

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Work Session and Regular Meeting
Final Minutes December 10, 2024**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, December 10, 2024.

Members attending were Fred Missel, Chair; Karen Firehock; Lonnie Murray; and Nathan Moore.

Members absent: Luis Carrazana, Vice-Chair; Corey Clayborne; Julian Bivins.

Other officials present were Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Tori Kanellopoulos, Principal Planner; Scott Clark, Conservation Program Manager; Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning; Syd Shoaf, Senior Planner; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Missel established a quorum.

Public Hearing

ZMA202300017 & SP202300020 Chestnut Grove Manufactured Home Park Community

Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning, said that he would be providing staff's presentation for the Chestnut Grove Manufactured Home Park rezoning and special use permit with the special exceptions. He said that first, he would identify the property in question. He said that this property is located in southern Albemarle County, approximately 15 minutes from Scottsville. He said that it is situated on the south side of Chestnut Grove Road, approximately one mile west of the Chestnut Grove Road and James River Road intersection.

Mr. McDermott said that the existing conditions of the site included that the property was approximately 50 acres, heavily forested, and featured a Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) buffer and areas of critical slopes throughout the property. He said that provided was an aerial view of the site, which shows the property's layout looking from the north towards the south. He said that the property was generally in this location along Chestnut Grove Road, and the surrounding areas exhibited a rural character with various rural uses, including low-density single-family residential, forests, open space, and agricultural uses.

Mr. McDermott said that the zoning for this property was rural area, which permitted single-family homes at 0.5 acres per unit and agriculture and farm wineries, country stores, and by special use permit, would allow community centers, private schools, and daycare facilities. He said that the Comprehensive Plan designation was Rural Areas, the purpose of which is to preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural historic scenic resources with low-density residential.

Mr. McDermott said that the applicant's proposal was to rezone the property from Rural Area to R-4 and request a special use permit to allow a manufactured home park. He said that R-4 was the lowest-density residential zoning that allowed manufactured home parks with a special use permit. He said that the proposed concept plan was on the screen, which showed the proposed

layout. He said that the property would be served by two entrances on Chestnut Grove Road, and the proposed mobile home or manufactured home units would be located along this road.

Mr. McDermott said that the applicant had identified potential well locations and drain fields, and there was a primitive trail system that circled around the property. He said that although the trail system generally avoided the WPO buffer, the lot development did intersect with the buffer in certain areas, which had been acknowledged by staff. He said that the applicant had proposed on-site well and septic systems, which would require approval from the Board. He said that the gross density overall was one dwelling unit per acre.

Mr. McDermott said that the applicant had also submitted a draft proffer sheet, which included restrictions on the uses and density of the property and provisions for affordability. He said that the proffers also addressed staff concerns regarding the special use permit, and no additional conditions were recommended as part of that special use permit. He said that the voluntary proffers included restricting permitted uses, removing some that were typically allowed by right and R4, such as higher density residential, and those allowed by special use that removed assisted living facilities, hospitals, and standalone parking. He said that these restrictions could be seen in the attachment to the draft proffer statement.

Mr. McDermott said that it also limited the density if manufactured homes were constructed, allowing a maximum of 50 units. He said that if those manufactured homes were not built under the R-4 proposal, the maximum was six units, which was what was allowed by right on these 50 acres. He said that the affordability proffers included that 33% of the affordable land-leased units would be at 50% Area Median Income (AMI), and the remainder of the land uses would be land-leased units at 100% AMI. He said that the units not land-leased would be affordable rental units at 60% AMI.

Mr. McDermott said that the applicant had requested some special exceptions to modify or waive regulations related to manufactured home parts. He said that staff had not fully evaluated all of these exceptions because they were recommending denial of the rezoning and special use permit. He said that if the Planning Commission decided to vote to recommend approval of the rezoning, any comments on the special exception requests would be included in the staff analysis and presented to the Board. He said that the list of special exceptions could be found on pages 12 and 13 of the staff report.

