

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes March 23, 2021**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, March 23, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

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

Members absent: none.

Other officials present were Steve Allshouse; Andy Reitelbach; Kevin McDermott; Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

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

Ms. Schaffer called the roll. All Commissioners indicated their presence.

Mr. Bivins established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners if they wished to pull anything from the consent agenda and heard no requests to do so.

Ms. More moved to approve the consent agenda.

Mr. Keller seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Public Hearings

STA202100001 & ZTA 202100001 Community Development Fee Update

Mr. Steve Allshouse, Department of Community Development (CDD), said the last time he met with the Planning Commission was on February 2, when he outlined the recent history of the CDD fees, including the 2007 fees study that was conducted and the 2008 policy that the then-sitting Board adopted, which was not always adhered to in subsequent years. He said he made mention of the last update that was done, for the most part, in 2015.

Mr. Allshouse said last time, he was talking exclusively about Chapter 18 fees. He said they have included Chapter 14 on the advice of the County Attorney's Office who, subsequent to the last meeting, discussed that because the Planning Commission does have a relationship with Chapter 14 fees, they should come under consideration of the Commission.

Mr. Allshouse said he wanted to update the Commission with the work that staff has done as of March 21. He said much of that work has involved a comparison of proposed fees with fees that exist in other localities. He said he would also talk about the impact of proposed fees on development in Albemarle, using some case studies they were able to conduct. He said finally, he wanted to discuss a remaining timeline for completion of the fees update. He said he hoped to field some questions and get the Commission's opinion on how to move forward.

Mr. Allshouse said staff has developed fees based on the 2008 Board-adopted policy. He said this exercise has resulted in increases of about 10% for most of the items that are existing fees.

Mr. Allshouse said staff also identified several services related to architectural review which, in this case, show up predominantly of Chapter 18. He said this led to the creation of some proposed new fees based on the relative time required to do the tasks inherent in these functions.

Mr. Allshouse said finally, staff constructed a tentative estimate for a new technology fee that would help fund a CountyView replacement system. He pointed out that the proposed technology fee is based on CDD's share of the total placeholder amount they are using for the replacement cost of a new system. He said in other words, CDD users would be paying only for CDD's envisioned portion.

Mr. Allshouse said staff also did some outreach work. He said they sent an email out to all Amail recipients and to anyone else who has worked with the County CDD in the past two years alerting them of the proposed changes, links to the documents, and a feedback box. He said there were about 700 unique visitors to the webpage, but only one person left comments. He said the deadline for the comments was February 26, and staff then closed down that comment box.

Mr. Allshouse said as he mentioned at the last Commission meeting, the second part of staff's outreach was on January 19, when they met with members of the development community. He said on January 21, staff met with representatives from the Southern Environmental Law Center and the Piedmont Environmental Council. He said out of those meetings came two important questions. He said one question was, "How do our proposed fees compare with other localities?" He said the group desired a fee comparison with additional jurisdictions.

Mr. Allshouse said the second question that came up was, "How would these fees impact development in Albemarle?" He said this was about how, hypothetically, the fees would have impacted projects that had been completed or were underway in the County, and what the total difference would be in terms of what they would be charging under the proposed fees versus what they had charged historically.

Mr. Allshouse said he would go first to the comparison section, but before starting, he would note that fee comparisons across jurisdictions is very tricky for three reasons. He said first, there is no standard format across jurisdictions for reporting or classifying fees, generally speaking, and this makes things difficult to parse out. He said secondly, practices and definitions of what is included in services are not

always consistent across jurisdictions.

Mr. Allshouse said finally, what he found in doing this exercise was that many jurisdictions have not updated their fees in some time. He said he could talk about the fees the County is proposing in 2021 and compare them against other jurisdictions' fees, but he would ask the Commission to keep in mind that a number of fees in these other jurisdictions have not been updated for some time.

Mr. Allshouse said staff looked at other Virginia jurisdictions' development-related fees, which included Fairfax, Montgomery County, and Roanoke County, primarily because they have technology fees. He said not every jurisdiction in the state has a technology fee, but these were three examples of localities staff found that did have one.

Mr. Allshouse said staff also looked at Alexandria for ARB-type fees. He said the City of Alexandria does quite a bit of ARB work, and so staff wanted to see how Albemarle's proposed fees would compare against those. He said they found an example that they believed was comparable and tracked it.

Mr. Allshouse said finally, staff wanted to look at Charlottesville, their next-door neighbor, as an example. He said since they are in the same metro area, staff thought it was relevant to compare Albemarle's proposed fees to the City's fees.

Mr. Allshouse said that based on staff's conversations with the development community and others, they examined general fees in Hanover, Henrico, James City County, and Roanoke, as these were seen as comparable localities.

Mr. Allshouse said with the caveats he put in mind, and realizing there may be people watching the presentation online for whom the numbers may appear a bit small on the screen and may not be perfectly legible, the chart on the screen was taken from Attachment D (the fees comparison) in the Planning Commission's packet. He said the table showed the truncated version of Table D. He said in other words, he took the proposed Albemarle fees, then looked across all the different comparable jurisdictions and took the average in the last column.

Mr. Allshouse said staff looked at factors that were common across jurisdictions. He said for example, every jurisdiction they looked at does building permits, site plan work, rezoning applications, and subdivision preliminary and final plats. He said the indicated column on the screen showed what staff is proposing for Albemarle. He reminded the Commission that these are common fees that can be compared across jurisdictions because everyone does them, and people generally have similar practices in the way they calculate and collect these fees, with one glaring exception he would discuss later.

Mr. Allshouse indicated to another column, explaining that this was showing the average of the non-Albemarle fees. He said the non-Albemarle fees include the fees in Hanover, Henrico, James City County, the County of Roanoke, and the City of Charlottesville. He said looking at the table, what he sees is that the fees Albemarle is proposing, generally speaking, are higher than the fees over in the non-Albemarle column. He said the reason is that they are proposing these fees in 2021, while many of the other jurisdictions' fees remained in effect that were adopted at earlier dates. He said it was not an apt comparison, but it was the best they could do. He said he could not simply ask Charlottesville, for instance, to tell him what their fee would be now, as that information does not exist.

Mr. Allshouse said one glaring difference one could see between the proposed Albemarle fees involves commercial building permits, which was showing on table as \$2,000 and showing as \$10,000 for the average of non-Albemarle jurisdictions. He explained that three of the jurisdictions – Hanover, Henrico, and the City of Charlottesville – calculate their building fees based on the stated dollar value of the project; whereas Albemarle, James City County, and Roanoke County base their fees on the square footage of the building.

Mr. Allshouse said he was recently talking with Mr. Michael Dellinger about this dual methodology, and Mr. Dellinger said it is very common to get huge discrepancies depending on which methodology is being used. He said if he looks at the jurisdictions that charge by square footage, which is Albemarle's methodology, he sees that in James City County, for example, their comparable fee would be \$1,365. He said the County of Roanoke's would be \$3,320. He said Albemarle's proposed fee is \$2,050. He said in that sense, Albemarle's fee looks reasonable compared to the other two jurisdictions that use their methodology for calculating that fee, and quite a bit below the \$10,000 that is being skewed upward by the inclusion of the other jurisdictions.

Mr. Allshouse said he would move on to some case studies staffed looked at. He said they looked at six recent developments in Albemarle County, looked at the fees that were charged for these projects, and calculated the levels that would be charged under proposed changes to existing fees as well as all proposed new fees, including the technology fee. He said for each of the six developments, they determined the difference in total actual fees versus proposed fees.

Mr. Allshouse acknowledged that the table on the screen was probably difficult to read and apologized to those watching online. He said this was found in Attachment E of the Planning Commission's packet, and he would walk through the various case studies staff looked at. He said one of them was 999 Rio Road East, which was a rezoning. He said 1538 Oakencroft Circle is a single-family detached residence in the Rural Area of about 2,500 square feet. He said 2704 Poorhouse Road is another single-family detached residence of about the same size, also in the Rural Areas. He said 810 Stargazer Lane is an affordable townhouse that is part of Emerson Commons in Crozet.

Mr. Allshouse said 601 5th Street Landing is a commercial building and is sometimes called the "Starbucks Project" in CDD. He said this is a parcel next to the main parcel on 5th Street Landing and is a commercial building with a number of businesses in it, the main one being Starbucks. He said the last case study was 1576 Avon Street, which is a commercial building that currently houses an autobody service center.

Mr. Allshouse said the second column on the screen showed the type, and the third column showed the dollar value that the County actually charges on all these projects as they move through the development review system.

Mr. Allshouse mentioned that sometimes, it is a bit difficult for staff to say what they charged on a particular project. He explained that there may have been, for instance, a rezoning back in 1998 that got the project into a commercial use, but the property might have been sold off, or things may have happened between 1998 and present time. He said staff had to make a judgment call about what they included, and they typically included fees that were identified that were directly attached to the project as it is envisioned and will actually be built, and not to something that took place 15 years ago and never got built.

Mr. Allshouse indicated on the screen to what the County charged. He said looking at these projects, he talked to all the County division heads and got their input about what they would be charging under the various proposed fees. He said for example, at 999 Rio Road East, they would be proposing \$10,195.

Mr. Allshouse said next, staff looked at the dollar increase between the two numbers. He said for example, 999 Rio Road East would have seen an increase in fees of about \$1,812. He said looking at that column, one would see the dollar increases right down the line.

Mr. Allshouse said the question came up of how staff is to grab meaning from these dollar values. He said clearly, everything was going up. He said one could see from the original dollar amounts that in some cases, in percentage terms, they have been fairly sizeable. He reminded the Commission that this includes everything, including the existing fees that have come up by 10%, in most cases; anything they would envision charging as a new fee; and the technology fee on top of that. He said it was not the case that these all went up by 10%, as they clearly did not.

Mr. Allshouse said one thing he looked at, however, was the value of the project overall, which shows in the next column. He said through the County's property records and through CountyView, he found what the properties were assessed for. He said for example, the affordable townhouse is assessed at \$308,700, which includes both the land and the structure. He said there may have been one or two cases where he had to look at the assessed values of the land, and then for anything that had been proposed but not yet built on the land, he took the dollar value as stated for the construction portion of the project.

Mr. Allshouse said the actual assessed dollar values for these projects were listed on the table. He said he took the increase in the fees, divided it by the total dollar value of the project, and got the last column. He said these can be compared because they are a percentage across. He said it is one thing to look at absolute dollar values, but then to look at the incremental increase (given the size and scope of the project), what the column was showing was that, on average, the increases in fees as a proportion of the total size of the project in terms of dollars was about one-fifth of one percent.

Mr. Allshouse said there were a couple of caveats. He said when the County collects these fees, they are usually collected upfront. He said the builder or developer may not recoup those fees for a number of years. He said in other words, there may be some carrying costs, and the column showing the increases did not reflect that fact.

Mr. Allshouse said overall, he wanted to focus on the last column (Increase as % of Assessed Value), as this gives an idea of the magnitude of what staff is proposing.

Mr. Allshouse said he talked about the comparison with other jurisdictions and about the case studies (admittedly, in a cursory matter). He said next, he would talk about the remaining timeline of what staff is proposing. He presented the timeline on the screen. He said on March 3, he went before the Board of Supervisors and gave them what was basically the presentation he just gave the Commission. He said at present, they were at Chapters 14 and 18 fees for March 23. He said on April 21, he will be going before the Board again for a public hearing on all chapters, which would be Chapters 5, 14, 17, and 18.

Mr. Allshouse said if the Board adopts the fees on April 21, the fees will become effective on July 1, 2021. He said there would be some time between the adoption of the fees and the actual effective date of the fees.

Mr. Allshouse mentioned he had two proposed motions for the Planning Commission and offered to take any questions.

Mr. Clayborne said it was a great presentation, and he sees this as the cost of doing business. He said he noticed a couple of figures on one slide that showed the increase compared to the actual dollar value of the project. He said \$3,630 on a \$1.07 million project and \$4,000 on a \$2.3 million project, to him, almost seems negligible.

Mr. Clayborne said while he hated to say that about money, at the same time, presenting this information shows how the technology upgrades could show an efficiency. He said if he is a developer, for instance, and the County is telling him that through the course of his project, the County's technology upgrades could save him eight hours' worth of work for a project manager, this is \$1,200 to \$1,600 where they have basically already recouped their cost. He said perhaps in carrying this forward, it may be helpful for Mr. Allshouse to show an example like this one, particularly around the technology fee and how it could save some project management time for the developer.

Mr. Allshouse said he would take this into consideration as they move forward.

Mr. Randolph thanked Mr. Allshouse for making his study much more comparative by looking at some of the other counties that Albemarle traditionally uses as comparables. He said he thought this was very helpful and appreciated Mr. Allshouse doing this, as well as showing the statistical comparison with which he ended the presentation.

