, leave the maintenance shed and leave the open space undisturbed. They felt like that was a requirement by the Peter Jefferson contact.

Mr. Loach asked if this was all career fire fighters or a mix of volunteers and career.

Mr. Eggleston replied that it would be a mix. They have talked and been in discussion with East Rivanna to help assist staffing that station nights and weekends. They will continue with that discussion. He felt that it looks favorable right now and that is their goal.

Mr. Strucko asked if they have worked out at all the first due response area that this station would cover, and Mr. Eggleston replied no not at this time, but it would be part of the process.

Mr. Morris asked what the feeling is of the current staff at Stony Point and East Rivanna Fire Department as far as the need for this new station.

Mr. Eggleston replied that was why they had been discussing this with East Rivanna. This area has been protected by the city for a number of years, but those services have been provided as back up by East Rivanna. That is why they approached East Rivanna about a partnership to help staff this station. It has been a while since they had some detailed discussions, but at the time they were supportive with their involvement. They will certainly support that and actually reach out to other stations if need be to help make this a true combination volunteer/career station.

Mr. Strucko asked if the career County staff provide day coverage service to East Rivanna now.

Mr. Eggleston replied that is correct and includes Stony Point.

Mr. Strucko asked if Charlottesville Albemarle Rescue Squad was the first responder in this area,

Mr. Eggleston replied that was correct. He noted that the general feeling right now is based upon the demand that this station will open with a fire engine and not an ambulance. They feel right now after discussing this at their advisory board that the rescue services are covered. So it would be a minimal approach and open up with just a fire engine.

Ms. Porterfield said that they were going to partner with East Rivanna, which does not have a rescue service.

Mr. Eggleston replied that was correct.

Ms. Porterfield asked what is the response time currently, and Mr. Eggleston replied that he did not know right off hand right now, but that their analysis of this general urban ring right now that it is adequately covered from the response time point of view and the number of ambulances to cover that call. He noted that this station will provide first response EMS through the fire department. So they have that as a first responder if there were delays in the ambulance arriving.

Mr. Strucko noted that East Rivanna does first responder too on rescue calls, and Mr. Eggleston agreed that is correct.

Mr. Strucko invited comment from other members of the public. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Morris said that he was torn. Number one, he knew they had been looking forever for a spot. As Mr. Lilley stated the spots that are available run between one and three million dollars. He did not think they had that at this particular time. Here they are faced with a possibility of getting a gift on this. However, that gift just happens to be in the green area. He knew that the Pantops Steering Committee briefed the Board of Supervisors the other day and that was one of the key areas that they stated that they need to protect the green space. He just did not know if this is setting an example for eating away at more and more of the green space. As they can recall, the Commission was faced with making a decision on critical slopes where an owner of the land would like to exercise his right to build condominiums and it just happened to be spot they thought was going to be a wonderful open space and green space. That was a number of acres that went off the board. It was something that they had looked at and were planning on and it fell through. He questioned if this was another one. He noted that he did not know.

Mr. Strucko said that the way he was weighing it was that they have a public service that they deem is essential and then they have this commitment to keeping a rare green space in a development area. Does the public safety concern outweigh the policy to maintain green space? That is the question. The County has a fairly aggressive set of standards of a five minute response time for both fire and rescue services. If they look at the staff report it says that the current response time from the East Rivanna Station to the general Pantops area are double that. They are looking at a 12, 10 or 11 response times over 2006 and 2007. In order to reach the goal for a 5 minute response time within the designated growth area they need more facilities sprinkled around the growth area in strategic locations close to population centers. That is why he asked Mr. Eggleston if they had worked out the first due response area because each station has sort of a zone that they respond to. In some instances the zone may overlap. That is what he is weighing.

Mr. Loach agreed that Mr. Morris makes a good point. They get coverage now from the city, but the County pays them. He asked what the cost differential is between what they pay the city now and what this will cost which includes the staffing. Secondly, he asked if it would be possible to continue with a piece of the contract to cover Mr. Morris' area and not have to use the open space.

Mr. Strucko asked Mr. Eggleston to come forward and answer the question.

Mr. Eggleston replied that the point right now is that the county pays roughly \$750,000 to \$800,000 for the county contract with the city fire services contract. That expires in 2013. So they would have to renew the contract. The big question is how much will that cost. A consultant's review of those services estimated it would cost close to two million dollars to provide those services. Mr. Elliott, the Assistant

County Executive, and he met with the city and discussed this possibility. They were not given a hard number, but were certainly told that it would cost a lot more than what they were paying now. The fact is that area served by the city has response times similar to those if the area were served by East Rivanna. By extending services to the city and continuing to allow the city to cover that area they want to achieve their goal. That is really what they are faced with. In addition, at the end of the contract they have to replace those services. They are hoping to move towards more of a mutually aid style agreement. In order to do that with the city they both will need to give a little bit. They are trying to replace that service that would normally come out of the city. They have on one hand to try to achieve this five minute goal and the other hand they have to replace that consistent engine company that comes out of the city. They feel like this is the best bet at this point.

Mr. Strucko pointed out that the Worrell Land and Development Company is planning to simply donate this acre so it won't come out as a cost to the county for the land.

Mr. Benish replied that was what staff understood.

Mr. Strucko assumed that there would have to be a road improvement to that gravel road to handle a Class A pumper. He asked if that would be at County expense or be part of the offer.

Mr. Lilley replied that it would be a County expense to upgrade the road.

Mr. Strucko asked how long the roadway was from Peter Jefferson Drive to this facility.

Mr. Lilley replied that it was approximately 200 feet or so from the paved road turn off down to the maintenance shed.

Mr. Strucko asked if any critical slopes would be impacted by this.

Mr. Benish noted that there was not an actual site plan. The area shown in the staff report does not have any critical slopes. The intent is to avoid the critical slopes. The drawing in the staff report shows a four-bay station, but their intention is to build a two-bay station.

Mr. Loach asked if the station does not go in this location to preserve the green space if the increased response time will affect the ISO rating and increase the insurance cost on homes in the area.