Mr. McDermott said that staff concerns regarding the rezoning and special use permit included that the proposal was inconsistent with the Rural Area Goals, Objectives, and Strategies found in the Comprehensive Plan, the proposal was inconsistent with the County's Growth Management Plan because it proposed residential densities above that recommended in the Rural Area, and staff believed there were inadequate services and facilities and infrastructure to support the development in this proposed location. He said that primarily because of how far away it was from any services that residents might need, including fire and rescue services, schools, and other daily needs.

Mr. McDermott said that he wanted to point out a typo related to this number three on page 11 of the staff report under the assessment of the special use permit. He said that it should be noted that they believed that fire and rescue and police services for the existing community members were also impacted by the additional residential density, as this new development would further strain those existing resources. He said that to clarify, this information was cut off in the staff report.

Mr. McDermott said that additionally, there was inadequate information to determine whether the proposal could be supported by the central water and sewer service facility. He said that the Virginia Department of Health (VDH) had not received enough information to review the proposed

wells, soils, and drain field locations. He said that the stream buffer had not been field surveyed, and therefore, there was potential for conflicts existing with some of the home sites. He said that the County Code required that the buffer be incorporated into the design of the development by keeping stream buffers in open or natural spaces and out of residential lots or areas of active use to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. McDermott said that the positives that staff had identified related to the affordability that they had discussed, which provided an option for affordability that was not typically available in Albemarle County and helped to address their affordability concerns. He said that staff was recommending that the denial of the rezoning Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA) 202300017 and also recommending denial of the special use permit for Chestnut Grove. He said that with that, he would take any questions.

Mr. Missel opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Justin Shimp said that he was the engineer of this project, and he was joined by Paulina from his office and Jason Moss, who would be the primary owner and operator of the mobile home park. He said that he was also an investor in this project. He said that as they moved through this presentation, he would try to cover the key points quickly. He said that the site they had selected was unique in that it was located in a rural area with a lot of forest surrounding it. He said that the land was rolling, fairly level, and had adequate soils for drain fields, making it suitable for this type of development. He said that this was a key factor in their site selection criteria.

Mr. Shimp said that what this really was, was a community. He said that it was a 50-unit mobile home park with 120 residents who could live there long-term. He said that they would have their own yards, access to amenities, and the ability to save money compared to renting. He said that one of the main benefits of this development was that it provided affordable housing options in a rural area, where such rentals were scarce. He said that they were proposing a unique model, with 50.6 acres of land in total and 72% of it would be set aside as open space. He said that their density was approximately one unit per acre, which was higher than typical rural area density. He said that it should be noted that these were small units, about a third of the size of the average house currently in the rural area.

Mr. Shimp said that the units would be income-restricted, with 33% leased to individuals making 50% or less of the area median income. He said that some units would be owned by the park, rented at 60% of the County-established rent levels, and the remaining would be land-leased to individuals making less than 100% of the area median income. He said that this model was designed to be self-sufficient and did not require government subsidies, because they were able to use land well-suited for this type of development without requiring subsidies to meet the target affordability.

Mr. Shimp said that the zoning regulations in Albemarle and surrounding areas had been in place for a long time and were generally well-intentioned. He said that he had had the opportunity to visit this area with his friend Vito Chetta on several occasions, who had consistently praised the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan, and he agreed that it had been very good. He said that over the past 40 years, the communities created here had been of high quality, well-designed, and implemented with the help of the County.

Mr. Shimp said that however, the County had nearly doubled in size since 1970 when the 5% growth area was established, leading to a squeeze in available land. He said that as someone in the business of this, he could attest that it was becoming increasingly difficult to find a place to build a single-family house. He said that the cost of building on scarce land was prohibitively expensive, with prices ranging up from \$900,000 for a new house. He said that the good land had already been developed, leaving limited options in the 5% growth area.

Mr. Shimp said that to address this need, they were exploring alternatives that allowed for affordable housing options, and this project aimed to provide a solution for those who wanted to own a home with a yard but could not afford a single-family house. He said that the open space overlay provided the idea of the area, which included cleared trees for drain fields, leaving the area as essentially green space afterward. He said that zooming in, one would see street trees in a neighborhood setting and wooded 50-foot buffers between the development and Chestnut Grove Road.