Mr. Bivins added that he continues to hope that the Supervisors will do the initial investment from funds not attached to the fee increase and that the fee increase, then, pays for upgrades. He said since they have an interesting budget item that is going to be spoken for quickly, he would suggest that while people are lining up in front of the Board of Supervisors, this initial investment in technology should come from this one-time fee, but the ongoing maintenance of it comes from the technology fee so that they also have an opportunity to build a bit of a reserve so that they are always prepared for new technology when it happens.

Mr. Bivins said he would go farther than what Mr. Clayborne suggested by stating that some of these costs seem de minimis. He said while Mr. Allshouse looked at the percentage change, he actually looked at the fee cost against those projects, and he believed there was only one cost that was 2% of the project. He said this is a mistake and the wrong pipe being brought in on one floor, and this is eaten in a big way, or it is someone forgetting to get something from a supplier. He said from his standpoint, going back to what Mr. Clayborne said, the ability to continue the language that the County is investing to make things more efficient for developers to do business in the County is the language for this. He said it is not about punishment.

Mr. Bivins said if the County does not ask for extra money, it is on them that they did not raise their fees. He said in raising the fees, the question is to how they will facilitate doing business in this locale to the extent that EDA can go to Henrico and Richmond and say that it costs \$23,000 to build there versus another amount to build a commercial building elsewhere. He said he thinks this is something where fees do matter when talking about those types of buildings. He said this is the kind of argument that he would advance if he were in that situation. He said the cost of doing business is less expensive in Albemarle, and

it is also a beautiful area.

Mr. Randolph added that if the fees do not keep pace in a somewhat comparable way to what the estimated percentage of cost is that the County should recoup, then in general, the taxpayers end up directly subsidizing the developers for the project by having lower fees than are comparatively existing with comparable counties to Albemarle. He asked if there is any reason that the taxpayers should be subsidizing growth in the community.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing.

Mr. Neil Williamson said he is President of the Free Enterprise Forum, a privately funded public policy organization focused on Central Virginia's local government. He said it was interesting that the last staff report provided to the Commission on this topic was on February 2. He said that evening, the Commission again had before them a fundamentally flawed proposal to increase Community Development fees.

Mr. Williamson said that despite being told this is not a significant increase, he is most concerned that the economic comparison, based on assessed value of the project, is wrong [inaudible]. He said this includes the land and improvements and instead, staff should examine the difference between the fees. He said he believed it was the fourth example in staff's presentation where, in some cases, the combination of the increased fees and new fees would increase the regulatory costs as compared to the current regulatory costs in excess of 30%.

Mr. Williamson said the day prior, on the Free Enterprise Forum blog, he wrote about the "bananas" technology fee and compared this with the concept of paying for a plumbing fee. He said technology is an operational cost like labor, electricity, plumbing, etc. that should be captured in the base fee structure. He said if the average planner uses the bathroom five times during an application review, he would ask if there should be a planner plumbing fee assessed to the application.

Mr. Williamson said the Free Enterprise Forum believes the technology fee is opportunistic, used by only three other jurisdictions in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and should be rejected.

Mr. Williamson said while others have said the fee increases are needed because the County has not raised them in a good while and may be behind some localities, he suggests they examine page 35 of the Albemarle County FY 20 Audited Financial Statement, which is available on the County website. He said this audited document shows the cost of services for Community Development actually went down by 4.26%. He said additionally, this document suggests the net cost for these services (which is the cost of services, less the fees paid) went down by 2.23%.

Mr. Williamson said he does not have an economics degree, but as an armchair economist, he believes that the CDD is charging more for their services than they are spending by 2%, at least in this particular snapshot.

Mr. Williamson said the fees before the Commission increase the cost by 10%. He said some have said this is de minimis, but he went back to the document to see what the fiscal impact is of these fees for the year ending June 30, 2020, and governmental activities generated \$6.914 million in program revenues from users of services provided by the activity.

Ms. Schaffer informed Mr. Williamson his speaking time expired.

Mr. Bivins closed the public hearing. He asked Mr. Allshouse if he had anything he wanted to add.

Mr. Allshouse said he did not.

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners for their thoughts and for staff to put the motions on the screen.

Mr. Randolph moved approval of STA2021-00001 as presented.

Mr. Keller seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Randolph moved that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors approve ZTA2021-00001 as presented.

Mr. Keller seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Allshouse to take what he heard from the Commission and move forward.

Mr. Allshouse said he would do so.

SP2020000016 Claudius Crozet Park

Mr. Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner, presented an aerial view of the site, showing Claudius Crozet Park, which is slightly to the east of Crozet Avenue in Downtown Crozet. He said Barnes Lumber Yard is somewhat to the north of the site, and Hill Top Street is directly north of the park. He said Park Road is directly to the south of the park, and one could see in the image Eastern Avenue to the east. He said Crozet Park consists of three separate parcels that are contiguous with one another.

Mr. Reitelbach presented a slightly more zoomed-in view of the park. He said one could see a pond on the west side. He said the blue square in the middle, next to the star, is the outdoor pool that has a dome over it for weather purposes. He said there are several athletic fields on the eastern side of the park. He said he also identified several of the residential subdivisions that surround the park, including Agatha Ridge to the south; Parkside Village directly to the north; and Foothills Crossing and Glenbrook, which are both under construction, to the northeast.

Mr. Reitelbach presented another view of the park showing the south entrance, slightly off-center from the intersection with Agatha Ridge on the south side. He said there is the north entrance to the park off of Hill Top Street, also near the intersection with Indigo Road, which is a dead-end street heading toward the east at Parkside Village. He said Foothills Crossing is currently under construction.

Mr. Reitelbach said before getting into the proposal, he would provide some background on Claudius Crozet Park. He said it consists of three parcels that total 22.806 acres. He said the park is privately owned and operated by Claudius Crozet Park, Inc., a Virginia nonprofit organization. He said it is not a County-owned park, though there is an operating agreement with Albemarle County outlining certain responsibilities that the County Parks and Recreation Department has, mainly regarding maintenance of some of the public facilities, especially the athletic fields and tennis courts.

Mr. Reitelbach said in regard to this application, it is important to note that the operating agreement is not proposed to be amended at this time, and the existing operating agreement was included in the staff report presented to the Planning Commission as Attachment 6. He said there is also no public funding for improvements at the park being requested at this time. He said this application is not a County-affiliated application, but is from the private nonprofit organization Claudius Crozet Park, Inc.

Mr. Reitelbach said the existing zoning of the property consists of three parcels, with the larger two currently being zoned RA – Rural Areas. He said these include the portions of the park with the pond, athletic fields, existing [inaudible], pool, and most of the parking. He said there is a small, narrow sliver-like parcel along Hill Top Street and Indigo Road that is zoned R6 Residential.

Mr. Reitelbach said there are several overlay zoning districts on this property, including Managed and Preserved Steep Slopes. He said there is also Entrance Corridor, but this is on the R6-zoned parcel only. He said the main portion of the park that is zoned Rural Areas is not a part of the Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Reitelbach said surrounding zoning districts are mainly Residential at various densities (R2, R4, and R6), which are two, four, and six units per acre, respectively. He said the map on the slide showed where the Downtown area and Barnes Lumber Yard are zoned DCD and Heavy Industry.

Mr. Reitelbach said the purpose of the hearing that evening was that the community center and swimming club require a special use permit in both RA and R6 Zoning Districts.

Mr. Reitelbach said the Comprehensive Plan and Crozet Master Plan designates all three parcels of this property as Greenspace, which is for public parks, open space, and environmental features, including all existing and proposed public parks, active park areas, greenways, institutional uses related to parks, and the like. He said this includes both public and privately owned park areas.

Mr. Reitelbach noted that the Crozet Connector Trail is proposed between Eastern Avenue to the east, going through Crozet Park and over to Downtown Crozet, which is an important part of the Crozet Master Plan.

Mr. Reitelbach said this is a request for an amendment to a previously approved special use permit, SP1995-43. He said the applicant is looking to amend the special use permit to allow an expansion of the community center and of the swimming club use that are both on this property. He said the proposed community center building would be a height of approximately 32 feet, or two stories, and would include a fitness center, meeting rooms, and gathering areas totaling approximately 34,200 square feet. He said the applicant has identified that this would be constructed in their proposed Phase 1.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant's proposed Phase 2 would be the additional swimming pool, which will be a new eight-lane indoor pool in a building of approximately 12,600 square feet. He said the applicant is also proposing new basketball courts to the north of the park pool and community center facilities, new pedestrian pathways and trail connections around the park, additional parking to accommodate the expansions of these uses, and proposed new landscaping to provide buffering and screening of the new facilities from the nearby residential areas. He said the athletic fields, tennis courts, several of the existing trails, pond, and existing outdoor pool will remain so that ultimately, there will be two pools proposed (the existing outdoor pool and a new indoor pool).

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant is also requesting a special exception to Section 18-5.1.16(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to modify the requirements for swimming club uses to allow the proposed new pool to be closer than 75 feet to the nearest property line. He said as shown on the concept plan, it would be approximately 30 feet.

Mr. Reitelbach said the next slide showed this better, which was an overall view of Crozet Park and the proposed improvements, which are mainly in the center of the park. He said the areas to the east with the athletic fields and the pond area to the west have very few proposed improvements.

Mr. Reitelbach presented a slightly more zoomed-in view of the concept plan showing several parking areas. He said the darker gray rectangle in the center was the proposed recreation center with the proposed pool expansion building directly to the north of it. He said the existing pool area and concrete deck is to the west.

Mr. Reitelbach presented a view of the more northern part of the park showing the new basketball courts and an additional new parking area improvement to the entrance on the north side to Hill Top Street. He said though it was slightly difficult to see on the plan, there was a identifying figure showing that from the corner of the property line of the residential property to the proposed pool expansion is approximately 30 feet.

Mr. Reitelbach said regarding access and circulation on the site, there will be two proposed main entrances. He said one entrance off of Park Road, on the south side of the park, which is the existing main entrance on the south side of the park. He said the proposed entrance off of Hill Top Street, on the north side of the park, is currently an emergency access entrance or only used for special events. He said the applicant is proposing this to be a full entrance to allow for better dispersal of traffic of the use to both sides of the park, coming both off of Park Road and Hill Top Street. He noted that any required improvements to both of those entrances would need VDOT approval at the site plan stage in order to be issued entrance permits.

Mr. Reitelbach said that for multimodal transportation opportunities, the applicant is proposing additional trails, sidewalks, and pathways throughout the park. He said this is to create connections both among the existing facilities and the proposed new facilities, along with connections to the surrounding areas and neighborhoods. He said this is to help promote biking and walking to the park as alternative transportation modes by providing infrastructure that would allow for safe passage to and around the park from those nearby neighborhoods. He said Crozet Park is a designated destination on the proposed Crozet Connector Greenway from Eastern Avenue to Downtown Crozet.

Mr. Reitelbach presented a screenshot from the Parks and Green Systems chapter of the existing Crozet Master Plan, showing Crozet Park in the center of the figure. He said the yellow-orange solid line represented the proposed greenway connecting from Eastern Avenue (shown in teal) heading from Route 240, under the railroad tracks, down toward Route 250. He indicated to Barnes Lumber Yard and Downtown Crozet, noting it is envisioned that the Crozet Connector Trail would eventually connect from Eastern Avenue up through Barnes Lumber Yard and over to Crozet Avenue, with a spur into Crozet Park as well.

Mr. Reitelbach said there are several recommended revisions by staff to the concept plan and application. He said the applicant has identified that concession sales would be included with the park and new

proposal, but those locations were not identified on the concept plan. He said staff has determined that those sales areas should be located on the concept plan.

Mr. Reitelbach said in terms of the landscaping buffers and proposed utility easements directly on the northwest side of the new building, the location should be somewhat modified to avoid conflicts on the concept plan. He said there appears to be a conflict between those two elements. He said there are also additional requested notes by CDD to be placed on the plan.

Mr. Reitelbach said in terms of factors favorable to the use, the proposed use is consistent with the Crozet Master Plan and the designated greenspace use of parks and recreation areas. He said the proposed use is located within the Development Areas.

Mr. Reitelbach said the factor unfavorable is that the use is expected to generate additional vehicular trips on the surrounding local street network, such as Hill Top Street, Park Road, Tabor Street, and other nearby streets.

Mr. Reitelbach said staff recommends approval of SP202000016 Claudius Crozet Park with the listed conditions, and provided that the previously mentioned revisions listed in the staff report are made to the application prior to a public hearing with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Reitelbach said the first condition is the standard condition for special use permits, that it be in general accord with the concept plan that has been provided, identifying certain major elements of the plan including the buildings, recreational facilities, and pools. He said it does allow for minor modifications to the plan to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance at the site plan stage if the special use permit were approved.