Mr. Eggleston replied that it could, but it depends on where the station is located in the Pantops Development Area. There are certain areas that are more than five miles away from the fire station. Commercial buildings are rated separately and will certainly be affected if not located within the five mile radius. So it certainly is an issue when it comes to the ISO. He reminded the Commission that this particular area is high risk because over 27 percent of the population is above 65 years of age. It puts this area in the higher risk bracket. They have a number of elderly care facilities in the area. Westminster Canterbury has 640 units in addition to the hospital. They really consider the Pantops area as compared to some of the other development areas the highest risk area because of those attributes.

Mr. Morris thanked Mr. Eggleston for the additional information.

Mr. Strucko pointed out that information had affected his opinion.

Mr. Franco asked Mr. Lilley in the CIP how much was allocated for the land.

Mr. Lilley replied that the CIP has changed over the last couple of years, but his recollection was that three years ago there was 1.6 to 1.7 million dollars allocated for acquiring the land. When this option surfaced the working plan was that they could use that money to build most of the station needed if they don't need to acquire land.

Mr. Franco noted that he was just trying to find other solutions for the green space. One solution was to find other land available that would meet the green space requirements for the Pantops area and

purchase the land for under that amount. Instead of treating it as a savings they could treat it as an opportunity to get other public green space somewhere else.

Mr. Morris agreed that it was a good idea.

Ms. Porterfield said that it was prudent that they do something good for the tax payers. The tax payers are being offered a piece of land of one acre with a good looking building that could be used for other things, which will benefit Pantops and the Village of Rivanna. It sounds like a good thing to do if the money is there and in addition there is an available space.

Mr. Strucko agreed that using the land for that intended use was good particularly because the use was outlined as a need in the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Loach agreed, but that it should be kept in the back of the county's mind in the future that should there be some green space that could be purchased to make up for this that it should be done. He felt that was an excellent suggestion.

Mr. Strucko noted that the matter before the Commission was to determine whether this proposal is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in terms of general location and character.

Motion: Ms. Porterfield moved and Mr. Morris seconded to find the potential site within Peter Jefferson Place for CCP-2009-00001 Pantops Fire Station (Station 13) in accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Work Sessions:

CCP-2008-00002 Crozet Master Plan Five Year Update

Review of focus areas for revision to the Master Plan and public process (Rebecca Ragsdale)

In Ms. Ragsdale absence, Ms. Echols and Mr. Benish presented the information.

Ms. Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation on CCP-2008-00002 Crozet Master Plan Five Year Update and distributed copies of the tentative schedule.

The Crozet Master Plan (CMP) was the first master plan to be completed in the County and was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on December 1, 2004, for the Community of Crozet. The Master Plan process included an extensive public participation process and resulted in a comprehensive plan amendment that updated the land use designations for Crozet.

The five-year update was initiated by the Board of Supervisors in January of this year. The Planning Commission and Board both endorsed the public participation plan presented by Lee Catlin, Community Relations Director. The expectation was that staff and the Crozet Community Advisory Council (CCAC) would bring the list of Focus Areas to the Commission and Board for endorsement, prior to beginning work on the revision.

Over the last several months, staff and the CCAC have put together the recommended list of Focus Areas. The proposed list was developed after two public meetings, completion of a community questionnaire, staff input, and discussion at several CCAC meetings. This staff report details the list of Focus Areas and plan to be followed for preparing the recommended revisions to the plan.

Staff recommends that the Commission review and affirm the Focus Areas for revision and update of the Crozet Master Plan and endorse the general public process for developing strategies to address the Focus Areas.

The fall of 2009 is the time staff is trying to get the endorsement of the list and the participation plan.

Tonight staff is looking for the Planning Commission's endorsement of the plan. This item will then go to the Board of Supervisors in about three weeks for the Board to accept this as the list and the proposed process or modify it

Staff hopes on October 15, which is a CCAC date, to have the first of a series of forums, which is the process they want to use to gain input to get the revision done. From September, 2009 to July, 2010 they are working to develop the recommendations that would then go to the Planning Commission for a recommendation to be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors.

To develop the focus area staff has gone through several different venues. The Board of Supervisors has given a directive on which focus areas they are interested in having everyone look at. The Planning Commission has also had some endorsements of particular areas. They have had some applications from property owners. The CCAC has had a list of focus areas that they are interested in. Staff has worked with the CCAC and jointly come up with this list. The CCAC has gotten a lot of input from the public. They had an extensive questionnaire. The questionnaire results have been provided in the Commission's packet. The meetings and open houses have been held to gain input to make sure that it is the right list. It is about an update to the Master Plan and not about a rewrite. There is an opportunity to go really far into this if they want to, but what staff is hearing from the Crozet community is that the plan is not in bad shape. The plan just needs a few changes, some updates and clarifications.

There are three critical areas that staff is interested in seeing some clarifications or potential changes:

- Addressing the population issue including the density of the fringe;
- The Downtown; and
- Businesses and Industries particularly on Route 250 including the Yancey Mills area. Staff is looking at how the community can improve its prospects for economic self sufficiency.

With regards to the population estimate and projection the Master Plan text refers to a population of 12,000 and in some places 12,500. However, the land use designation shown on the current Master Plan allow for a greater potential ultimate population of up to 24,758. The plan with the colors relate to the table, which has the list of uses and the densities. When the land use map is updated it will represent the new development that has taken place.

Staff is looking to see whether or not there are any capacity changes that take place just because of the new development shown on the plan. Not all parcels develop at their full potential in terms of density. So there will be places where there will be less density that actually develops than what is shown on the plan. Staff wants to get that updated so they know where the starting point is. Staff expects that in this table that there are probably going to be some adjustments to the densities to make sure that they really fit in with what the expectations for Crozet are. Both staff and the CCAC have worked very hard on developing a list of focus areas.

The map in the packet shows the two other critical areas. The first has to do with Downtown. One of the goals of the Crozet Master Plan is to enhance the vitality of Downtown. There have been some requests to expand the Downtown further north and some other ideas about expanding the Downtown further east perhaps to create a relationship between the ConAgra/Music Today area and the Downtown. So they want to look at those two areas to see whether or not any recommendations for adjustments to where the Downtown boundaries are warranted.

The plan needs to consider how the historic district would relate to the Downtown properties. The Crozet Downtown district is promoting redevelopment of properties in the Downtown area. Some of these properties are contributing structures to a potential historic district. So knowing what it is they want to retain of those properties for the historic district in the Downtown area is fairly important.