Mr. Shimp said that there was an issue in the site plan, with the house too close to the stream buffer. He said that the lots were approximately the size of a Belmont lot in Charlottesville, approximately 50 feet by 120 feet. He said that this allowed for flexibility in terms of yard space, extra storage, and even the possibility of owning a dog, which were things one could not get with renting an apartment. He said that a point of concern were the impacts of this development, such as traffic and the strain on services. He said that this area was interesting, as it had seen relatively little activity in a long time.

Mr. Shimp said that current traffic conditions could be seen by looking at Route 6, Irish Road, which connected to Scottsville. He said that there were a current 1,300 average daily trips (ADT) on that road. He said that for comparison, rural area roads such as Union Mills or Buck Mountain experienced 5,000 to 6,000 trips per day. He said that this was not to say they wanted to replicate that level of traffic, but it illustrated that people were traveling through Albemarle County's rural areas to get into Charlottesville, but it had not happened in this area like it had in the more northern parts of the County.

Mr. Shimp said that 2001 traffic counts for Irish Road was 5.8% lower than today, so it was clear this was an area that had not experienced much change in traffic over the past 20 years. He said that the small amount of development in this area did not push the traffic substantially. He said that it is unlikely that this area could support 10 of these projects, but one would result in a minimal change in traffic conditions.

Mr. Shimp said that another important graph he had was a 2022 survey using census data, which showed that 44% of renters in Albemarle County are cost burdened, paying more than 30% of their income on rent. He said that this is a growing problem, and part of it is the lack of affordable housing options. He said that for example, in the Avon Road neighborhood, south of Charlottesville, a two-bedroom apartment can be rented for \$1,930 per month, which translates to \$23,000 per year. He said that to afford this, an individual would need an income of \$77,000 or more.

Mr. Shimp said that this aligns with prior housing studies in the County, which have identified up to 10,000 households as severely cost burdened. He said that the reason this mobile home park is a good solution is that if one leases the land and buys their home, it significantly protects them from further cost increases associated with housing. He said that for example, if one rents the land for \$500 a month for a lot and purchase a \$100,000 home with a mortgage of \$86,600, plus repairs, taxes, they end up paying \$17,000 a year, compared to renting for \$23,000 a year, which is a \$6,000 difference.

Mr. Shimp said that although living closer to town might offset some of that, the cost of their home remains fixed over time, whereas historically, rents increase by 3% to 4% per year. He said that over 30 years, the difference in cost between buying and renting is \$620,000. He said that when multiplying that by 50 units, the total difference is \$31 million. He said that to make this mobile home park affordable for residents, the annual cost would be approximately \$1 million. He said that this is why this type of housing is important and something they need to make work.

Mr. Shimp said that he would like to touch on a few points before they run out of time. He said that one of the staff analyses of rural area priorities suggested that any development in the rural area was generally not feasible. He said that this project was unique because it required minimal infrastructure investment and could be easily reverted back to forest in 50 years if the community's housing needs changed. He said that the reversibility was an important consideration.

Mr. Shimp said that he would like to respond to a few of the other staff concerns. He said that regarding the growth management policy, if they could not build a community where people could afford to live and have a yard, he wondered if the growth policy was a good thing. He asked if they should consider revising this policy to address the issue. He said that the site-specific challenges, such as water and sewer, and the stream buffer, were site plan issues.

Mr. Shimp said that the water and sewer in this case was a non-consumptive use. He said that for those concerned about the use of water, it was domestic, so they pulled water out of the ground from wells, put it into a drain field, and it goes back in. He said that in the agricultural business, watering crops and watering cows was a water use that did not come back into the ground. He said that a winery used water and did not put it back.

Mr. Shimp said that those uses were more damaging to the water. He said that he would leave them with this chart as a reminder of the project's goals: to provide affordable housing options for rural living, without requiring government support. He said that they believed it was a good project, and he hoped the Commission would support it.

Mr. Missel asked if there were any questions from the Commission for the applicant.

Mr. Murray said that he would like to understand the reasoning behind the number 50. He said that currently, they could build six homes on the site by right. He said that he would like to know how the applicant arrived at the number 50 from six.