Mr. Reitelbach said most of the other conditions pertain to screening, lighting, sound, and mitigations to any potential impacts that these new facilities would have on the adjacent property owners and residents. He said Condition #5 limits the sales of concessions to the two locations that will be identified on the concept plan. He said Condition #8 includes additional conditions related to buffering and landscaping screening of the proposed uses from the nearby properties.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant is also requesting a special exception to the setback of the swimming pool, and staff recommends approval of this request with conditions and the previously mentioned recommended revisions. He said the conditions for the special exception are very similar to those in the special use permit including the standard condition that it must be in general accord with the concept plan as well as several other conditions related to landscaping, screening, and lighting to help mitigate any impacts on nearby properties.

Mr. Reitelbach presented the suggested motions based on staff's recommendation for the Commission to come back to when they were ready to make a motion, both for the special use permit and the special exception request. He offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Clayborne said one of the conditions was to not have freestanding on the west side, and he wanted to confirm that this is west of the side that is closest to the stormwater management pond.

Mr. Reitelbach replied yes. He said it is on the side where the existing residential lots back up directly onto

the park to prevent any lighting pollution or impacts from affecting those residential properties.

Ms. More said she had questions she would wait to ask, but she wanted to insert a correction about the stormwater management pond. She said she did not believe that it is a stormwater management pond but rather, just a pond. She said she wanted to be clear about that so that as they move throughout the conversation, they do not misunderstand what that is.

Mr. Reitelbach said this was correct. He said the pond does actually have a Water Protection Ordinance stream buffer around it as well. He said in any engineering grading stormwater management of the site, this is something that the applicant would have to take into account and the County Engineering Division would be looking at to make sure the buffer is not disturbed.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to follow up on the lighting question. She asked Mr. Reitelbach if he could tell the Commission if the site's current lighting is subject to the most recent version of the Albemarle County Dark Skies Lighting Ordinance, or if it was approved before the ordinance was adopted, as she wanted to understand the light quality.

Mr. Reitelbach replied that he was not sure about that. He said he believed that based on the age of when the original special use permit was approved, it is not under the most recent lighting ordinance. He said a couple of years ago, more on the athletic fields side on the eastern side of the park, there was a special exception granted by the Board of Supervisors related to lighting on the athletic fields. He said this was something he could look into more.

Mr. Bivins asked if new construction would have to adhere to the current ordinance.

Mr. Reitelbach replied yes.

Mr. Randolph said he had a question for Mr. Kevin McDermott. He said on page 6 of the staff report, where there is a discussion about whether this project will have any substantial detriments, the next-to-last paragraph says, "Although the development will generally add trips to the adjacent roadways, this addition is not expected to significantly affect delays or queuing of the nearby intersections." He asked what "significantly" means here, empirically, given the fact there is an expectation under the Traffic Engineer's trip generation manual of 985 vehicle trips per day on the site, regardless of the time perhaps not being in sync with rush hour. He asked how "significantly" is defined.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Planning Manager, replied that he would define "significantly" as something that would be noticeable to the general public driving through there. He said generally, if a couple of seconds are added to a trip or to a delay at any one stop, this is not necessarily noticeable, especially on average. He said if over 30 seconds are added, however, he believes this would start to be noticeable by the general public and is what he would refer to as "significant."

Mr. Randolph asked the "general public" meant the general public with a bird's eye view over the project, or if the general public includes neighbors who have customarily not seen that level of traffic and for whom this would be highly noticeable.

Mr. McDermott replied that when he was referring to "significantly," this was specifically in reference to delays at intersections. He said he was talking about how long one would have to wait at any one

intersection. He said to say whether or not a person living on that street would notice additional traffic going up, this is not something he assessed here. He said he thinks it is something that has to be taken in context when considering the number of vehicles spread throughout the day if 985 would be noticeable by someone sitting there. He said it is possible, but he would also point out that they have a lot of development going on currently in Crozet, and so numbers are probably [inaudible] all the time. He said two years ago, those living there would probably say that traffic was not nearly as bad as it is today.

Mr. Randolph said this is true throughout the County, but if they assumed an 8-hour day with 985 cars measured out over 8 hours, they would average 100 or more cars an hour. He said to these two neighborhoods, he would say this is highly noticeable and is a significant increase in traffic. He thanked Mr. McDermott for helping to give him an idea of where he was coming from with this.

Ms. More said she thought it might be helpful to make her comment before moving through the rest of the hearing. She said when she read staff's report specifically about the special exception, it leaves her wanting to better understand why the applicant is making the request. She said when she reads the applicant's narrative, she is still left with that feeling. She said she hoped that with the time they had, they may hear more about that. She said this is the special exception about the distance being less than the 75 feet.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Reitelbach if he wanted to answer the question or defer to the applicant.

Mr. Reitelbach said he would defer to the applicant to answer those questions.

Mr. Bivins said he had a question for Mr. McDermott, since he had a sense of how VDOT may respond to some of this. He said in the site review, he would assume that VDOT would look to see whether or not that with the hope for expansion of the northwest pedestrian alley or occasional road for high-impact events, this would be an appropriate road. He asked if VDOT would ever suggest, for example, that instead of going to the northwest of the community room, to go to the northeast of the community room, which appears by the concept plan to be not only a shorter road out to Indigo, but a road that does not put one immediately at an intersection. He asked if this is the kind of conversation VDOT would have.

Mr. McDermott asked Mr. Bivins if he was saying that if they redirected the existing north entrance further to the east so it joins up with Indigo before it joins up with Hill Top.

Mr. Bivins replied that it is a shorter piece of concrete that is just on the other side of the Crozet Community Building.

Mr. McDermott said he supposed this could be something that would be evaluated as a possibility if they were not able to meet all of the current site distance standards with the current entrance.

Mr. Bivins said he was trying to balance this with what Ms. More asked about the setback. He said the applicant is asking the Commission to consider a setback to that property and also widen it so that it becomes an additional entrance into the park. He said his question was whether VDOT would take into consideration that there is a different way to get in that perhaps shorter.

Mr. McDermott said he thinks this would be up to the developer to reevaluate if they were not able to do that. He said he thinks VDOT would probably say there is reasonable access already provided to the park,

so they are not forcing the developer to have a second full-access point. He said if they wanted to move it, this would be something that the developer would have to consider and recommend.

Mr. Bivins said he saw on the concept plan that there was a proposed road facility that was to the left of everything, sitting on the slope going to the pond, and he was trying to figure out what this proposed facility was, indicated on the plan by a hatched triangle.

Mr. Bailey said he believed this was stormwater management.

Mr. Bivins said perhaps the applicant could speak to that.

Mr. Keller said he would have a number of questions after hearing from the applicant and the public. He said he was trying to think back to a project a number of years ago, where there was concerns about if the park were opened on Hill Top on a continuous basis, there was potential for a de facto cut-through from Downtown Crozet to linking up with the Eastern Connector, or the piece that is going to connect to Route 250.

Mr. Keller said Mr. McDermott is on top of these things on a number of these projects, and while he obviously could not speak to hypotheticals for the future, he is certainly aware of them. He said he wondered how Mr. McDermott would respond to the question of whether there might be ways to lessen that impact if that, indeed, were to happen in the future.

Mr. McDermott said that in general, all the roads surrounding the park are local roads with residential development all along them. He said none of them are specifically intended to carry high volumes of traffic, as they are local roads. He said what the County is trying to do with the Comprehensive Plan overall and with the Master Plan is build out the network so that vehicular travelers have more options for where they can go, which disperses the traffic throughout all of those local roads a little better.

Mr. McDermott said Eastern Avenue is going to make a connection, hopefully in the semi-near future, down to Route 250, and this will go through the Westhall and Westlake developments, all the way up to Foothills. He said there will then be multiple connections from Eastern Avenue – one up by Park Ridge, and one up by Westlake that connects to park road. He said both of those would make connections over toward Crozet Avenue, which builds out the grid system.

Mr. McDermott said his comment about dispersing the traffic is that it would allow traffic that is coming from the north to use the northern entrance, and the traffic coming from the south and possibly places down by Route 250 to be using the southern entrance to the park. He said this would spread things out more rather than putting all the pressure on one, which would put additional pressure on those residential areas like Westlake and older neighborhoods surrounding Park Road. He asked Mr. Keller if this addressed his question.

Mr. Keller said it did so very well. He said to go back to his point, because there would then be an opportunity for that flow-through, and if there is something happening on Eastern Avenue, either to the north or south of traffic flow, that could force people to select that as an alternative through neighborhood. He said this is very much a discussion Mr. McDermott has with the Commission when they talk about new neighborhoods being built next to older neighborhoods and the connectivity through they all want to have on the one hand but where often, the community is concerned because their perception

of increased traffic as well as the benefits one can see from the connectivity.

Mr. Keller said his question was that if this were to become a problem in the future, they could think about ways they might be able to lessen that now or, in other words, possibly a condition that if traffic flows increase through the park, there could be speed bumps or some sort of traffic calming that it would make it so negative that people would not consider this as an option. He said obviously, they do not want a cut-through in this park.

Mr. McDermott said he agreed entirely. He said he thinks this would be something that they would want to talk to the developer about. He said they could work this out at site plan stage if needed.

Mr. McDermott said currently, however, the connection through the park is not exactly a direct one. He said he did not think people would use that cut-through in the parking lots to necessarily save time on anything. He said since it is going to be a private travelway through lots, though, it would probably be a good idea for the developer to consider (especially where there are pedestrian crossings) possibly having raised pedestrian crosswalks in the parking lot so that they could slow the traffic and reduce those levels of cut-through. He said he thinks this would be a wise thing for the developer to do since there will be a lot of pedestrian activity in the park, and they would not want people to be able to drive fast through there.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. McDermott where a stop sign would go on the southern entrance, since there is not one there now.

Mr. McDermott asked if there is no stop sign if one wants to leave the park and go onto Park Road.

Mr. Bivins replied there is no stop sign. He said one can get onto Park Road, but they do not have to stop.

Mr. McDermott said there is a requirement that any private road has to have a stop sign. He said he is sure they can work with the Crozet Park owners and get them to install something as part of this. He said there should be a stop sign there.

Mr. Bivins said there was not one there as of two days ago. He invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Drew Holzwarth, one of the park board members for Claudius Crozet Park, said he would give a presentation, adding that Mr. Scott Collins, the applicant's engineer, was also attending.

Mr. Holzwarth said he would start by giving a brief background on Claudius Crozet Park, as he believed it was relevant for the Commission to be aware and because there is a lot of confusion about this in the community. He said in 1958, a local resident donated 22 acres to the community and later that year, Claudius Crozet Park was established and incorporated as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization.

Mr. Holzwarth said since that time, each year, the community board members become park board members, and several age off. He said one thing that has remained consistent since that time, however, is that the board members have the park's mission in mind, which is to promote the health and wellbeing and enhance the general social, physical, and cultural welfare of the residents of the community of Crozet and Western Albemarle County.

Mr. Holzwarth said as the community has changed over those years, the park board has its responsibility to communicate with the community to continue to operate in that effort of their charter. He said over the past several years, from 2014 through 2019, the Claudius Crozet Park Board conducted five surveys of the community, two of which (in 2014 and in 2016) were community-wide surveys to understand what the community's wants and needs were so that they could guide the design of the facility in the best efforts of the community.

Mr. Holzwarth said that over that period of time, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and the Albemarle County Parks and Recreation Association, in 2004 (which was before that time) and in 2019, did a needs assessment for the County. He said that in those assessments, Claudius Crozet Park was identified in both 2004 and 2019 as an ideal central location to have expanded recreational facilities.

Mr. Holzwarth said that as the population has grown in Western Albemarle County as a result of development, the needs for this type of facility have grown. He said they could automatically think about the park and playing fields for youth to make sure that youth is engaged, but Western Albemarle County also does not have adequate facilities (or facilities at all) for the aging population to be active year-round. He said it is a beautiful place to get outside during the summer months, but as it gets cooler, the aging neighbors in the west because sedentary because they do not have a place like a shopping mall to walk at, nor facilities where they can stay active. He said the stakeholders are really all the residents of Western Albemarle County.

Mr. Holzwarth said that in terms of the membership of Claudius Crozet Park and pre-COVID numbers, at its peak was 2,863 members. He said this obviously ebbs and flows with the summer swim season and different times of the year. He said with regard to the after-school program, which is an additional need the project will fill, as the student numbers have grown at Crozet Elementary and Brownsville Elementary, those after-school activities get full. He said currently, Claudius Crozet Park houses 29 children for after-school activity, and the new proposed facility will expand from 29 to between 150 and 250 based upon how many children their operators decide to bring.

Mr. Holzwarth said there were many benefits including the pool, activity, and recreation. He said the reality is that the western end of the county has a great need for facilities not only for youth and the older population, but everyone in Western Albemarle County.