The third area is to look at the business and industry aspects of Crozet. Currently there is an employment area at the lumber yard and at the Music Today/Acme area. Those are the expected employment district areas. There was another expected in the Old Trail area. The Board and Commission have been looking at the Light Industry inventory. There needs to be a determination made

fairly soon as to whether or not the County believes that Crozet should have more Light Industrial designated land or Light Industrial zoned land or both. The Commission remembers the Yancey CPA, which was outside the development area boundaries. The Commission reviewed the Yancey CPA and did not recommend including the land in the development area or with the applicant proceeding with that proposal. The Board of Supervisors asked that the Commission relook at that issue as part of this Master Plan process.

There are several other CPA requests including one at the corner of Route 250 and Crozet Avenue. The Commission said that this particular issue should be reviewed with the Master Plan. There have been requests to remove roads from the Master Plan, which will be revisited at the requests of some applicants.

Other areas for review are not as critical and are more about strategies. One of the most often heard statements in the questionnaire was the importance of preserving Crozet as a small town. Public safety and crime prevention were very important. They will be relooking at the strategies to see if they need to be enhanced.

The transportation update will need to address expectations for functionality and appearance of Crozet Avenue, Three Notched Road and a review of Eastern Avenue. There is also a desire to look at the Entrance Corridor Guidelines to see whether or not they need to be made specific to Crozet. There is some interest to requesting the Board to remove the Entrance Corridor Guidelines for this particular area. The plan did not address a couple of the main roads that they need to be looking at. It did address Eastern Avenue, but that needs to be reviewed to see if that should be the plan.

Strategies will also be looked at for transportation improvements in ensuring adequacy of infrastructure for new development, including new roads. Strategies will be looked at for providing sidewalks, bike paths, trails and greenway paths in Crozet along with bus and rail service. Our existing strategies should be updated as necessary. Strategies for preservation of streams of wooded areas and looking at loss of open space will be reviewed as well as protecting the water supply and building parks and greenways.

On the last few master plans staff has been talking about priority areas for public investment. This plan does not have those kinds of priority areas establishment with the exception of the Downtown. Staff will want to bring this plan into line with the other plans in how they are recommending priority areas.

Other topics to be looked at include: recycling school facility needs and potential redistricting; the need for community schools and the relationship of water supply and sewer capacity in new development. These things are about relooking at what has already been done to make sure that the strategies are appropriate or to enhance them.

The Guiding Principles of the Master Plan that were adopted in 2004 are still planned to guide this particular update.

The public participation plan has been put together to try to get public input from the community mostly through forums on those particular focus area topics. Staff talked to the CCAC about potentially using their meeting dates and times for holding those forums. There have been some discussions about that as well as using the time of the CCA. There is a CCAC meeting on Thursday night.

A tentative schedule was prepared by staff and the CCAC, which was provided in the staff report. The Board of Supervisors at the request of Ann Mallek made a directive to the Planning Commission that instead of having the Planning Commission begin looking at the update in August that the Commission would have a recommendation in July. Staff reviewed the schedule to see if there was any way to shorten that time period. The tentative schedule was distributed that shortened the time period at the end. The schedule may need to be modified to deal with the Light Industrial discussion. The Planning Commission will change in January after the election. The new Planning Commission and Board may have some thoughts that might be different. Staff wants to give those two groups the opportunity to have weight in since they will be the ones that will ultimately looking at the Master Plan. There may be some shifting around on some of the topics particularly on the new Light Industrial land after the new members

are in place. The revised schedule will be reviewed at the CCAC meeting on Thursday.

Staff invited questions from the Commission. She asked if the focus areas that have been identified appropriate. Is the process scheduling and sequencing of events appropriate? Once the Commission has their discussion and heard from the public staff would like the Commission to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors either with this particular set of focus areas and public participation plan or one that they wish to recommend with modifications.

Mr. Strucko invited questions for staff.

Mr. Loach noted that the population issue is very important to the community. There still seems to be some vagueness in what the original intent of the Master Plan was. The first question is from the implementation handout that went to the public. Is not the Crozet Master Plan based on a total population of 12,000 with 4,500 households? He asked if that was the original intent of the Master Plan.

Mr. Benish replied that the focus of the Master Plan when it was drafted under the assumption of the Board of Supervisors was that they were looking at a planning horizon at that time. What staff realized when the questions came up about that capacity was that they had a capacity that far exceeded what they expected over that 20 year period that was entirely inconsistent with that type of target.

Mr. Loach pointed out that he did not know how that could be. In as much as what they had from the Master Plan from the consultants was a table that showed neighborhoods and within each neighborhood it showed what the residential population would be or number of houses per say and the amount of commercial space. What they had at some point was an inconsistency between the colors on the map and what that table was. He noted that he understands that. The question was is that they were not off by a factor of a couple of percentage points to stand a deviation or two. They were off by 100 percent. It seemed when they were off by a 100 percent he did not understand how the decision was made not to take the colors on the map and make them equivalent to the table which the community had been told was the population build out. He would be glad to quote Mr. Strucko, Mr. Rooker and a number of other people who were before all of the Planning Commissions and Board of Supervisors who consistently told us that this population was going to be between 12,000 and 12,500. He pointed out that this number was not picked by the Crozet Community Association or by the community. It was a number that was given as a result of the first DISC study by the consultant who said that the ideal maximum population for Crozet was 12,198. What he was saying is that if population is an issue and when he reads in the report that says that population potentials of upward of 16,000 and above he thought that they have to start in their discussions to get more towards what the original goal and intent of the Crozet Master Plan was. He noted that he asked Ken Swartz, who was the consultant, what his plan was built on and he said it was 12,000. In regards to population he thought that they now need to make sure that the colors now match the actual plan that was done by the community.

Mr. Benish said that in terms of the focus areas that was certainly one of the focused areas they want to concentrate on. They need to get the total population and the land use designations right.