Mr. Shimp said that it was because of a couple of things. He said that the one unit per acre standard provided a comfortable margin to ensure that septic and well systems could be installed without overtaxing the land. He said that there was a specific number that needed to be reached to justify development over simply placing six single-family lots on the site and moving on. He said that in essence, this approach elevated the site to a higher and better use versus this quantity of affordable housing.

Mr. Murray asked if rezoning was the only way to accomplish this sort of project, or if this could have been done by special use permit. He asked if the number of units would require a rezoning.

Mr. McDermott said that a mobile home park was only allowed by special use permit in R-4 districts or above.

Mr. Moore said that if, in some future case this were built and the County or landowner wanted to revert it back to a more rural area use, he was interested in the steps necessary to undo this type of development.

Mr. Shimp said that what was in the ground was primarily water lines, sewer lines, and electric infrastructure. He said that these could be abandoned, disconnected, and left in place. He said that the grading required for a basic road was minimal. He said that it was similar to what was done when building a farm, where a wider road was created to accommodate driving. He said that they had seen this happen in places, where mobile home parks had closed down, often due to neglect or lack of maintenance on the part of the owner, rather than a lack of demand.

Mr. Shimp said that if, 50 years from now, they were living on Mars, there may be no need for this type of housing due to advancements in technology and societal preferences. He said that in such cases, people would simply move out, and the owner would reassess the land's use. He said that once the park dwindled down to only a few people left, the owner would likely choose to plant some pine trees, as it became the highest and best use of the land. He said that the homes would be removed, which only had dirt underneath them, the pipes would be capped, and they would plant some trees to grow and harvest.

Ms. Firehock asked if the land lease per month was \$500.

Mr. Shimp said that yes, it was \$500.

Ms. Firehock asked if Mr. Shimp was constructing the trailers and the residents would purchase them, or if they were bringing a mobile home for construction themselves.

Mr. Shimp said that if this were approved, they would go to a company such as Clayton Homes, where people went all the time to buy a house, and asked for a place to put it. He said that there were a few parks that had expanded or had capacity, so when someone picked out their home, the home seller would usually connect them with the location. He said that they would call Mr. Moss up to sign a contract for \$500 per month. He said that then, the home is delivered and set up by the home provider.

Mr. Shimp said that an advantage to this setup was that someone could buy a used home for \$30,000 in reasonable condition, so with \$30,000 in capital, they could buy a home, move it there, and pay \$500 per month. He said that for folks who lacked credit, this was an option. He said that it could be through a private market or a new home dealer, and usually those folks would set it up. He said that Mr. Moss was familiar with setting up homes, so he could move the home to the park for somebody if they wanted.

Ms. Firehock asked what the approximate cost for a new home was. She asked if it was \$70,000.

Mr. Shimp said that they used to be \$70,000, but the retail price now was around \$100,000. He said that if he went to a place and wanted to buy five homes for his park, he could likely get them for \$60,000 or \$70,000 a piece. He said that they could be available for under \$100,000, but including setup costs and other expenses, it was likely over \$100,000. He said that five years ago, it was well less than that.

Ms. Firehock said that she was supportive of mobile home parks as a general affordability option. She said that although they called them mobile home parks, they were not that mobile. She said that they were set on foundations, and after 20 years, the house was not easily transportable or stable. She said that she was curious about that issue. She asked if they assumed people would be living there for 20 years and then picking up their house to move to a different location.

Mr. Shimp said that it was more likely they would sell their home to someone else.

Ms. Firehock asked if they assumed they would sell it and not try to move the house.

Mr. Shimp said yes, because it would be easier. He said that it depended on where they were trying to move to. He said that they worked on the Crozet mobile home park, and there were some residents in that park who had lived there for 40 years, with multigenerational families. He said that some of those mobile homes were from the 1950s and 1960s, which were not of great quality back then. He said that the new homes built and bought were higher standard and likely would survive 20 or 30 years and could be relocated easily. He said that older ones could not. He said that basically, someone would buy their home, pay off the mortgage in 20 or 30 years, and it

would still have life in it so they could sell it for \$20,000 to someone, who would then move in and live in the park.