Mr. Holzwarth said in terms of communication, in addition to the companywide surveys Crozet Park Board members have presented several times to the CCA as well as the CCAC regarding this facility starting in 2016, as soon as the Crozet Park Board identified that they were going move forward with this project. He said in addition, they have had four different articles written in the Crozet Gazette.

Mr. Holzwarth asked Mr. Collins if he wanted to speak specifically to the site plan.

Mr. Bivins informed the applicant they had five minutes left of speaking time.

Mr. Collins said this is an expansion of the existing special use permit for this facility for the upgrades they are looking at, not only for the building and for the recreational facility, but also for the amenities on the entire site. He said with these upgrades and changes to the park, they have concentrated not only on building a facility that not only would have all the benefits and meet all the needs of the community for children all the way up to aging adults, but also a way that the site can be used and people can get to the

site. He said it transferred over to the design of the pedestrian connectivity, bike and trail connectivity, and vehicular connectivity with the additional entrance.

Mr. Collins said there is a dispersion of ways to get to the park, whether from the north, east, west, or south. He said there are multiple ways to get to the park based on the grid system. He said he created an exhibit of this that he would show the Commission.

Mr. Collins presented the exhibit showing the grid system around the heart of the park that highlights the trail connections and existing grid system around the park. He said the existing grid system has many roadways being improved, from Eastern Avenue all the way out to the Western Avenue to Old Trail. He said the circles on the exhibit show a quarter-mile radius, half-mile radius, and one-mile radius. He said the one-mile radius serves almost the entire Crozet area that has walkability to this park.

Mr. Collins said the applicant focused on the additional trails and pedestrian pathways to the park. He said once they get to the park, there are trail connections through the park that link up to different neighborhoods. He said this was important not only in terms of the upgrade of the facility itself, but the upgrade of the pedestrian connectivity in Crozet and how Crozet Park is integral in that whole system.

Mr. Collins said he would also touch on the special exception request for the pool itself. He noted that the section of the code that talks about setbacks for a pool is referring to the exterior pool being 75 feet from a property line and 125 feet from a residence because of the noise that comes along with the pool facility. He said they would not want an outdoor pool 25 or 30 feet from a property line with noise, kids, and distractions. He said this is an indoor pool, so all the noise will be contained inside the building, and this building is no bigger than a house in Crozet in R2, R4, or R6 Districts. He said it is not a height that is towering over the community, and the pool is contained within a structure so that the noise is contained and not affecting the residents.

Mr. Collins said the proposed indoor pool itself is 165 feet away from the nearest residence, which is far more than 125 feet, as required in the code. He said it is 30 feet from the property line, but the applicant is also looking to heavily screen and plant that area to enhance the vegetation.

Mr. Collins said in terms of the traffic through the park, on the concept plan, there is a raised sidewalk connection that focuses on pedestrian traffic through the site and not vehicular traffic, so this is already incorporated into the design. He said this would slow down traffic if cars are trying to go through the site which, based on the grid system, there are plenty of routes.

Mr. Collins said the stormwater management facility is a water quality feature behind the building for treatment before it gets released. He offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners if they had questions for the applicant.

Mr. Randolph said he had two questions, with the first being about the new building. He asked who would own the new building, legally.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that the ownership will be Claudius Crozet Park (CCP), which is a 501(c)(3) and will continued to be owned by the community.

Mr. Randolph asked who is financing the new building.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that the applicant has had a series of success over the past decade of public-private partnerships, and so this facility will be built with a combination of private funds, to start, and requests in the future for public funding in assistance of this facility.

Mr. Randolph said as per the March 25, 1997 P3 agreement between the County and CCP, there was an agreement that there would be reduced fees. He asked the applicant if they plan to have reduced fees to ensure there is social equity for people that are residents of Albemarle County that would like to be able to use these facilities, but whose income may make it difficult for a family to be a member.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that this is the foundation of the Claudius Crozet Park 501(c)(3). He said the answer is absolutely a yes, with the commitment that no one will be turned away.

Mr. Clayborne said he had questions that were more about the programmatic pieces of the space. He asked the applicant if they could talk more about the spaces that will be included in the 30,000-square-foot building. He asked if, for example, there will be a kitchen there, since this is a community center, or competition swimming.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that the total square footage is 46,800 square feet of enclosed space, of which 34,200 square feet will be a multipurpose gymnasium, functional training studio, indoor walking track, multiple group exercise studios, a community room for community meetings and gatherings, expanded stay-and-play for youth, and a large cardio and strength area.

Mr. Holzwarth said one will walk into a second structure, which is relegated because of HVAC, which will be a 12,600-square-foot, eight-lane competition pool. He said there is a bit of a swim dynasty with the Western Albemarle Swim Team and some other private swim stakeholders that swim at the pool, even older master swimmers. He said there will be competitions from time to time, but this will not be the primary focus. He said it will be focused on keeping people active.

Mr. Clayborne said he had a couple of questions that pertained to the site. He said he believed he saw in the documents that there is lighting for the baseball fields that was done some time ago. He asked if there will be lighting for the tennis courts and basketball courts.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that at that time, on the site plan, they did not have any additional lighting outside of the lighting of the parking lot itself, for safety. He said as they continue to assess community needs, however, this may come up in the future, though it was not a part of the plan at that time.

Mr. Holzwarth asked if water will be run out to the sports complex (basketball and tennis areas) for outdoor fountains or the like.

Mr. Holzwarth said he was not familiar enough with this to answer the question.

Mr. Collins replied that he was not sure the applicant had gotten to that level, but it is something they can definitely look at during site plan, once they get further along.

Mr. Clayborne said his last question pertained to the pond that he had mistakenly called the stormwater

management pond, and Ms. More corrected him to say it was an actual pond. He said it looked as if there is a walkway that goes around it. He asked if there is any fencing around it to separate those walking on the path to the pond, as he anticipates there would be more children in that area.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that this is currently one of the most actively used items in the park. He said the perimeter trail was generously donated a few years ago to Claudius Crozet Park that is currently an actively used trail with significant use. He said anytime one goes out during daylight hours, there are people walking out on the perimeter trail. He said it does come close to the pond, but he did not find it to be a safety concern at all. He said it is far enough away from the pond, and one would really have to try to go swimming if one wanted to.

Mr. Keller asked the applicant if any thought had been given to dealing with impermeable versus permeable pavement for all the parking. He said there is a great deal of surface parking. He said he looks at this and believes it is called a “park,” but it is starting to look more like a shopping center with a series of physical athletic opportunities. He said he wondered how the applicant was thinking about addressing that in terms of dealing with the water and not having all the runoff on the slopes.

Mr. Keller said he knows there is the tradition of the arts festival in the parking there, but historically, he remembers going there, and much of this was parking in fields before it became such a major event.

Mr. Keller said he also wondered about tree cover and whether there is an interest or ability in this plan to add more shade to this area they all know can be extremely hot in certain months of the year.

Mr. Collins said as far as the parking lot itself, the applicant is looking at options, whether it be permanent pavers or gravel. He said they are keeping some of the area as grass. He said anything that is overflow parking, they are trying to keep as grass so that it maintains that consistency. He said when a parking space is used more than once or twice a week, however, it does need to be a different surface. He said the applicant is comparing asphalt, permanent pavers, and different types of materials. He said some of this will come up during stormwater management design of the final site as well.

Mr. Collins agreed about adding more landscaping and trees to the parking improvements there and the perimeter to help offset some of the additional impervious area, whether it is a parking lot or otherwise.

Mr. Keller said they all know, with the Albemarle County clays, the compaction that occurs over time. He said it would have to be a fairly rare instance of field parking for it not to really become an impact.

Ms. More said she wanted to ask about the special exception. She said she understood the explanation in staff’s report, with the suggestion being that the pool is inside while the 75-foot requirement speaks more to an outdoor pool. She said she understood this, but she still wanted to understand why since as the applicant is programming the site, it seems to her that they might want to avoid having that exception. She said she assumed that because the applicant was asking for it, there was a reason why they thought it made more sense to have it be this way. She said she wanted to hear more about the rationale as to why the applicant chose the design of the site to be such that the exception is needed.

Mr. Collins replied that the way the building is positioned on the site, it interacts with the existing pool there. He said everything is built around the existing pool and facility so that one can have the transfer of connections. He said the old bathhouse and changing rooms all get programmed in with the new facility.

He said the location of the new facility, therefore, must be in relationship to the existing pool. He said they are also trying to preserve much of the greenspace around the existing pool, especially on the north as well as on the west and east sides, as many of those areas are used during swim meets when they expand out and even during day-to-day operations. He said it is nice to have some green grass areas around the concrete pool platform.

Mr. Collins said based on all of this, they are programmed to have the fitness center building at the southwest corner of the site, wrapping around with the locker rooms, and with the pool being added onto the facility. He said this was how the facility was planned out, and it all fits in with the existing parking, expansion of parking, the pond, and everything else.

Ms. More said this helped her to understand. She said another question she had was about the proposed entrance/exit onto Hill Top. She said she wanted to save some of this conversation for later but when she looks at this, though she is not a Traffic Engineer and she understands from the staff report and comments that VDOT will weigh in on the intersection and entrance in the future if the project moves forward, she is concerned that the intersection with Indigo and Hill Top is very close to where the new proposed entrance would be.

Ms. More said she hoped the applicant could speak to a concern of hers and of the community about the proposed entrance construction and what is planned for that. She said she was thinking back to the community meeting, where she felt like she heard an idea that all construction would be routed to the proposed entrance and exit. She said she wanted to hear more about what the plan would be.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that from July 1 through September 20 of 2020 – which was a busy period at the park, even though it was during COVID, because people were looking to get out of their homes – the park averaged 472 cars a day on the counter. He said the park board has talked at length about this in terms of how they can build the facility while keeping stakeholders active, including Peachtree baseball and softball, SOCA, pickleball players, and Crozet Gators. He said the stakeholders in Crozet are many, and the question is to how to keep the park open and active while also building the facility.

Mr. Holzwarth said one conversation the park board had (and they are happy to have more conversations) is to relegate the construction traffic to the back of the park, through the back entrance, so that they are not conflicting with the youth and activity in the park while they are building the facility. He said they can fence off that area fairly easily.

Mr. Holzwarth said if someone were to come up with a better idea where the construction traffic would come in the front of the park and they can still do that, the applicant is all ears. He said in terms of keeping the park active and open during this project (as it will take, from what they have been told, 14 months from start to finish), the question is how to keep the park an active place and open during those 14 months.

Ms. More said this was helpful.

Mr. Bailey said he was thinking about the impervious surface on the conceptual plan. He said the basketball courts to be put in are listed as asphalt, and there are several pervious basketball court alternatives to add drainage systems and other things. He asked what the applicant thought about possibly using alternative pervious materials to help offset the amount of concrete and asphalt suggested.

Mr. Holzwarth shared that one of the uses that came up in both the surveys was that the basketball courts that are currently used quite a bit in the park are not regulation courts, and they are goals that were set up on opposite ends of a parking lot, which is about one and a half times the length of a normal basketball court. He said it really has not been conducive of more organized games at the park, and this was some of the feedback the applicant received.

Mr. Holzwarth said he would not feel comfortable trying to take an activity that people want and try to tweak a service that may not be received well by the basketball community. He said the applicant would rather have pervious parking, and so as they look at that parking area, the goal is not to have another enormous shopping center parking lot with asphalt, and they will be sensitive to try to find a pervious way to make the parking. He said he thinks there are ways to reach the goal Mr. Bailey was asking about.

Mr. Holzwarth said another thing he would share is if they look at where they are dropping the building onto the park, it is being dropped on like an asphalt driveway. He said while they are building an enormous building, not all of the building is taking over greenspace, and so there is a bit of a trade where they are actually dropping the building in terms of impervious structure.

Mr. Bivins said he saw that there were two play areas there now, with one looking very complicated towards the eastern part of the parking, and one being a small [inaudible] outside the present recreation center. He said it looks in the concept plan as if the small one goes away. He asked if it would show up anywhere else or if it was just going away.

Mr. Holzwarth replied that the complicated but fantastic play structure Mr. Bivins saw is a new structure. He said when Albemarle County Parks and Recreation stepped in and helped out the applicant with that playground, one was for younger children and one was for older children, and they took that and created one very nice facility, which is what Mr. Bivins saw. He said the applicant is aware that the playground Mr. Bivins saw at the top of the hill is going away, and the two have been combined at the lower end of the park.

Mr. Bivins said if they look at the new facility in terms of the recreation part of it and the indoor pool, he wondered if the indoor pool was at the same height, looking from outside the building, the same roof level as the recreation, even though it is 1.5 stories. He asked if the rec building is the same height as the pool building.

Mr. Holzwarth asked Mr. Collins to pull up the image if he had it. He said they are very similar. He said there is a bit of a break in the building so as to not have one large structure. He said height-wise, they are very similar.