Mr. Loach said that his second point was in regards to the paragraph on the third page of the Crozet questionnaire. His view of the questionnaire was that what it did was to validate the work of the Crozet Advisory Committee. Essentially on a number of these points the Crozet Advisory Committee has already taken a position. What this survey has done is to validate the positions they had taken with over 700 people out of a population of 5,000. He felt that was fairly strategically significant. Again, it does substantiate the work that has already been done by the community. To that end it says the open ended qualitative responses will be used in developing the next phases of community input and eventual strategies for addressing the focus area. He asked someone to explain what an open ended qualitative response is and how they feel this would be more strategic significant than the survey in addressing the focus areas. He felt that a lot of these points have been taken up by the committee and that the survey validates what the committee has done.

Ms. Catlin clarified that the questionnaire had some questions that were on a scale of 1 to 10 and rate these kinds of things. Some were open ended questions that said if one believes this why or tell us other

comments. Those are the open ended questions that staff is referring to. The open ended ones were the ones staff was not able to put together how many people answered this or that. It was more subjective in terms of people giving opinions. That is the information they will be delving into more that they will be giving out to the subcommittees and that the CCAC will be examining as they are looking to put together strategies over the next couple of months. It is all information that is from the questionnaire.

Ms. Porterfield asked which is the chicken and which the egg--the 12,000 or 24,000 number.

Ms. Echols said that in terms of the staff's approach to working with the community on getting at what would be the ideal work out. Staff wants it to be an iterated process where first they start by looking at the map and what has developed and what has not developed.

- If there are areas that have been developed or at least platted showing a lot less density than what they were intended to have that is going to start to reduce the capacity number. The other thing is to start looking at the colors on the map. There are some areas circled on the map. The dark colors have the highest intensity. In Old Trail it does not show the plan for the density or the intensity that is expected in that area. The Westhall rezoning was a R-6 development with proffered plan. It was shown in a CT-4 area, which had a tremendous amount of potential for both development and mixture of uses with some fairly high intensity uses. The first thing they would be looking at is where they have these properties they would look at the centers. There is another area that has been platted, which does not look like what is shown on the map.
- The second thing has to do with looking at the fringes. What the table has are numbers that perhaps are in excess of what the expectation for this area should be.
- In terms of what the table says it talks about the net residential density of 4.5 acres in the center of a hamlet but mostly the neighborhood villages 12 dwelling units per acre and up to 18 dwelling units per acre in the center of a neighborhood village. Once they look at these centers and decide whether that really was suppose to be a center and does it really make sense, that designation may go down and where the centers are they expect these numbers to be revisited and potentially reduced. That is the first step towards looking at the density picture. They need to look at these areas where there are some residential development shown that is actually zoned Light Industrial. That is where input is needed from the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission on whether those areas should be designated for Light Industrial. That may take out some of the capacity or designate it for employment uses. Also in the Downtown area if there needs to be more area designated for employment that has residential in it now it will go down. The first step is to look at the map, look at what has been platted, look at what has been developed and then relook at the designations to see if it right. That number would be added up to see what the map says in terms of capacity and then look at that with the idea of what is the sewer capacity, what are the road capacity issues and work with the community to come to what ought to be the ideal build out of Crozet.

Ms. Porterfield reiterated that the map and colors are going to be the starting point, which means the starting point is up to the 24,700 population.

Mr. Benish noted that the eye is always on the target of getting the population down to what the expectation was. They would like to take the planning approach to determine what the best type of mix of uses is and reflect what has happened over time and go through that planning process to get down to what the real capacity is right now and then look at that capacity against that 12,000 target. They want to take the planning assessment approach to see where today that high number is because it is probably not at 24,000.

Ms. Porterfield noted a problem in trying to determine the beginning point since it appears that the text refers to one thing and the maps refer to something else. She felt that it would be helpful for the discussion for everyone to know how they got something that is so disparate in the original Master Plan.

Mr. Edgerton agreed that it was a good question. In defense on the 12,000 if they look at the planning perimeter of 20 years, which is what a Comprehensive Plan and Master Plan does, he did not know the 24,000 number that everybody has been so worried about was ever anticipated within a 20 year period. He thought that both numbers are right. The land use capacity in this area will go above the 12,000. But

if the community grows as anticipated over the next 20 years of course they have some variables as in the last year since economically things have slowed way down. What Ms. Echols and Mr. Benish are saying is obviously the right approach in this 5-year review. This is exactly why they need a 5-year review. The right approach is to look at what has happened in the 5 years since the plan was developed as far as density. A lot of the areas on the map and schedules have not developed that way at all. In recalling the rezoning in the last 5 years in Crozet he could not remember a single rezoning that has accomplished what the schedule said they should as far as density. He questioned if staff has tracked that information. He remembered that they were not able to reach the target of growth in the development area due to market demands.

Mr. Loach noted that with the exception of Foothill Crossing all of the other developments including Old Trail, Liberty Hall, Westfall, have fallen within the higher brackets of the development density. Again, he pointed out that the original Master Plan for the 20 year is what they were told they estimated it to build out. In other words they would be at their borders. But they did move some of the borders around to accommodate that.

Mr. Benish said that what staff is seeing is that they have some intensities of development that are too high for Crozet regardless of what that minimum number was. It is a form and character that is probably not right for Crozet right now. They would rather put an eye to where they are right now, how close are they to that 12,000 target, what the land uses they want are and the form that they really want now looking at this 5 years from now and measuring that. It is with that eye that they are trying to achieve a much lower target here. It is something that was the intent of the original plan.

Mr. Loach noted that there also were some other decisions that were made that sort of nullify the plan. In other words if they look at the area between ConAgra and 250 where those higher densities are located there was supposed to be a school site in there. The sites were so they would be a walkable neighbor to the school. In the interim they decided that they would increase Brownsville and Hensley. It kind of negates the need for that. If that was the idea of making these compact walkable neighborhoods that by making those other decisions they have kind of gotten away from that.

Mr. Benish noted that staff's intent today was to make sure that they have caught the focus areas and not to delve into too much detail in the substance of those. He asked if they are capturing the right ones or are there other areas that are not covered

Mr. Loach said that this has been discussed at the Crozet Advisory Committee in depth. So he thought that the areas have been covered well. He had a concern when they said that the County should decide whether Crozet needs more LI. It seems that when a growth area comes up with a master plan that is consistent with the Comp Plan and what that growth area wants it seems that these sorts of decisions should be within the context of the community that is going to have to adjust to them. Most of the people in Crozet felt that essentially the master plan was a contract with the County and they did their part. If they go back to the advisory committee and would tell them that all of the time and effort that they are putting in is just suggestions and that may or may not be taken into consideration it will have an entirely different impact. He thought that they were going to see that with Places29 as well.