Ms. Firehock said that they talked about people being able to store their equipment on this property if they had a lawn care business. She said that she did not understand, however, whether the application mentioned they were including additional storage areas. She asked if they were talking about someone who had a lot in the mobile home park and then constructed a shed on their property.

Mr. Shimp said yes.

Ms. Firehock said that to clarify, in their application they were not providing additional storage area.

Mr. Shimp said that no, they were not, but they would have the right to put a landscaping trailer or something like that on their lot, due to the available space.

Ms. Firehock asked if they could put up a shed to store their riding mower, trailer, or other business equipment.

Mr. Shimp said that that was correct.

Mr. Moore said that regarding the water service, the County staff had not conducted a deep analysis. He asked if the applicant could discuss their knowledge of the water table and availability. He said that there was some concern that 50 units was a large number compared to the surrounding density.

Mr. Shimp said that he did not have the numbers with him. He said that before they bought the property, they conducted a FOIA request from the Health Department about all the well records of the immediate area. He said that there were some areas that were not great around there, but there were probably 20 gallon, 7-minute-per-gallon wells in that vicinity, so that gave them enough confidence to purchase the property. He said that how they would proceed was that they would hire a geologist to conduct a study where they lay out electrical wires in the ground to spot the prime water locations, then drill the wells. He said that they were required to have a 0.5-gallon-per-minute rate per unit.

Mr. Shimp said that during the site plan phase, they would drill the wells and get them permitted as part of the site planning process. He said that for some reason if they were short on water, then they may not be able to build all the units. He said that the data they had seen did not indicate any significant challenges with the water supply. He said that the use, based on United States Geographical Survey (USGS) definitions, was non-consumptive because they were not taking water from the ground and dispersing it somewhere else. He said that it was returning it to the source.

Mr. Missel said that he had the same question about the watershed. He said that even if there was capacity, the 50 dwelling units caused concern regarding the water usage. He asked how many gallons per day were estimated to be pulled on average.

Mr. Shimp said that a new unit would likely consume approximately 100 to 120 gallons of water per day. He said that therefore, the total daily water usage would be around 7,000 gallons in total for the site.

Mr. Missel said that Mr. Shimp had mentioned earlier that approximately 72% percent of the parcel would remain as open space. He said that this percentage did not account for areas such as

septic fields, wells, utilities, and other features that would require clearing. He asked if Mr. Shimp could provide the Commission with a more detailed estimate of the percentage of the parcel that would need to be cleared, taking into consideration factors such as drain fields, ponds, dry hydrant locations, well sites, and stormwater management areas.

Mr. Shimp said that it was approximately 14 acres. He said that the green area on the map represented everything except the 14 acres. He said that they had some drain fields and ponds, which accounted for around four or five acres of open space that was impacted by the development. He said that this would bring the total disturbed area to around 20 acres; however, five acres of that area would be converted back into a pond, and the drain field would be repurposed as a grass lawn, allowing residents to use it for recreational activities.

Mr. Missel said that that was helpful. He said that it had appeared more than that to him. He said that he understood they were dealing with slopes, as he saw the critical slopes referred to with the shaded areas on the map. He asked if there were three drain fields, indicated by the darker green on the map.

Mr. Shimp said that that was right.

Mr. Missel said that there was a drain field on a pretty significant slope, where it said force main. He asked if they had put those drain fields in those locations based on what they expected the topography that would be necessary to support those.

Mr. Shimp said that they were. He said that they had soil tests in all of those locations from soil scientists to lay out the area for those.

Mr. Missel said that shifting the topic to traffic, he would like to know the vehicle trips per day generated by this project.

Mr. Shimp said that it was 356 trips.

Mr. Missel asked what they were applying as a number for each unit.

Mr. Shimp said that it was around seven trips per day per household. He said that these households were generally smaller, consisting of older individuals living on a fixed income, who tended to stay at home and were not frequently traveling. He said that this type of housing was also preferred by some families due to its affordability, although the units were typically two bedrooms, limiting the size of families that could reside there.