Mr. Bivins said the applicant may have heard his question about how the owner of the property to the northeast corner is both going to have his or her view obstructed with the building coming close to it, plus a [inaudible] next to the house with people walking their dogs and bicycling, which is why he asked what would happen if one passed that road on the other side of the Crozet Community Building. He said it seems like that person is going to be impacted the most from this wonderful addition to the Crozet community.

Mr. Holzwarth said he did not know if the applicant studied having the entrance moved to the right of the

community. He asked Mr. Collins if he studied that opportunity.

Mr. Collins replied that he looked at that, and it is certainly an option that is not off the table at all. He said this is something that will be fleshed out during the site plan process as well. He said there is the existing driveway that could be improved for the entrance at a cheaper cost than putting in a new road. He said they are also planting trees over in that area to help screen the park in the one spot from Indigo Road, but they could probably work on moving some trees around and making that connection if it is the right way to go. He said this is something the applicant will definitely be looking at.

Mr. Bivins said there is one property owner that is bearing much of the burden for this new enhanced park, and as the applicant moves forward, he would encourage them to spread out some of the burden, as it may be appreciated. He said this was one thing that caught his attention.

Mr. Collins said this made sense.

Mr. Bivins said the other piece the applicant heard him mention to Mr. McDermott is that there is no stop sign coming out of the park on the south entrance, and hopefully, this will be fixed as it seems like something the applicant would want to pay attention to.

Mr. Holzwarth agreed.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing.

Mr. Holzwarth asked if there was any chance they could ask Coach Dan Bledsoe, who had to leave at 8:00 p.m. for another commitment, to speak if he was available.

Mr. Bivins said Mr. Bledsoe could speak from the public, but he was not part of the meeting plan. He said the Commission understood what the project is and that while the swim coach could talk about his programming, this was not necessarily what the Commission was evaluating that evening.

Mr. Schaffer said Mr. Bledsoe did have his hand raised and asked if he could speak from the public first.

Mr. Bivins replied yes.

Mr. Dan Bledsoe said that for the past 12 years, he has been a teacher at Western Albemarle, and he is also the head swimming and diving coach. He said he was in support of the proposed fitness and aquatics facility. He said when he first started at Western, there was not an indoor swimming facility in the community, and the team traveled to the Fairview Swim and Tennis Club in the Belvedere neighborhood from 8:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. in order to practice.

Mr. Bledsoe said this all changed in 2012 with the addition of the Crozet Dome to the outdoor pool at Crozet Park. He said the Crozet Dome was an amazing addition to the community at large. He said with the dome installation, residents of the area were able to stay local and swim in the community.

Mr. Bledsoe said at Western, they immediately saw the impact of having a local facility in which to train. He said that despite practicing in the early morning before the start of school, he saw the participation of the Western team grow from 38 athletes to 58 athletes. He said those numbers have not declined, and

the interest in the team continues to be incredibly high. He said one could tune in that Thursday, March 25, to CBS19 to check out one of the Student Athletes of the Week, who is one of the Western swimmers.

Mr. Bledsoe said he provided those numbers to the Commission because he thinks it is important to show that local access vital if residents are going to participate in an activity at a high rate. He said in terms of why this indoor swimming facility is so important, Mr. Holzwarth brought up the opportunity for low-impact exercise for people of all ages, but it is particularly important for older adults. He said an indoor pool creates an opportunity for seniors to have access to beneficial and effective exercise.

Mr. Bledsoe said that more importantly to him, as someone who has been involved in swimming and grew up with a pool in his backyard for 50 years, it is a public safety issue. He said data from a recent study illustrates the importance of access to a swimming pool. He said 64% of Black children, 45% of Hispanic and Latino children, and 40% of white children have few to no swimming skills. He said these deficiencies have long-term impacts. He said children who do not learn to swim because adults who do not know how to swim. He said when parents have low to no swimming skills, their children are unlikely to have proficient swimming skills. He said this impacts 78% of Black children, 62% of Hispanic and Latino children, and 67% of white children.

Mr. Bledsoe said Black children ages 5-19 drown in swimming pools at a rate that is five and a half times higher than white children in the same age range. He said 79% of children in households with incomes less than \$50,000 have few to no swimming skills. He said access to pools has declined dramatically in the last 20 years.

Ms. Schaffer informed Mr. Bledsoe that his speaking time expired.

Ms. Miki Salzberg, a resident of Crozet, said she is in support of the connection of the Crozet Park, specifically for the reasons of needing good after-school care for her children. She said two years ago, she had to pull her children from the local schools for a year because she was not able to get into the local school's after-school care program and did not have the transportation for them. She said she is an educator on the other side of the mountain and got special permission for her children to attend school there for a year just so that she could have care for them during the school day, as the school day ended much before her school day did across the mountain.

Ms. Salzberg said the availability of having that many more spaces will significantly help the community, which is growing so quickly now. She said it is hard to get after-school care, which is part of a lottery system. She said one child can get in and the other child cannot, and there is no guarantee of transportation if they do find someone who is willing to watch their children after school because the buses are crowded. She said she sees a huge benefit to Crozet expanding, especially for the after-school and summer camp options for the children as well.

Mr. Jacob Feldman said he, his wife, and his daughter live in Parkside Village, where they moved to in February. He said although they are newcomers, they walk to Crozet Park at least twice every day via Hill Top Street. He said rather than moving into Foothills Crossing, they selected a neighborhood that valued greenspace and large trees. He said he believes this is what makes the neighborhood of Parkside Village unique and why he opposes the approval of the special use permit.

Mr. Feldman said as a community member, he believes the proposed commercial project, first, does not

belong in the neighborhood park. He said the Planning Commission has approved a site along Route 250 for recreational facilities, and the commercial establishment may receive up to an additional 985 visitors per day. He said it does not belong in a neighborhood park.

Mr. Feldman said secondly, he believes the proposed commercial project eliminates greenspace. He said it dramatically enlarges indoor recreational spaces and expands parking lots. He said there is already rapidly decreasing greenspace in Crozet as a result of residential development, and the proposed commercial building's accompanying parking is antithetical to preserving that greenspace.

Mr. Feldman said that with organized sports beginning, all the available fields and grassy areas are being used, and even the area surrounding the lake. He said as a family not yet participating in organized sports, there are already very limited spaces available on weekday afternoons and weekends. He said one can park on grass, but they cannot ever get that greenspace back.

Mr. Feldman said he wanted to direct the remainder of his time to the proposed Hill Top Street entrance. He said the Hill Top Street entrance for the proposed commercial project will significantly affect the neighborhood character and safety for residents on Hill Top Street. He said the addition of some of the 985 visitors per day, and the 472 noted over the summer, on Hill Top Street is significantly noticeable to a resident, and it will further increase after Hill Top Street is extended into Foothill Crossing.

Mr. Feldman said that in addition to VDOT's generalized traffic assessment that represents the perspective of the driver, he would ask the Commission to consider how traffic on Hill Top Street will affect residents, given the highly unusual and dynamic impact of the rapidly growing Foothill Crossing community.

Mr. Feldman provided details regarding his concerns of the Hill Top Street entrance. He said first, the increased traffic because of the commercial project is not safe for drivers. He said from the intersection of Indigo Road and Hill Top Street to the current end of Hill Top Street, there are no road markings along the windy street. He said these roads will become more congested and cannot safely accommodate the increased traffic following the extension of Hill Top Street into Foothill Crossing. He said in the staff planning report summary, there is no consideration of the suitability of Hill Top Street's ability to handle the increase in vehicular traffic coming to visit the commercial site.

Mr. Feldman said secondly, the increased traffic is a danger to pedestrians along Hill Top Street.

Ms. Schaffer informed Mr. Feldman that his speaking time expired. She said before moving on to the next person, if there was anyone who emailed her and wanted to sign up to talk that evening, this was the time for them to raise their hand and get in the queue.

Ms. Sarah Kasen said she was representing the Parkside Village Homeowners Association. She said Parkside Village is the neighborhood that borders the park on its northern boundary. She said the association wanted to voice two concerns regarding the special use application.

Ms. Kasen said the applicant proposes that all construction traffic use the park's Hill Top Street access point. She said today, this access point is gated and only used during special events. She said it was stated during the October virtual CCAC meeting that diverting all construction traffic to the Hill Top access point was to avoid disruption to the park's visitors, who currently use the park's main entrance on Park Road.

Ms. Kasen pointed out that Hill Top Street is the only access route to over 80 existing homes and is already congested with construction traffic because it starts at the only access route for Foothill Crossing's most recent buildout phase of an additional 32 homes. She said this single street, Hill Top Street, will therefore soon serve as the only access road for 112 homes.

Ms. Kasen said the association believes it is dangerous to put the additional and significant construction burden on the homeowners whose houses line Hill Top Street as well as the Parkside Village neighborhood – a burden which is unwilling to be borne by the park itself at neither its main entrance, nor an existing secondary entrance on Park Road which currently sits unused. She said therefore, the association respectfully requests that the Planning Commission require construction traffic to use the unused secondary entrance on Park Road.

Ms. Kasen said County Engineers noted concerns regarding screening between the proposed facility and the subdivision. She said the association greatly appreciates such suggestions from the engineers. She said the submitted plan shows the removal of existing mature growth trees at the park's north boundary. She said these trees are the only remaining light and noise abatement features on the entire northern park boundary – a boundary that extends nearly a quarter of a mile along residential neighborhoods. She said their imminent removal leaves no natural screening whatsoever.

Ms. Kasen said it would be reasonable to question the magnitude of disturbances that could possibly come from a park. She said they welcome the sounds of soccer games and pickleball, but there have been significant disturbances over the years – for example, the noise that was created after the pool's install of the dome maintenance system, which literally shook the walls of the neighbors' homes, and one which continues today, which is the lightning alarm siren that frequently goes off during hours in which it should be deactivated.

Ms. Kasen said her point is that there are acceptable disturbances, and there are disturbances that are and should be avoided. She said the association respectfully requests that a specific and detailed screening design plan be required by the County as a condition prior to granting the special use permit.

Ms. Kasen said Parkside Village Homeowners Association has submitted these concerns and others to the Planning Commission via email prior to this meeting. She said it provides additional details on their proposed solutions as well.

Ms. Schaffer informed Ms. Kasen that her speaking time expired.

Mr. Peter Thompson, Executive Director of The Center at Belvedere, formerly known as The Senior Center. He said he was speaking in support of the Claudius Crozet Park and the need for this great community service. He said The Center is a 61-year-old nonprofit organization that positively impacts the community by providing opportunities for key ingredients of realistic healthy aging for people ages 50 and above.

Mr. Thompson said similar to Crozet, they saw a need in the Charlottesville-Albemarle area they have served for 65 years. He said over 10 years ago, after extensive market research and experiences at The Center, they identified the need for healthy aging programs in the greater Charlottesville-Albemarle area, and as stated by the applicant, The Center as well as Claudius Crozet Park has found a need for more indoor recreation spaces to meet the priorities of Albemarle County residents. He said there are some large, lovely parks in the outreaches of the County, but they only meet a small portion of recreation needs.

He said there is a significant shortfall of indoor recreation spaces that can be used year-round in daylight hours and by larger audiences that can use the large parks.

Mr. Thompson said the booming 50-plus population is particularly acute in Albemarle. He said more want to age in place, and the County continues to be a magnet for older adults to relocate there. He said this is a good thing for Albemarle County, and they will continue to meet the needs of the growing aging population. He said facilities that encourage active aging, like those that Claudius Crozet Park are recommending, are key ingredients for meeting this need.

Mr. Thompson said The Center, based on the information of their own research [inaudible] 2025 document several years ago was [inaudible] a two-pronged approach to what Albemarle area residents need from them. He said one is to build a flagship facility in the urban heart of Albemarle and Charlottesville, which became The Center at Belvedere, which opened in 2020.

Mr. Thompson said that because the area has and will continue to grow, both in numbers and in geographic reach, there is a long plan to deliver The Center's programs through more satellite locations. He said it makes no sense for them or for the community to build many versions of The Center at Belvedere all over the area. He said rather, they intend to partner with other entities to deliver the healthy aging programs at which they excel. He said Crozet has always been the first area they identified as having unfulfilled needs and a critical mass of residents to sustain a robust community center.

Mr. Thompson said the proposed Crozet community center expansion is the exact type of partnership The Center has envisioned. He said they know that the Western Albemarle growth demands more amenities to meet the citizens' needs. He said The Center has been communicating with Mr. Holzwarth for many years about this exciting project and look forward to how they would and should be able to work together to meet the increasing demand of healthy aging programs in the area. He said they envision utilizing this new facility as a place where The Center can deliver more of their programs in collaboration with this organization.

Mr. Thompson said they both look forward to working together to help all their neighbors and, for The Center in particular, their older friends to remain active and healthy.