Mr. Strucko clarified the three critical focus areas were the land use that delves into the population question, the Downtown area is the central business region and businesses along Route 250 with the question of light industrial as a possibility.

Ms. Echols referred to attachment F that has a list of the focus areas that have been identified. They are critical areas of addressing the population, density at the fringe of the development areas, the Downtown business and industry on Route 250 including the proposal at I-64/Route 250 in the Yancey Mills area outside of the growth area, and Crozet's prospects for greater economic self sufficiency. The other focus areas are the ones that deal more with strategies and updating information on what they have now in making sure they know where they want to go with them. Those are preserving Crozet as a small plan and transportation, environment and community facilities.

Mr. Strucko noted that staff wanted the Commission to confirm the tentative schedule passed out and attachment F.

Ms. Echols pointed out that staff was most interested in the sequencing and making the Commission aware that the Board wants the Commission to take an action in July of next year.

Mr. Strucko asked if any Commissioner had questions about Attachment F, the focus areas, and the actual tentative schedule of events. He noted that several of the Commissioners would not be here past September. So he would have to weigh in whether it is appropriate for him to make a decision on critical areas or should they build in a time sometime after December for a new Commission to revisit it to give them an opportunity to make any adjustments they see necessary.

Mr. Morris asked if the CCAC is in agreement with Attachment F, and Mr. Loach replied yes that it was consistent with the past meetings with staff.

Mr. Franco noted that the evaluation of the changes that have occurred since the plan was adopted will occur in October. He questioned if the land use density ought to be in November as the next issue or talk about Downtown.

Mr. Loach felt that it was fine the way it was. He thought that the CCAC can handle any of the changes that they see will be necessary. He would defer to the CCAC since they act as his advisory group when it comes to make these decisions. There have been decisions made. In order to shorten this process the CCAC could reconfirm that the decisions they have made are valid. He thought that the schedule is fine.

Mr. Strucko opened for public comment and invited the first speaker to come forward.

Mike Marshall, Chairman of the Crozet Advisory Council, noted that they make a plan and then there is what happens. He made the following comments.

- The CCAC has looked at these focus areas extensively and agree basically with what has been presented to the Commission. They see the population issue as the main thing that the community wants addressed. He asked to make a brief statement to address the reason this is foremost in the community's mind. As Mr. Loach said at the time the master plan was drawn Crozet was a town of 2,500 people. In 1980 a Comprehensive Plan for Crozet was created which assigned zoning in all the parcels. The total density in that zoning comes to about 12,000. In 2001-2002 over a course of about 8 to 10 months several large farms in the development area were sold to developers. The citizens realized that these developers were likely to operate independently and not necessarily coordinate their plans. The town asked to be master planned so that all of these projects could be rationalized. They thought that they were going to rationalize them within the ultimate population that already existed. They were going to take these plans and make sure that the 12,000 made sense with the new subdivisions that were coming and so forth. That is why the master plan was what it was in their mind in that way. In 2004 the plan was adopted.
- The first thing that happened was the Old Trail rezoning. The Old Trail rezoning basically assigned all of the slack in the growth area to Old Trail. The town felt that they had been betrayed and that the plan had not been followed. It immediately raised this whole population question in the town. That has persisted to this day. In response they heard from the county that it was a 20 year plan and it was not going to happen or they actually had more capacity. Neither of those responses actually has satisfied the community in Crozet. As Mr. Loach said they entered into it willingly and they agreed to be 400 percent than they were and they wanted to be good citizens about preserving the rural areas, etc. But they felt a little taken advantage of when the implementation decisions came around.
- He said that there is a plan and then there is what happens. In the five years since the plan was adopted four locations have actually materialized as Mr. Loach said. It happened in Downtown, Old Trail, Clover Lawn and the ConAgra area. It is obvious that densities will continue to develop in those four locations. They wonder why other areas are still in the plan for which there is not plausible density to come. They see from the county some understanding of that point of view that it is

possible to negotiate out some of these densities. The other thing that was revealed to the citizen that was unexpected was that on these charts one could have a piece of property zoned R-6, but the plan might say that this might be eligible for a rezoning to R-10. It is plausible that it might be R-10. Or it is plausible that one could actually get to 18 on these properties. This information would be thrown back to the public when they objected to the densities that the developers were proposing. They would ask how this is possible because they were busting the population. They would point to the plan and these numbers. So what the public wants is for these numbers to be drawn down closer to what they think is realistic. There might be some locations in which higher densities make sense. That is why they do go back and revisit the plan. The fact of the matter is that the horse is out of the barn. Old Trail is much bigger than what the thought it should be. It may not be possible to achieve a population of 12,000. It just may not be possible.

- None the less, the town wants the plan to as Mr. Benish was saying to reflect what its expectations were really in the first place. The other thing to remember is that when the plan was adopted they did not have what he would call suitable zoning for Downtown Crozet. Even though it was supposed to be the densest place in fact it had a suburban style zoning, which nobody could get into. One had to proof that they had parking places that they could not proof that they had, etc. So they have rezoned Downtown Crozet. This rezoning makes the density Downtown a lot more plausible to achieve. So this is a success since then.
- Because of that another reaction in the community has been to put townhouses right on the edge. The citizens have a pyramidal concept of density. The idea is that as one gets farther from the middle the densities ought to be lower. That is another thing that the plan does not explicitly lay that out. That is the second objection.
- The third thing, of course, is that some property owners on 250 have come forward and wanted to be considered for rezoning. The way they have been handled so far is that they have been punted down the line and put into this process. The CCAC are brave about their opinions and they talk them up. He complimented the County for responding for the most part. They still have an agenda that is not completely in agreement with the citizen's agenda. But they do hear us pretty well.
- In the second category of focus areas he thought that it was understood. But the newer residents don't understand some of these questions such as do they have enough water or what about these roads and so forth. They are going to go back and look at that to make sure that the plan is still coherent. Their understanding is that the plan as ratified in 2004 is still basically sound in these areas. But they are going to go back and look. They don't think they will require many changes.
- One other comment on the survey is that he noticed in the staff report that there is a line on page 3 that says the survey is not scientific and not strategically valid and not a source about making decisions about the master plan. The CCAC was fortunate to have a PHD whose job is to do strategically analysis. He is the person who led the subcommittee who devised the survey. He works for UVA ITC in analysis of things like this. They were advised by the County that it was not scientific if they could not prevent a person from filling out more than one survey and they could not. That is why it is called a questionnaire and not a survey. He noted that 700 was a good number of people out of 3,000 if the children are taken out. They did their best to provide statistics valid from the community. He encouraged the Commission to go ahead and ratify this. The community is well represented by the opinions and personalities on the Advisory Council. He was pleased that the County proposed that they have the forum meetings coincide with the Advisory Council meetings. He felt that this was going to make this much more efficient and help attract the public to the meetings. So far so good and it has their endorsement.