Mr. Missel asked if there were any comments from VDOT on this project yet.

Mr. McDermott said that they did not get any comments other than that they would need a land use permit for the entrances.

Mr. Missel asked if the applicant was planning any off-site improvements to the roads.

Mr. Shimp said no.

Mr. Missel said that regarding the visibility from the road, there was a 50-foot setback.

Mr. Shimp said that that was correct. He said that on both sides of the road was a 50-foot landscape buffer. He said that those were existing trees they would leave in place.

Mr. Missel asked if any members of the public would like to speak on this item.

Barbara Lowe said that she lived on the corner of James River Road and Chestnut Grove Road, on a property she had owned since 1995. She said that she was very aware of the changes in the Chestnut Grove community because she has been an integral part of the community. She said that she would like to thank the staff for attending the meetings. She said that over 100 people attended the two community meetings, and everyone expressed strong opposition to the proposal. She said that it was important to note that she had attended the Planning Commission meeting at 4:00 p.m. because she was interested in understanding their approach to community input in rural areas land use on AC44.

Ms. Lowe said that not much of this proposal aligned with the discussions they had at that meeting. She said that someone had mentioned during that meeting that recommended land uses should be tailored to each community, and that there should be engagement with individual rural communities. She said that there was engagement regarding this project, and this community had very specific facts and concerns, and in staff's recommendation they noted some of those things.

Ms. Lowe said that one of the key points mentioned was the traffic. She said that the engineer had discussed Route 6, but this site was not accessed by Route 6. She said that it can be accessed by going down Route 20 from Charlottesville, then turning onto Langhorne Road, across Route 6, down James River Road, onto Chestnut Grove Road. She said that James River Road is a critical artery connecting Buckingham and Nelson, and it is the only way to access Route 20. She said that as a result, there was a significant amount of traffic on this road.

Ms. Lowe said that she had requested a study on this road, but none was conducted. She said that one day, she counted 850 trips in 12 hours, but she did not count individual cars. She said that the applicant wanted to add 365 more cars to this road. She said that this road has three one-lane bridges, two places where it constricts down to two cars, and many tight curves. She said that these issues were previously discussed and addressed, and she would ask that they note it again. She said that Chestnut Grove Road is not a true one-lane road, but rather a one-and-a-half-lane road.

Ms. Lowe said that she would like to emphasize the importance of emergency services. She said that several people spoke about this issue at the community meetings, and her own family experienced it firsthand. She said that they waited 52 minutes for an ambulance to arrive while her mother-in-law had a seizure, and it took an hour and a half for the police to respond to a break-in at their home two months ago. She said that the police officer told them that they only ran one person south of Wegmans because that was the way it was termed. She said that now that was just a fact, they did not mind that, but they could not increase the call on that when they had limited resources.

Ms. Lowe said that affordability was clearly the touted feature here, but she noted that regarding the figures, she called Clayton Homes to verify them. She said that he called the mortgage \$700, but for the lowest model, it cost \$80,000, then they had to pay \$70,000 for them to bring it and set it up, connecting HVAC and the trailer. She said that her husband had inquired about financing, and there were only two banks in Virginia that offered it.

Ms. Lowe said that to qualify, one would need to put down 15% of the purchase price, which was \$30,000 to buy one and set it up. She said that additionally, paying personal property tax and other costs meant that overall, this was not an affordable option. She said that she finally would like to note the environmental impact of this project, particularly regarding the wells. She said that they did not know if they would be able to achieve the amount, so she questioned what the effects would be on the neighbors' wells.

Kevin Fletcher said that he lived at 7814 Chestnut Grove Road. He said that to talk about the traffic, if they chose not to take James River Road, they would take Chestnut Grove Road to Route 6. He said that regarding the idea that there were just 150 trips per day on this road, it was 150 trips in the morning because it was the shortest way to get to Route 6. He said that even in the applicant's comments, he talked about going from Buckingham to Plank Road. He said that to get from there, they would have to drive through Esmont, which was 25 miles per hour, or Porter's Road, which was very densely populated and 35 miles per hour.