Ms. Schaffer informed Mr. Thompson that his speaking time expired.

Ms. Allie Pesch said she is the Chair of the Crozet CAC. She said at the community meeting, there was no motion for a resolution, but she wanted to share that the overall feedback from the CCAC members was positive.

Ms. Pesch said she would use the remainder of her time to speak not on behalf of the CCAC, but on a personal level. She said personally, she is in support of the proposal and thinks that the community is in great need of expanded facilities at the park. She said while she is sympathetic to the next-door neighbors, especially during the construction phase, and while she takes their concerns seriously, she thinks the park board and Mr. Collins are going to be good neighbors and that, in the end, this facility will serve the community well.

Ms. Pesch said one of the previous speakers referred to the park as a "neighborhood park," and she wanted to say that Claudius Crozet Park is the primary, central, public recreation site for the entire growth

area. She said the park board has prioritized pedestrian access for this park. She said the park itself is a huge part of the Crozet Master Plan and, looking at the map, is in the center of the growth area. She said as the community grows, the park use continues to grow. She said next-door neighbors should know this if they are familiar with the plan. She said the whole Comprehensive Plan prioritizes greenspace in the Rural Areas and development in the Growth Area, and this is a natural development of that.

Ms. Pesch said she thinks it is great that the park board is taking this project on with so much private investment and effort. She said as this moves forward, the area will get some much-needed space.

Ms. Rashmi Ghei, a Crozet resident, said she is a mom to a second-grader at Crozet Elementary. She said she works full-time, and her day does not end when school ends for the day. She said she therefore needs a safe, reliable, and affordable place to send her daughter for after-school care. She said each year, it is very stressful, as there are limited options in Crozet. She said many parents in the community experience this stress as they scramble to find care and hope their children get a spot in one of the programs.

Ms. Ghei said in her case, each year, she applies for the Extended Day Enrichment Program through Albemarle County Schools. She said this is based on a lottery of who gets in. She said last year, there were only 60 spots for the school. She said she also applies through the Crozet YMCA, which is now operated by ACAC. She said the morning registration opens as their spots are limited as well, and she hopes her daughter gets into one of those options. She said bus transportation is also important for many families so their children can get transported to after-school care if needed.

Ms. Ghei said as the community is growing, the demand for the limited, coveted spots is putting a strain on working parents. She said it would be beneficial if the existing programs could expand, but she knows there are space and staffing limitations at these sites.

Ms. Ghei said another need is for expanded summer camp spots. She said because the cost and convenience at Crozet Park in the past has traditionally allowed families a great option to send their kids, her daughter attended camp at Crozet Park the past two summers and enjoyed it, which allowed her to work. She said these spots fill up very quickly, often within a couple of days of registration opening during non-COVID times. She said currently, the physical indoor space at the park is limited. She said she believes that expanding the park will ease the space limitations and allow for more families to utilize the care options.

Mr. Albert Beasley said he and his wife live in Parkside Village, on Cranberry Lane. He said they had been making many notes that evening and listened to what was being said. He said while he thinks there are exciting things about what is being proposed, the problem is that he did not believe he heard anything that helped his feelings about the problems with the infrastructure, especially roads.

Mr. Beasley said he thinks the proposed entrance to the park onto Hill Top will be detrimental to them getting in and out of the neighborhood and for emergency vehicles to get into the neighborhood when needed. He said the addition of the 35 homes behind them in Foothill Crossings gives them a potential 70 cars going in and out of the Parkside Village area, and up and down Hill Top.

Mr. Beasley said he did not hear anyone mention the intersection at Tabor and Route 240. He said while it normally takes him 25 minutes to go from his house to Charlottesville, and that morning, it took him 20 minutes just to get from Tabor Street onto Route 240. He said the traffic is already a problem, and he just

does not know that they are really addressing that.

Mr. Beasley said there must be a solution because he thinks the proposed project will probably add the types of things that people spoke of as needs in the area for children, senior adults, and swimmers. He said the dog leg at Hill Top and High Street is impossible to get through sometimes, and it has become worse over the years. He said now, with the additional construction traffic coming in and out, it has been difficult to get in and out of the area.

Mr. Beasley said he wanted to make sure that as this is being planned, there are plans for ways for people to get in and out. He said they have not had people on the road that much during the pandemic, but when things open up and people go back into work like they had been, they are going to have a real problem trying to get in and out of the neighborhood.

Mr. Beasley said he is concerned they are losing much of the greenspace around them. He said he has concerns about emergency vehicles getting in and out of the neighborhoods. He said he thinks roads must be tantamount to planning so they know people are safe.

Mr. Marc McKenney (5353 Park Road, Westhall neighborhood) said first and foremost, he is in favor of the project. He said he thinks it is a great idea and plan. He said they can fine-tweak it with the community and the CCAC down the road. He said Crozet has grown so much from a planning side that they need facilities to support this.

Mr. McKenney said he wanted to caveat this. He said there was just a child hit on St. George Avenue. He said Park Road has absolutely zero sidewalks to allow the residents in Westhall, Westlake, and Foothill Crossings to take that avenue safely to the park. He said he does not feel comfortable allowing his nine-year-old daughter to walk through the trails in the woods out of fear of her being assaulted. He said there have already been some problems at the park with some teenage boys either breaking into equipment or harassing younger children.

Mr. McKenney said there are concerns about the infrastructure, and while he knows VDOT is responsible for the roads, he wants to make sure that the County is simultaneously planning capital improvement projects to support the growth. He said a 2019 VDOT report had, on average, 1,500 vehicles per day traveling on Park Road from Crozet Avenue. He said this number is only increasing based on the residential that the Planning Commission is approving for rezoning applications and now, they are growing this park to a 30,000-square-foot facility.

Mr. McKenney said when they complete the Downtown Crozet Square, this is even more traffic coming in. He said when they complete the Eastern Avenue connector road to Route 250, this is even more traffic coming in, cutting through these neighborhoods. He said he wants to see capital improvement projects from the County mirror the growth and to enable families to allow their children going out on family walks or riding their bikes safely.

Mr. McKenney said in November, before they had a County stakeholder meeting with issues in the Westhall neighborhood, there was a DUI on Park Road that went through the fencing at Crozet Park, through the baseball fence, and back out onto the road. He said the time of day is irrelevant, and the fact is that there are 1,500 cars per day traveling on this road in front of the park.

Mr. Phil Kirby, a resident of Parkside Village, said it is highly debatable as to the reason for all the furious stampede of development in Crozet. He said whatever it is, somehow, this has justified allowing developers to scratch out every inch of the town's profitable real estate, unsupported by infrastructure and heedless of how it effects existing neighborhoods. He said property values, safety, and greenspace are all being negatively impacted. He said although the development was expected, it did not have to be done this way. He said Crozet Park's request is an example of how the urgency of development has gone out of control.

Mr. Kirby said Parkside Village has been the park's neighbors for 18 years and has supported them on every level. He said he has donated time and money to the building of the dome. He said he wonders why the president of the park board was not making the presentation that evening. He asked why the park has not met with the neighborhood associations around it to discuss the project. He asked why the park has not provided a drawing that shows the physical scale of the building looming over its neighbors.

Mr. Kirby asked what will happen when this for-profit enterprise fails. He said this project, regardless of what staff's report says, will substantially change the character of the neighborhoods around it due to its physical size. He asked the Commission to picture three quarters of an acre in footprint, over 30 feet high, and with its parking and traffic requirements that all the Commissioners acknowledged that evening, across the street from or next to their house. He asked if it would change the character of their neighborhood. He said this proposal is for a for-profit business entity that will invite 985 car trips every day into what is not a commercial district, but a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Kirby said at the last Planning Commission meeting he attended, the CCAC, staff, and public participants agreed that redesignating the site at Route 250 adjacent to Brownsville Elementary was an appropriate place for a recreational facility. He said it makes sense in that location for a daycare to be closer to the schools that use it and where parking might even be shared.

Mr. Kirby said he has been very upset about the way the development directly around him has been handled, and he has become engaged in providing comment on what he learned afterward were by-right applications. He said he was told his comments would be important but found that "by right" means that while the public can say whatever it wants, it does not matter.

Mr. Kirby said that if the applicant wants to change the exit onto Hill Top from a special event exit only to a full-time entrance/exit, they should be required to show that impact now – not during the site plan later, when public comment can be ignored. He said resolution of the configuration of the intersection, the school bus stop, and bike trails there should be required before this application is recommended for approval.

Mr. Thomas Adajian (5643 Hill Top Street) said his property actually touches the park, and he can see the pond from his deck. He said he does think that Crozet needs better park facilities, but he thinks there are serious problems with the application. He said he thinks, as the last speaker said, it is not realistic to think that this two-story, 46,000-square-foot building 30 feet from the street is not going to affect the character of the neighborhood, with no screening. He said he thinks this is just not plausible. He said it absolutely will have a significant effect on the neighborhood.

Mr. Adajian said he thinks traffic will be a problem. He said he agreed with Mr. Kirby that the County should, at present, require the applicant to spell out how a new entrance would work, rather than kicking

this down the road.

Mr. Adajian said if three-quarters of this area is to be paved, the sense in which it is greenspace is purely nominal. He said he agrees with the comment that this will be something that is called a “park.” He said if the County cares about that (and they should), why not require permeable surfaces. He asked why they would not require detailed screening and that the applicant addresses community concerns about traffic and a new proposed entrance.

Mr. Adajian said the idea that future sidewalks and pathways internal to the park will solve traffic problems is hard to understand. He said that people will suddenly put their cars aside and walk to the park does not seem plausible.

Mr. Adajian said it is a beautiful little park, and the community needs these things, but concerns with traffic, the nature of the neighborhood, greenspace, and commercial development in a residential neighborhood (i.e., ACAC, a for-profit outfit) are all things that need to be addressed before this is approved.

Mr. Bivins closed the public hearing. He asked the applicant if he wanted to use his three minutes of time to wrap up before the Commission discussion.

Mr. Holzwarth thanked the Planning Commission for their consideration. He said this project has been a long time coming for the community of Crozet. He said it has been executed with a lot of thought and detailed planning, and the applicant looks forward to moving the project along.

Mr. Bivins brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to make a number of comments. She said first, in terms of the substantial, mature shade trees that are proposed for removal, while she knows there is some screening proposed, because of the environmental value of the trees, if this additional facility and new pool, etc., were to be approved, she thinks that the trees should be replaced on an inch-per-inch caliper basis. She said to explain that, it would be common to see something such as cutting down 10 trees and replacing them with 10 small starter trees. She said this would take 20-40 years to reach the same dimensions and provide the same benefits for shade, noise abatement, air pollution, mitigation, and reducing urban heating.

Ms. Firehock said she is not in support of adding the access at Hill Top because of the curvature of the road in that location and the fact that if one looks at the road network farther away from just around the park, she does not believe they get a lot of advantage in terms of traffic flow into and out of the area. She said she thinks the detriment to the residents is substantial in terms of adding a lot of additional traffic to a small neighborhood street.

Ms. Firehock said she always appreciates her colleagues’ insights, and so she was anxious to hear what their thoughts were, as she may change hers after they deliberate. She said at that time, however, she was not in support of adding this size and scale of a facility to what is a neighborhood greenspace. She said she believes it is not in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan of the parks and greenspace that it is designated for. She said she thinks the facility is out of scale with the park and is not in the right location for such a facility. She said she does not at all debate that such facilities are needed in the Crozet area, but she does not think that tucking all of that massing into a neighborhood park is the right solution.

Ms. Firehock said her opinion differs from staff in that she finds the additional 985 vehicle trips per day to be a substantial impact. She said she understands the Traffic Engineers look at it from how much time one has to wait at an intersection, but she is looking at it in terms of the disturbance of the quality of life of the people who live along those streets and who did not necessarily expect to have something of that scale in the middle of a small-scale residential neighborhood.

Ms. Firehock said she would leave her comments at that for the moment. She said she thinks there are other things that, as Mr. Keller said earlier, could be done in terms of permeable pavement. She said there are options for reinforced grass called “grasscrete” that can be used for overflow parking.

Ms. Firehock said she was struck by the applicants talking about swim meets and different competitions, and she started thinking about buses transporting teams to this site. She said it just does not seem, to her, to be the right scale of use for a small neighborhood park, and she says this with more of 20 years of experience in doing small-scale park design. She said this is where she was coming from, but she could change her mind, and she looked forward to hearing what the rest of the Commissioners had to say.

Ms. More said she wanted to let others talk before she would go through a couple of questions she had about traffic, but to quickly add some context as someone who has been at the park and enjoys the amenities there, there are currently swim meets happening at the park, and they have been doing so for years. She said she was not familiar with buses coming in, though she supposed there perhaps were buses of different groups coming in for competitions. She said she knows the nights for swim meets are very busy.