Mr. Strucko noted that he granted extra time to Mr. Marshall because he is the Chair of the CCAC. He invited other public comment.

Gardy Bloemers was present as a member of the Scenic 250 Steering Committee and made the following comments.

- Scenic 250 is a grass roots organization of like minded Albemarle County residents who have been actively involved in a wide range of land use issues in the county for well over ten years. She noted that she was also a resident of Crozet. Route 250 west from Charlottesville to the western boundary of Albemarle has rural, scenic and historic characteristics which makes 250 West a valuable asset to the greater Albemarle County -Charlottesville community. They believe the 250 Corridor is not appropriate for large scale commercial development. She was present tonight to let the Planning Commission and the citizens of the Crozet area know that they are closely following the findings and activities surrounding the Crozet Master Plan Five Year Update. The Scenic 250 Steering Committee shares a majority opinion of the respondents to the CCAC questionnaire as it relates to commercial development in the Corridor.
- Specifically, she was referring to the following:
 1. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents agreed with the main principle of the 2004 Master Plan that Downtown Crozet should get first priority in commercial and residential development and development along Route 250 should be discouraged.
 2. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents oppose no commercial or industrial development in the vicinity of Yancey Mills/Interstate 64 interchange.
- CCAC has identified business and industry on Route 250 as one of the focus areas that should be considered by the Planning Commission. They are currently aware of two specific requests which if approved would involve a substantial and significant increase to existing commercial development and rezoning of agricultural and residential land to commercial/industrially. Specifically these include the change of zoning to commercial for the corner parcel along 240/250 as well as the proposed Yancey Mill Business Park. This type of expansion clearly conflicts with the principles of the original Crozet Master Plan as well as the Comprehensive Plan. The growth area for Crozet is defined by the Comprehensive Plan and was set and its boundaries created to foster development in a responsible manner. They respectfully request the Planning Commission to take their comments into consideration.

Barbara Westbrook, resident of Crozet and member of the CCAC, spoke.

- The 12,500 figure is a very important issue. As with most everybody in Crozet they were led to believe that was going to be the build out figure even though the colors on the map don't agree with that. In the Master Plan that 12,000 figure was mentioned at least 10 to 12 times. It is not just a one time thing that somebody came up with. It is really important to the Crozet residents. At one time they had a petition signed by at least 1,000 people in favor of keeping the 12,000 figure. She was not sure if it was submitted to the Board of Supervisors. That is really important to the community.
- The subcommittee worked hard and put a lot of time in on the questionnaire. She worked with Tim Tolson who was in charge. She felt that was an important thing for the Commission to consider when making any decisions on Crozet. She personally handed out hundreds of flyers trying to get people to come to Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors meetings. One time she handed out 500 flyers regarding a subdivision that was very controversial to its neighbors and not a single person came to the Board meeting after that. She was very discouraged. She felt that the 700 people who answered the questionnaire would be insulted if they were not really listened to. That questionnaire is very important.
- The majority of the Crozet residents do not want to see more commercial development on Route 250. She does not hear Jarman's Gap Road mentioned very often, but that is one of the most important roads that need to be improved and has been pushed back and pushed back. She had heard the figure 2012 tonight. She hoped that Jarman's Gap Road does not get pushed back any more because that is a really strong connection between the western part of Crozet and Downtown Crozet.

Morgan Butler said that he directs the Charlottesville-Albemarle project of the Southern Environmental Law Center.

- One of the major focus areas proposed is commercial and industrial activity along Route 250. That focus area references the Yancey Mills Business Park proposal. They have spoken to the Commission about the Yancey proposal on two prior occasions acknowledging that there may conceivably be situations in which a Comprehensive Plan Amendment request like this might make some sense, but voiced some strong concerns that the drawbacks of this particular proposal would outweigh its potential benefits. As staff pointed out the Board of Supervisors has determined that the potential benefits and drawbacks of the Yancey proposal could best be flushed out and evaluated in the context of the Crozet Master Plan revision.
- Tonight is not the appropriate time to argue the merits of the proposal. However, they would like to suggest a few areas the review of the Yancey proposal should focus on so that the community receives all of the information necessary to make as informed a decision as possible.
- First, although the proposal is being studied in the context of the Crozet Master Plan they believe that it is very important that staff analysis of the need for additional office space and industrial land consider the inventory of available land throughout the entire county as opposed to just the Crozet area. Similarly if staff determines through that county wide evaluation that more such land is needed they believe that it is critical to consider potential locations throughout the entire county and not just in and near Crozet. Based on the staff report it sounds like that is a path staff has taken. But they did want to emphasize that a county wide analysis of both the need and location questions is critical.
- Second, the report suggests that a potential benefit of the proposal as it could create employment opportunities for Crozet residents hoping to keep Crozet from becoming a bedroom community for Charlottesville. In order to judge this purported benefit they believe that the review of the proposal must include some analysis of the percentage of jobs from this proposal that would likely go to Crozet residents.
- Third, they believe that the study must explore how the designation of 150 acres for a business park just outside of Crozet would affect efforts and other goals in the master plan to encourage redevelopment and invigorate the Crozet Downtown area.
- In closing, the SCIC looks forward to participating in the master plan review process in helping to ensure that any changes don't undermine the main principles of the master plan in the county's key growth management strategies.

Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum, said that this evening they were discussing including process scheduling and sequencing.