Mr. Fletcher said that by adding all this extra traffic through there, it was not feasible for the neighborhood. He said that secondly, preserving their rural areas was a priority. He said that looking at the conservation easement map for southern Albemarle County, there were thousands of acres set aside by citizens in the area; it was one of the largest contiguous conservation easement blocks in the entire County. He said that the private citizens were doing their part, so the idea that the County would thwart their efforts was a bad one. He said that again, thousands of acres had been set aside.

Jennifer Gaines said that she resides at 9237, the closest house across the street, down around and about 0.25 miles away, which spoke to the density of the neighborhood. She said that she and her husband have lived in their house since 2007. She said that she was here to discuss their rescue response, which was a well-known issue. She said that when they chose their house, she was aware of this problem. She said that as a nurse with nearly 30 years of experience, she worked bedside at Martha Jefferson Hospital for 20 years and currently teaches at the School of Medicine and School of Nursing at UVA. She said that in chaotic medical emergencies, she remains calm.

Ms. Gaines said that last summer, her teenage nephew suffered a severe asthma attack, and it took 15 minutes for a volunteer firefighter familiar with their name and address to arrive with oxygen, followed by an additional 30 to 45 minutes for the single ambulance to reach their house. She said that this was a situation where he had an aunt who was skilled to calm him and love him, as well as a firefighter with lifesaving resources. She said that she was concerned about the impact on infants and the elderly when they experience this kind of increase.

Ms. Gaines said that with estimated 120 people needing rescue services at 50 houses, but if the residents were parents with children, it would be at least 200 individuals. She said that families were the ones who were low-income and needed affordable housing in their area. She said that if this was the case, it would double the population of their 6-mile Chestnut Grove Road neighborhood. She said that they understand the rescue time, and she was 100% behind affordable housing, but she could not support further stressing their already-stressed resources with doubling the population and no access for these residents.

David Roadcap said that he owned land along Chestnut Grove Road, directly opposite from the land of the proposed development. He said that he would like to take his time to express his strong opposition to the development, which he believed ran counter to the County's development plan, both the current plan and the draft version of AC44 that was discussed by the Commission earlier today. He said that the plan's core guiding principles included directing growth to development areas and maintaining the character of rural areas of the County.

Mr. Roadcap said that the plan laid out essential factors that need to be met when running counter to those core goals, and he would like to highlight a few of those. He said one factor was that any proposed development should be of size and scale that complements the character of the area, but this project would essentially double the residents on Chestnut Grove Road, with a density of housing seven times greater than what would be allowed under the division by right. He said that it was 50 homes on less than 10 acres, which was not consistent with the surrounding area.

Mr. Roadcap said that secondly, the development should not result in a significant change to the traffic pattern, but Mr. Shimp's numbers indicated that it would triple the amount of traffic on Chestnut Grove Road from 150 trips to over 500 trips. He said that this was tripling the risk of collisions on a twisting, narrow road with little to no shoulders, and triple the risk of collisions on the nearby one-lane bridges. He said that this was an unacceptable risk to the residents of the region. He said that he would like to address the issue of groundwater, which had been mentioned earlier.

Mr. Roadcap disagreed with the water data presented by Mr. Shimp, and he had heard stories from well drillers and residents about the difficulty in getting adequate flow from wells in this region. He said that the daily usage of 5,000 to 7,000 gallons was terrifying; it would have a significant impact on the ability of other residents to access adequate water to their homes. He said that he believed this should weigh heavily against this development. He said that there were other factors as well, but the general theme was that the size and scale of this proposed development made it fundamentally unsuited for the Chestnut Grove Road area. He said that he could not think of a worse place to put a development like this in the County.

Alan Herndon said that he was able to buy a piece of property on Chestnut Grove, located between the Gaines's and Ms. Lowe. He said that he had been on that property up around where Mr. Shimp bought his property for about 30 years, hunting. He said that he had been on every inch of that place, and all the elevations there were disproportioned to what Mr. Shimp had stated. He said that the area was very steep, and he would only be using the section along the road. He said that as a general contractor with 40 years of experience, he could not imagine how Mr. Shimp would avoid tearing the trees to pieces. He said that the trailers would be sitting with one 3-foot block on one end and a 10-foot block on the other end unless he cuts the ground down to be level.