Ms. More said from her observation, many of these activities are already happening at the pool where the proposed expansion would be, and there simply is not enough space for all these things to happen throughout the day. She said there is swim team, water aerobics, people who just want to enjoy swimming, and swim lessons. She said the way she sees it is that the goal is to allow for those things that are already happening to continue. She said she does not think it is to create many swim meets that they are not already having, as they have been having those for years. She said having all those things happen in one pool has gotten things to the point where it is difficult to find the time to manage it all.

Ms. More said in her mind, she worries that people think of this as a neighborhood park, as she does not think it is a park that is only meant to be enjoyed by a couple of neighbors. She said it is a centrally-located community park.

Ms. More said she would let others talk about the valid concerns the neighbors have about impacts to them and traffic, but she wanted to be clear that she was reacting to the application that was before the Commission, and she did not know that she was being asked to think about where there might be a facility elsewhere in Crozet. She said when she does think about this, though, there are not many spots where it makes sense, so she does think it makes sense to expand the services that the park has to offer and the amenities there.

Ms. More clarified that although there is not anything approved, there is interest (which is completely separate from this application) in the site on Route 250 that is tucked behind the school. She said that facility’s vision is to offer a completely different type of service than what she thinks is being envisioned here.

Ms. More said she would let others go through their points, but she did want a chance to ask Mr. McDermott a couple of questions about traffic.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. More if she wanted to do that or wait.

Ms. More said she knew that Mr. Randolph wanted to speak and that she just wanted to add her comments to Ms. Firehock's.

Mr. Bivins said Ms. More could come back to Mr. McDermott later with traffic questions.

Mr. Randolph said he wanted to thank Ms. Firehock for channeling his inner thoughts as well. He said he has the same thoughts about the loss of the beautiful trees. He said he has concerns about the Hill Top exit and the impact on that neighborhood.

Mr. Randolph said he would ask the question if the Commission should be supportive of a car-intensive, asphalt-intensive recreational use in a current greenspace surrounded by residential streets and communities where there does not seem to be any evidence that the applicant has done a lot of fence mending with those communities in moving to a win-win situation. He said the level of opposition from the surrounding communities to this park, with a voice of two in the crowd that supports the project, has been firmly uniform in opposing it. He said he also has concerns that 985 trips per day, as he indicated earlier, is a substantial impact.

Mr. Randolph said what has been coursing through his head that evening was the Joni Mitchell lyrics, "They paved paradise and put up a parking lot." He said his other thought is that the community does not know what they have until it's gone, when all of this greenspace disappear with two very large buildings going up. He said this is no longer Claudius Crozet Park, but the Claudius Crozet Recreational Facility with surrounding grounds.

Mr. Randolph said he felt the Commission was being asked to look at a proposed use in a location where that use is incompatible with the location. He said this is what he has been wrestling with because he feels there is an absence of bike facilities, a lack of specificity in terms of the design of the two buildings, and a lack of helpful traffic information. He said 985 is a huge number. He said if he sat and watched 100 cars per hour go by, then he would not be living on a road or a street, but on an avenue.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks that fundamentally, the issue is that there has not been an adequate level of consultation with the surrounding communities on this project. He said it is well and good to have CCAC sign onto this. He said they broadly represent the interests of the Crozet community at large, but there are micro-communities to the north, south, east, and west, and he does not see the level of consultation with them in hearing and trying to address their concerns.

Mr. Randolph said all of these are major concerns for him but he, too, was anxious to hear what other Commissioners had to say about this. He said he would retain an open mind till the end.

Mr. Carrazana said he has spent many a weekend in the park. He said both his boys went through Peachtree baseball, then on to Greenwood, where he coached for many years. He said he knows the park well. He said he was there recently since having not been there for a couple of years, and what struck him

was the amount of green that is gone from the park. He said there was always a need for shade trees, and he thinks there has been an attempt to plant some trees. He said he remembers playing in the lower field, with a beautiful green backdrop there, but there is a mound of dirt there.

Mr. Carrazana said he does think the development had an opportunity to integrate with the park and take advantage of some of the areas that were less developed in how they think about extending greenspace and shade opportunities, integrating with the traffic patterns that are there now with lots of baseball and swimming activity and people crossing the driveway as one comes in, the arts festival, and so forth.

Mr. Carrazana said in the current plan, which he understands is conceptual and that there is not yet a fully vetted site plan or design, what he sees from a conceptual standpoint as a planner and architect is that he feels it is lacking. He said it is lacking from a massing standpoint and how it is integrated from an articulation standpoint. He said there is a lot that can improve, and he hopes the developers heed the wise counsel of this committee, as they talk about sustainability elements (which are lacking). He said the impervious pavers, to him, is something that should be part and parcel of this project. He said he did not hear anything about cutoff lights and the approach to night skies.

Mr. Carrazana said he did not see much in the conversation of this project and in the concept to help him believe there is a sustainable approach consistent with the quality of Crozet Park.

Mr. Bailey said he had not visited the park, so he did not have the perspective that Ms. More or Mr. Carrazana has. He said he does have the perspective as a homeowner in Belvedere, neighbor to The Center, and neighbor to the SOCA field house that went up in the neighborhood and understands the scale of that building next to residences, and he does think that this is somewhat similar in scale to what is being proposed. He said one would never understand the impact of it until it was actually built, and it is big. He said one can see it as one enters Belvedere to the back.

Mr. Bailey said he is grateful for it, and there were traffic studies done for it on how much traffic there would be, and it was not anywhere close to 985 trips for the SOCA facility, but the neighbors do recognize the increase, especially during soccer times.

Mr. Bailey said he thinks this does warrant more consideration of where the proposed building is put. He said he supports the idea that the Hill Top Street entrance does not make much sense from a traffic perspective. He said he did not have a full picture, but when he looks at the conceptual plan of Downtown Crozet and how the traffic will route, he does have concerns about Park Street, Hill Top Street, and having two different infrastructures including the sidewalks for the safety of people moving throughout this straight, and how Hill Top dumps into Tabor that gets to Route 240.

Mr. Bailey said he has concerns about this as well as about using it as a construction entrance. He said he understands the desire of keeping the park open, knowing that if they used the front park, it would likely cut off access to the pond and walking around it. He said it does seem to be staging many construction vehicles closer to residences, however, which places a lot of burden on those residences for that construction period of 14 months.

Mr. Bailey said overall, he does see this as more of a community park than a neighborhood park, so he is broadly supportive of having increased facilities if they are done well and are thought out with balancing the impervious nature, the placement of them, and the safety and traffic concerns that have been

expressed. He said as it was presented in the conceptual plan, he would have a hard time supporting the application in its current form.

Mr. Keller said he came into the meeting with the idea of being supportive of the project and asking for a number of conditions to be added to the staff conditions for him to be able to vote for it. He said he had to say, however, that Ms. Firehock spoke to his inner gut as a professor of landscape architecture who has thought about parks and park design his entire career. He said he thinks that as Mr. Bailey was saying, is this is going to be a community park, then he does not think it is the right location for the community park.

Mr. Keller said he thinks there is another hidden issue where, as they are peeling back history, the Commission has a responsibility to talk about, and that is that if this is a swim club from the 1950s, it was part of the segregation history in Virginia. He said it was good to hear the swim coach talk about the desire to expand the young people who would become involved with that, and this might be one answer. He said when he puts this together with its location in the center of a neighborhood area, however, he thinks what is being proposed is changing this from what it has historically been so that a land swath or other area should be found for this facility.

Mr. Keller said finally, he wondered about the private versus public facilities and whether this ultimately needs to be a public park. He said perhaps this is what Mr. Randolph was getting at with asking the series of questions he did about what the relationship is. He said he does not have a problem with the concessionaires. He said there are a number of great parks, including national parks, that have a long history of concessionaires and changing concessionaires.

Mr. Keller said he does not share the public concern about the public-private conflict, but he is questioning the location as the Commission was hearing these many concerns. He said it was not so much because of the surrounding neighborhoods and what they think, but he is considering what the best location is for the numbers of individuals that would use this. He said the Commission had been hearing about the positives such as the daycare and the broad sense of swimming, from teaching a young person to swim up through elderly exercise classes and everything in between.

Mr. Keller said if the Commission decides to support this, he had a list of seven or eight additional conditions to build upon it. He said at that point, however, he was fine to go along with Ms. Firehock.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. More if she wanted to comment again.

Ms. More replied yes. She said she had some questions about traffic, but she was not sure she would do that at the moment after hearing the reactions. She said she agrees with many of the concerns the community has brought up, particularly about traffic. She said Tabor, which is a street that is not mentioned as much, feeds into Hill Top, Park Road, and High Street, which all had to bear the traffic from one development after another and all feed through these neighborhoods, which she is very sensitive to. She said she does think there are some things Mr. McDermott could share with the Commission that would help people understand some things that are happening that would help to alleviate some of those traffic concerns.

Ms. More said she heard one speaker talk about extra connections being created and while more traffic comes through, it also helps traffic move out of those areas without having to come through only one

place. She said she definitely have a different reaction to the plan itself, and while she struggled trying to balance wanting to know more now about lighting, stormwater management, and other things she will expect the Commission to find out if this moves forward in site planning. She said she appreciates that people want to know that level of detail, and she agrees that some of it is lacking, which is making it difficult for the Commission and possibly the community to reaction to it.

Ms. More said she does not have such a negative reaction to the size and scale of the building because she sees the need in Crozet for something like this. She said it is an enhancement of what is already being offered onsite. She said with parking lots, she does see the greenspace disappearing, but in driving there to reorient herself and imagine this plan on this property, while she did not want to dismiss the benefits of having the greenspaces, she does think some spaces are underutilized.

Ms. More said when she looks at this, she thinks there is a lot happening. She said it is probably a squeeze to get it all in, and she appreciates why it is being done. She said she sees an attempt to try to preserve some of the greenspaces there, make use of some parking lots and things that do not make sense now to create the space that the community needs.

Ms. More said to Mr. Carrazana's point about looking through the ballfields and seeing all dirt, this is all residential construction and not the park. She said trees had been there, and there were more gone than what should have been taken down. She said it is something that is a huge change in the way it looks at the park, but she thinks having all the development there makes her feel the need for something like this to happen in the area even more.

Ms. More said she was not saying this to minimize the voices that expressed concern, with many of those coming from the immediate neighbors, but she thinks there are many voices in the community that the Commission was not hearing that evening that would express their desire to have something like this. She said as she thinks as a Planning Commissioner about where something like this would go, there is a tendency for the Commission to say they like an idea but that it should be elsewhere, but she does not know where that would be. She said the Commission was not being asked to decide that.

Ms. More said she agrees that there is a lot that probably needs to get sorted out, and there is probably more than what they could say would happen at a stage down the road, but she would encourage a continued attempt to have this project happen on this property.

Mr. Clayborne said he likes the program of the space for this site. He said it seems like it is something that is definitely needed. He said coming into this, he was onboard with staff's report but now, he was hearing his colleagues making him waver. He said he would be in favor of trying to work something out, like Mr. Keller suggested, and have a list of conditions. He said he did agree there were some sensitivities that were being missed, but at the same time he felt that for the greater good, it is a good project. He said he would be in favor of trying to push it through and the Commission saying what they want.

Mr. Bivins said he understands the facilities there are woefully overused and overcapacity. He said he did not know how this would be corrected because this is not slated to be a County park. He said he thinks there will always be a need for some sort of private nonprofit relationship, and how the park does that is something that is best left to the park. He said it is not his role to manage the decision between that particular C3 and how they go about doing business. He said given what they are asking the Commission to do, his sense was to figure out whether or not he felt comfortable with this project happening in this

particular place, in this particular manner.

Mr. Bivins said he is extremely concerned about the setbacks, and he is not in support of the special exception. He said whether or not it is 100 feet or so or 35 feet, the 100 feet or so is not to the home, but to the property line, but he needs to be concerned in the same way that the Commission was concerned with the Yancey setback, where there was a movement to talk about where the machinery was to the house as opposed to where the property line was.

Mr. Bivins said this is a particular concern for him when there is a desire to not only come upon that piece of property with the requested setback, but also putting a road through. He said this is something he has significant concern about and how the road would enter Hill Top, as a number of his colleagues had spoken about. He said this is a significant reservation for him.

Mr. Bivins said he could somewhat appreciate how the concessionaire has been trying to program there [inaudible]. He said they are a for-profit entity, and they are looking at how to manage the square footage to maximize and get the number of bodies they hope to get there in order to have the kinds of programs serving [inaudible] in the Crozet community while at the same time, making this a positive cash flow experience for them.

Mr. Bivins said he would have liked to see more, as he feels this is going to significantly change the feeling of this particular community park. He said while it does not feel like his role to insert himself with the C3 and their vendor, he is concerned that there probably is a different solution. He said he did not know how he would even get to a "yes" because he is not in favor of the setback, nor of the road going there. He said if there was a way to pull the road out and deal with the setback, it would be a "yes" for him.