- Unlike Mr. Butler the Free Enterprise Forum does not take positions on projects. So any projects that might be referenced in this really are process oriented. Sometime ago he had been most critical of a decision this group made with regard to Places29. They deemed that area to be so important that this group is the Steering Committee for that body. His question is how in this schedule are the concerns that Mr. Butler and Mr. Marshall raised with regard to punting some of the applications that have been put forth and how are the county's concerns being addressed. Are they placing staff in the position of saying what the County's position is?
- He was mostly concerned when he looks at a very aggressive schedule which has been handed to the Commission from the Board of Supervisors and how the interested citizens have a context for their discussion. An inventory of the Light Industrial that is appropriateness would be an excellent tool. However, he wondered if the goals of the Board of Supervisors will be represented. He noted that the boards will be changing shortly. How will the Planning Commission weigh in? He was not really clear on that with the schedule that was shown. He was sensitive to staff's need to get this done. He was also concerned that the Planning Commission, as the organization that will put a stamp on this, won't have the opportunity to take a look at the overall county goals in how this particular Comp Plan revision meets those goals. No development area is an island. Each one serves a purpose. Each one is important. Every citizen's point of view is important. But it has to be taken in the full context and this is the body to do that.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Strucko closed the public comment of this deliberation to bring the matter before the Planning Commission. He asked that the Commission provide some directive to staff regarding focus areas and the schedule

Mr. Loach said that the Commission has heard from the Chairman of the committee saying that the focus areas and the process and schedules set up is consistent with the CCAC. Therefore, he felt they should accept the schedule as proposed by staff and move forward.

Mr. Morris agreed to accept the schedule set forth by staff and move forward with the conditions.

Mr. Strucko said that the focus areas hit the key issues. Everybody has a different stance on them, but they certainly are the key issues that Crozet has been wrestling with. Some they have been wrestling with longer than others. The population question has been around for at least four years. The Downtown area as the business center has always been the theme in the master planning process and should continue to be one in the five-year review. This is a more recent issue regarding business and industry along Route 250. It has been around about the past year or so. Mr. Marshall is right that the county kind of punt to the master planning process as the ideal venue to really weigh in and determine whether it is in the community's and county's interest to have that kind of expansion of the growth area for the purposes of business and industry. He tends to agree with the focus areas. Two of the key focus areas, the critical ones, will be considered by this Commission and one in January, the land use density, will be considered by a new Commission. There are potentially two or three Commissioners that won't remain. He asked if it is more appropriate to build in a date when the 2010 Commission can potentially reconsider Downtown and jobs housing balance in LI after December.

Ms. Echols noted that is not the way the schedule is intended to be read. The October through February forums are for the community. This would get to the Planning Commission in April for consideration.

Ms. Porterfield noted that they have a lot of these on their plates right now. They have two master plans in development and a master plan update. She requested that staff keep in mind that when the new people come on the board that the reading to get up to speed is going to be really intense. The Board will need to acknowledge that the new Commissioners will need extra time to be able to make informed decisions.

Mr. Loach said as Ms. Echols explained in the beginning, thankfully a good deal of the plan does not need to be rewritten. To a great extent the plan itself has been a success. Except for The Square, all of the other businesses are new. There are three new shopping centers. The adult community part in Old Trail has been approved, which means there will be more jobs there. To a great degree the land use planning that has been done and with the centers, the master plan and Downtown it has really done very well. These are just things that have to be taken care of. Outside of the population the things that have been brought up are outside of the master plan.

Mr. Strucko reiterated that he had heard no objection regarding the schedule except Ms. Porterfield's comments regarding work load. The key issues are right where the Commission expected. He asked if staff had received the necessary information.

Ms. Echols replied yes. She reiterated that the Planning Commission had endorsed the focus areas and the schedule with a cautionary note about the need to allow time for the new Planning Commissioners to come up to speed.

Mr. Strucko agreed that was the consensus of the Planning Commission.

- **In summary**, the Planning Commission received a PowerPoint presentation, took public comment and endorsed the Focus Areas to be considered in the revision to the Master Plan and the tentative review schedule with a cautionary note about the need to allow time for the new Planning Commissioners to come up to speed in 2010. The Planning Commission's endorsement letter concerning the focus areas and schedule to be provided to Board of Supervisors and the Crozet

Community Advisory Council.

The Planning Commission took a break at 8:11 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 8:20 p.m.

Places 29 – check in (Judy Wiegand)

Ms. Wiegand provided a check in on Places29 to provide a brief summary of the results of the two public open houses held last week; to ask if the Commission has any questions at this time on the Master Plan and if the Commission is ready to schedule a public hearing on the draft Master Plan. (See PowerPoint Presentation)

- There two open houses held last week that several Commissioners attended. At those public open houses the staff did answer numerous questions and explained the plan to different people that came through. Staff found that most of the questions were on the transportation aspects of the plan. They also found that the attendees were uncertain somewhat about the Places29 transportation network improvements and what was happening with the Western Bypass. Staff explained that to them.
- Staff received a number of individual comments with two in written form as shown in the first two bullets in the presentation) Someone opposed the Ashwood/Polo Grounds connector on the future land use map. There was a request that right-of-way for potential light rail transit line is identified. Staff received an email from Mr. Scott Ellef from Forest Lakes indicating that those neighborhoods supported the draft plan but did not support the expansion area adjacent to Hollymead. The Commission received a copy of that email also. Staff received one email from an individual in support and was very glad to see the plan's alternatives for those who don't drive. Those were basically the public comments.
- Staff did not see anything come up that would cause them to recommend that the Planning Commission have another work session to discuss any of these matters. Staff felt that the comments would come up at the public hearing and could be addressed as a result of that. Staff received some comments from some of the internal stakeholders, which were agencies and departments that would be working with the implementation of the plan. Comments were received from CTS and the University of Virginia Foundation. The Airport will be sending in comments. Staff expects comments from Facilities Development and the County's Traffic Engineer. All of the comments were minor clarifications or a request that they insert another sentence to make something a little clearer. There were a couple of changes to estimates. But there was nothing again major or something they have not already worked on.
- Staff presented the expansion areas at the workshops on maps. Copies of the Hollymead Expansion area were available for review. General questions were received along with an email from the Forest Lakes Community Associations that did not like the idea of expansion area. There was one individual that spoke to them saying that it was a great idea. That is basically all staff heard on those two maps. She asked if the Commission had questions, any matters to bring forward at this time or were ready to schedule a public hearing.