Mr. Randolph said Mr. Bivins posed a good question about the P3 and the Commission's role and relationship with it. He said the only point he would make is that given the fact that the County has had a 36-year relationship with CCP, the use of this site has been imbued with a County dimension for almost 40 years. He said he thinks it is inescapable for the Planning Commission not to feel that it has a role in weighing in, and not so much on the size of the buildings, scale, and character. He said some of that is appropriate for the Commission, but it is totally consistent with their role as a Planning Commission to be talking about the P3 and what the best use is on the land.

Mr. Randolph said if there were not any County dimension to this, he would agree with Mr. Bivins' point, but this was part of the reason he wanted to go back and find out the length and depth of the County relationship with CCP and the role that the County has played all the way through. He said this has been an ongoing P3 for Albemarle County since November 1985, and it will be based on the remarks that evening where there is an intention to come back to the Board and ask for some financial support of this park, that 36 years will not be the end of it, and it will continue on. He said he did not think it was something the Commission should wrestle with when he feels it is explicit that the Commission has this role.

Ms. More said it felt like she was hearing that there were enough concerns that people did not want to see this move forward, and she shared many of those concerns. She said she was not going to recommend denial because she would prefer to see a scenario in which they try to push this forward with many conditions like what Mr. Keller may have written down and hers as well. She said she heard what other people said and shares those concerns, so if this is how people felt, someone could make that

recommendation for denial. She said otherwise, she still felt, as she did coming into this and similar to what Mr. Clayborne said, they could move forward in a way that recommends approval for something that the community needs, but trying to establish expectations to improve it and answer questions.

Mr. Randolph said he could not speak for Ms. Firehock, Mr. Bailey, or Mr. Keller on the issue, nor the Chair, but he did not necessarily think that anyone was saying “denial” as much as they think that this project can be strengthened and become a better proposal. He said he would much rather see a deferral than a denial. He said as Mr. Carrazana pointed out, there is an opportunity to have a much more creative proposal than what the Commission had seen to date.

Ms. More agreed. She said in an effort to move forward, she was suggesting the option of approval with a laundry list of conditions, or denial with many suggestions about things that should be improved that were brought up. She said in the face of many things that people were seeking clarity on or wanting change, it was the applicant’s choice and not hers to request a deferral. She said she was just trying to set the path forward for how they might move through the rest of the conversation.

Mr. Holzwarth asked if he could make a request for a deferral, with the caveat that the applicant receives the list of concerns from the Commissioners so they can come back.

Mr. Bivins replied that Mr. Holzwarth certainly could request a deferral.

Mr. Holzwarth asked if, as part of that request, he could get a list of the concerns so the applicant could address those concerns, then come back.

Mr. Bivins replied that the Commissioners would pass those concerns through staff, and then ask the applicant to sit with staff in the future to respond to that.

Mr. Holzwarth said that with this in mind, he wanted to request a deferral from the Commission and see if the applicant could make that happen through staff.

Ms. More moved to defer the application. She asked Mr. Herrick if they would move to a date uncertain.

Mr. Herrick replied that this was up to the Commissioner making the motion. He said it did not sound as if there was a date specific in mind, at that point. He said if the motion was for an indefinite deferral, this could be the motion.

Ms. More moved for an indefinite deferral.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Herrick if the motion to defer needed to be made for both items.

Mr. Bivins said they were going to do both items.

Mr. Herrick asked the applicant to clarify whether he was requesting a deferral of both items.

Mr. Holzwarth asked for a deferral for both items, adding that the applicant would come back with the concerns for both items addressed.

Mr. Herrick asked Ms. More to clarify whether she was moving for a deferral of both items.

Ms. More confirmed that she was moving for deferral of both items.

Mr. Keller seconded the motion.

Ms. More said for discussion, she would add that as a part of the communication the Commissioners would have with Mr. Reitelbach to have the applicant have a list of all the things that were discussed in a way that is concise and helpful, she thinks that what also may be beneficial is that there had been communication from the public such that although it was reflected in the comments the applicant heard that evening, there were new things that came through, and she thinks there is a lot of good information there she thinks the applicant could benefit from. She said she thinks they should pass on all those things that would not have made it into the packet so that the applicant can see some of the detail and thoughtfulness that went into the questions and concerns.

Mr. Bivins noted this suggestion. He said that along with the list that the Commissioners will formulate, they will add any communications that came to them as public communications, particularly the entire package being included in that between Mr. Reitelbach, Mr. Holzwarth, Mr. Collins, and Mr. Rapp.

The motion to defer carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Bivins asked staff how the Commissioners could gather this information into a form that would be useful and constructive.

Mr. Rapp suggested that staff could get together to compile a list of the comments they heard that evening. He said there were several themes around transportation, greenspace, layout, stormwater management, impervious surface, the impact on the surrounding communities, and traffic connections. He said staff would compile all of this and have a meeting with the applicant to work through some of those ideas with them and hopefully provide them with some guidance about how to address this moving forward.

Mr. Bivins asked if once this is done, staff could circulate this to the Commission so that they can add to the list if they wish. He asked if this was an appropriate way to move forward.

Ms. Firehock agreed.

Mr. Keller said he believed Mr. Rapp hit on all the points and that if the list could be circulated through, the Commission to add anything more specific to it.

Mr. Bivins encouraged Mr. Holzwarth and Mr. Collins to sit with staff to see if there is a way forward on this. He said the Commission is hopeful that these features can be added to Crozet Park.

Regular Item

The 2020 Annual Planning Commission Report

Mr. Rapp said he attached a memo to the 2020 annual report. He said there had been an incorrect expiration date on quite a few of the Commissioners' terms that was pointed out and corrected, with an

updated version posted.

Mr. Rapp said the Commission has worked through a unique time. He said he had not even met some of the Commissioners in person, and he did meet others during one meeting. He said the pandemic has made for an interesting year. He said he would highlight the virtual world they have been in, as well as the fact that they have conducted 26 meetings throughout the 2020 year, which was quite a bit and almost at the levels of the previous two years.

Mr. Rapp said he would highlight some of the comparisons to the previous years so it would start a benchmark, which is something he would like to build on moving forward so that they can see how they stack up in future years.

Mr. Rapp said he also wanted to highlight some of the unique projects that were coming through, with the two he picked being Rivers Edge and Bamboo Grove. He said these are two very unique projects on very constrained properties that created unique solutions to provide affordable housing integrated into the natural features of the sites and surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Rapp said he wanted to thank the Commission for working with staff throughout the year. He said they had some stumbles in converting to virtual and trying to figure things out, but he thinks they accomplished a very productive year. He said hopefully, they can get back to in-person meetings soon. He said he believed it was an effective year as they navigated over to Zoom.

Mr. Rapp said he was happy to answer any questions on the format of the report. He said he knows that in previous years, some Commissioners had pointed out the Indicators of Progress Report in comparison to the Comprehensive Plan. He said this is certainly something that he would like to find a way to continue, but as the Commission knows, they are a bit staff constrained in trying to manage throughout the past year. He said it is a heavy lift to do that, but they certainly do not want to ignore it, and he would like to find a way to incorporate that in future reports and materials they work on.

Mr. Bivins said there were some Commissioners that would hold Mr. Rapp to that because there was a piece that was not only lifted up as being recognized as an excellent report, but it also had a way of framing for the community the full scope of what goes into creating the place they live. He said this was a way to move forward while also measuring their success, as well as including what has been done and what could be taken away. He said others may have a more elegant way of saying that, but he would share that since Mr. Rapp said it, it would need to become a reality.

Mr. Keller said he thought it was an excellent summary report, but he was extremely disappointed that they have not continued with the measures. He said there are a number of previous Commissions that called for something like this and did not see it happen. He said this was a legacy that some of the Commissioners inherited, to work to try to get that component in. He said it seems to him that they have a series of reports they see that come out quarterly that would only take a few hours to pull together, to at least have some of the data for the past year so that there would be a continuation of flow since the outstanding work of Ms. Elaine Echols, Mr. Andrew Gast-Bray, and Mr. Andrew Knuppel.

Mr. Keller encouraged Mr. Rapp to think about if there are other parts he could include in this report, even if it is incomplete compared to the 2016 report, and especially since they are moving into the Comprehensive Plan update. He said this is important data that Planning Commissions have been asking

for for decades, and they had it. He said for any Commissioners who were not aware of the 2016 report, he was sure Mr. Rapp would be glad to share it with them so that they can see what an interesting benchmark they had at that point in time.

Mr. Keller said as Mr. Rapp stated, there were many things that impacted things, he thinks they all did an outstanding job, and the summary captures that. He said he thinks that the availability of that data was very helpful for everyone from the homeowner in a certain area of the County to the people who want to do economic development. He said with its tie into major points of the Comprehensive Plan, he hopes this data is something they do not lose.

Mr. Rapp noted Mr. Keller's comments and agreed it is very valuable information, especially moving forward. He reiterated that the three people who had prepared that report in the past are no longer with the County, and they still have other vacancies as well that are frozen. He said they can certainly hope to get to that point when they have the capacity to produce that type of report. He said it is certainly valuable, especially moving forward with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Keller moved to receive the 2020 Annual Report.

Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion.

Mr. Bivins suggested to Mr. Rapp that perhaps there is a way to put an appendix in of the annual data.

Mr. Rapp said staff would do their best.

The motion carried unanimously (7:0).

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – March 17, 2021

Mr. Rapp said the March 17 meeting with the Board of Supervisors was a busy one and included the second work session to start the Comprehensive Plan update. He acknowledged that he should have given the Commission an update on what staff was going to talk about with the Board, but at that point, they had not had any discussions about content in the Comprehensive Plan. He said it has been very high-level in trying to estimate. He said staff thinks they will have a pre-planning phase of about six months or so, and a goals and objectives phase of roughly another nine months, and a production phase of a year or so.

Mr. Rapp said they are trying to gauge a timeline as to what a Comprehensive Plan update might take. He said they are short quite a few resources and are determining what those additional resources might be so that they can handle the heavy lift. He said staff had that conversation with the Board, who clearly dictated that they would like to see some specifics on content, so staff feels it is time to come back to the Planning Commission to start that discussion. He said staff would like to have an internal brainstorm to put together some options and talking points, then come back to the Commission at their next work session in April. He said hopefully, they can narrow down some specific things they can update within the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Rapp said some of the direction from the Board is to do things in a much shorter timeframe and identify some things they can accomplish quickly so that they can move forward to a Zoning Ordinance rewrite of a significant nature. He said he planned to put a work session on the schedule with the

Commission in April. He said there would be a couple of public hearings that same evening as well for the Housing Policy as well as for form-based code. He said both of those came very close to adoption, but there was a little more work to do.

Mr. Rapp said there is a Comprehensive Plan amendment with the Housing Policy, so that needs to come back to the Commission, but staff did get some great feedback from the Board on a few items. He said one thing they will want to discuss further and figure out is the requirement for 60% AMI versus 80% AMI for rental units, which was a topic of debate with the Board as to where that threshold should be.

Mr. Rapp said this discussion also led into form-based code, which mirrors the Housing Policy for some of the requirements there. He said since it is a by-right overlay, staff tried to incorporate some of the things they typically accomplish through a rezoning for affordable housing. He said they want to make sure those two align.

Mr. Rapp said the Board also talked about some additional clarity for what the transition would be from Core to Flex to Edge as far as building types, form, shape, and streetscapes. He said staff will do some graphic work to clarify some of that. He said Fashion Square Mall, for instance, is a good case study that staff will start to work at, and they will flesh some of this out as well with the Commission before bringing it back to the Board as staff would love to get the Commission's input on those two things. He said it would surely be a busy month or two ahead.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Rapp if he wanted to talk about any of the legislative acts that were sent out.

Mr. Rapp replied that there were not any on March 17.

Committee Reports

There were no reports.

Old/New Business

Mr. Bivins informed the Commissioners that starting in perhaps six months, the High Street/Market Street/Belmont Bridge area will become a juggernaut. He said there are three different projects that will be happening there. He said they will be starting the bridge and then, there is a Smart Scale project that comes down Market Street, wraps around, and goes into High Street. He mentioned the Tarleton Oaks development as well. He said the whole area there is something that people would want to be aware of for a certain amount of time that could be a mess.

Mr. Bivins said the Commission would have their next meeting in two weeks and asked Mr. Rapp if he would be sending the Commissioners a new calendar for April.

Mr. Rapp said there were quite a few public hearings coming up at both meeting dates in April.

Before adjourning, Mr. Bivins encouraged everyone to continue wearing masks and to be mindful of emerging COVID variants.

Items for Follow-Up

There were no items.

Adjournment

At 9:22 p.m., the Commission adjourned to April 6, 2021, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 04/06/2021
Initials: CSS