Mr. Strucko invited questions for staff.

Mr. Morris asked if staff has a recommended date for the public hearing.

Ms. Wiegand replied that staff has been looking at holding the public hearing on October 13 at Albemarle High School. Staff has been waiting for the Commission's input. She noted that there is also a later date in October.

Mr. Morris asked how many attended the open house.

Ms. Wiegand replied that there were 21 persons in attendance on the first night and 14 persons on the second night. Therefore, it was a total of 35 persons.

Mr. Strucko suggested that they plan to encourage greater attendance at the public hearing. He suggested that staff try to get some media attention for the public hearing.

Ms. Porterfield suggested if the hearing was held at Albemarle High School that the meeting be started later than 6 p.m. so people can have dinner before the meeting.

Mr. Strucko agreed that they should try to accommodate the people in order to get as much input as possible. He questioned what the sports schedule was at Albemarle High School.

Lee Catlin suggested if the Commission wanted they could do an information drop in session where people could give comment for the first hour or two and do the public hearing afterwards to accommodate both type of people. Staff could have a way to record any comment and make sure the Planning Commission got the information.

Mr. Franco asked that the public hearing be held on October 27 due to a conflict.

Ms. Porterfield asked that the Village of Rivanna be rescheduled to another date than October 27.

The Planning Commission discussed the options. It was the consensus of the Commission to schedule the public hearing on October 27th, preferably at a location in the Places 29 area such as Albemarle High School. If held off-site of the County Office Building, the public hearing should begin at 7:00 p.m. with a period of time provided at that location before the public hearing for public review and input. If an off-site location is not available, the public hearing should begin at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building Auditorium with a period of time provided before the public hearing for public review and input.

Mr. Benish noted that the public hearing would be set on October 27th. He passed around a resolution of intent for consideration. He noted that Mr. Franco asked for stronger language regarding the transportation component. This is a resolution for the Commission to adopt that resolves that they are going to study and undertake an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan through the Master Plan.

Mr. Strucko noted that there was a specific emphasis on the multi modal form of transportation network within the resolution of intent. He invited public comment.

Joan Graves, resident of Berkley Subdivision, said she lived there since 1962. She was a veteran of many wars concerning the Berkley community. She asked the Planning Commission to go out there and look at Dominion Drive and how it accesses 29. She asked that at the bank they look up the hill and see the backs of the Berkley houses on Commonwealth Circle. That is where that connector road is supposed to come. There are 179 houses in Berkley. Some of the residents do not have reason to use Dominion Drive. But, there are many residents that do use Dominion Drive. She asked what is going to happen to Dominion Drive if there is a road coming down to the bottom before getting to 29 going over into Shopper's World. She asked if Dominion Drive is going to be a cul-de-sac or have a four-way stop sign. She asked what good it is to do it there. She suggested because Commonwealth Drive was another parallel road to 29 and there are other Berkley residents who live on Commonwealth that Hydraulic Road, which was developed as a four-lane road, could not be used as a parallel road to 29 and just leave Berkley alone.

Mr. Strucko asked staff to add Ms. Graves comment to the list from the recent public sessions so that issue is not lost.

There being no further comments, the public comment was closed to bring the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and action. He asked if the Commission was ready to hold the public hearing.

Ms. Porterfield replied that if the hearing was held here that she would take back the 7:00 p.m. starting time. If the meeting was not held in the community she felt the meeting should begin at the normal 6:00 p.m. time.

Mr. Strucko noted that the public hearing would be scheduled for October 27 with the normal starting time

of 6:00 p.m. if it was held at the County Office Building. He asked for a motion on the resolution of intent.

Motion: Ms. Porterfield moved and Mr. Loach seconded to adopt the resolution of intent to amend the Comprehensive Plan for the Places29 Master Plan, as amended.

PLACES 29 RESOLUTION OF INTENT

WHEREAS, Albemarle County has a longstanding commitment to growth management and, since the adoption of Albemarle County's first Comprehensive Plan in 1971, County policy has been to direct growth into the 11 communities within the County's Development Areas identified in the Land Use Plan, which is a component of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, directing development into the Development Areas facilitates the economical delivery of services to those Areas and conserves the balance of the County's designated Rural Areas to protect its many resources including, but not limited to, its agricultural, forestal, natural and scenic resources; and

WHEREAS, the Neighborhood Model, which is also a component of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan, recommends that master plans be prepared for each of the 11 communities within the County's Development Areas; and

WHEREAS, it is desired to develop a master plan for the four communities within the County's Development Areas north of the City of Charlottesville identified in the Land Use Plan as Neighborhood 1, Neighborhood 2, the Community of Hollymead and the Community of Piney Mountain, and this proposed master plan is hereinafter referred to as the Places 29 master plan; and

WHEREAS, a multimodal transportation network must be planned and coordinated in conjunction with planning for the land uses within the Places 29 master plan area in order to achieve the County's vision of a livable and desirable community; and

WHEREAS, the Places 29 master plan, which will include, among other things, plans for land uses and a multimodal transportation network, will establish a vision of the desired ultimate future condition of the Places 29 master plan area.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good planning and land use practices, the Albemarle County Planning Commission hereby adopts a resolution of intent to amend the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan to adopt a master plan for Places 29 as determined to be appropriate after study; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the Places 29 master plan proposed pursuant to this resolution of intent, and make its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors at the earliest possible date.

* * * * *

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Strucko noted that the Planning Commission adopted a resolution of intent, by a vote of 6:0, to amend the Comprehensive Plan for the Places29 Master Plan. Also, the public hearing was to be scheduled on October 27.

Old Business:

Mr. Strucko invited old business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business:

Mr. Strucko invited new business.

- Don Franco agreed to replace Eric Strucko as the Planning Commissioner on the Fiscal Impact Committee recognizing that the commitment is not for the long term.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m. to the ASAP Ecosystems Service and Growth Presentation at 10:45 a.m., Tuesday, September 22, 2009 in Conference Room 241, COB McIntire Road, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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