Mr. Herndon said that regarding the water, they called that area Dry Creek. He said that Dry Creek goes down to Mr. Roadcap's side of the road, and he had walked along it for 30 years. He said that the other side of the road was Mr. Shimp's property, which dried up every summer. He said that Travis Hazel had recently built a house on the other side of Chestnut Grove Church, which required 380 feet of drilling and three wells. He said that Kenny Matheny drilled for wells every day in Albemarle County and could not find any water for that man, right on the other side of the subject property.

Mr. Herndon said that regarding Mr. Shimp's proposed use of the land, he himself was raised in a trailer, so he was not opposed to that, but this was not the right place for it. He said that it was totally wrong. He said that the roads shown in the plan had one road on the left-hand side, which was the flattest spot he had; however, it fell off hard to the right the farther it went in there. He said that the 50-foot buffer was actually a power line right now, which went all through the front of the property. He said that he would have to tear down the trees at the top of the hill to get all these trailers in there; it was as simple as that.

Mr. Herndon said that regarding the impact on the road, he had sat around for a long time listening while hunting, and he had heard traffic coming in most mornings. He said that everyone was exactly right; the traffic was mostly going back to James River Road. He said that anybody going to Chestnut Grove Church would go towards Route 6, and anyone on Pocket Lane was doing the same thing. He thanked the Planning Commission for their help, but they did not want any of that up there.

Adelaide O'Brien said that she resides on Hatton Ferry Road. She said that she would like to address the misnomer that mobile homes are affordable housing. She said that mobile and manufactured homes can be affordable housing if the homeowner owns the land beneath the home. She said that this proposal for Chestnut Grove is not affordable housing, as the homeowner

will not own the land that the mobile home sits on. She said that unless the mobile or manufactured home's owner owned the land, then it was real property, and they typically could only get a personal property loan for the mobile home, such as a car loan, which often come with higher interest rates than for those who owned the land and their mobile home.

Ms. O'Brien said that the mobile home parks are known as a predatory industry, with minimal financial risk for the mobile park owner and significant financial risk for the mobile homeowner. She said that when mobile homeowners do not own the land, they are vulnerable to rent spikes for the lot. She said that mobile homes depreciate over time, unlike traditional site-built homes and even manufactured homes. She said that while mobile homes are mobile, the cost to move them from their initial placement can be prohibitively expensive for most tenants.

Ms. O'Brien said that she would like to quote from a New York Times article from March 2022, titled "Investors Are Buying Mobile Home Parks, Residents Are Paying the Price." She said that the article states that "industry leaders are blunt about the business model. According to materials for a boot camp for aspiring mobile home park investors prepared by Mobile Home University, which is run by two of the largest mobile home park owners in the country, the fact that tenants cannot afford the \$5,000 it costs to move a mobile home keeps revenue stable and makes it easy to raise rents without losing occupancy."

Ms. O'Brien said that she requested the Commission not to consider the rezoning of this property nor provide a special use permit, as approval would primarily benefit the property owners, who would gain a stable revenue stream at the expense of mobile home buyers and the community at large. She said that the community would bear the costs of additional infrastructure, such as reopening Yancey School, increased fire and rescue support, and excessive traffic on their rural roads.

Isabel Ziluca said that she wanted to speak about the lack of well water in the area. She said that recently, she had purchased 25 acres, which consisted of two parcels, in keeping with the rural aspect of the area. She said that during the building process, she had had to drill a well first for a permit, which initially exceeded 400 feet and yielded inadequate water. She said that she subsequently drilled another well, reaching 450 feet, and while it provided sufficient water, she anticipated needing to drill additional wells if she were to build a residence; she was currently building a barn with an apartment. She said that she believed that addressing the issue of water was a concern for everyone, particularly given the scale of consumption being discussed in the application, which was far beyond what this rural area could sustain. She said that she hoped that the Commission would address this issue.

Casey Chisolm said that she was supportive of the proposal. She said that she did not live in the area yet, but she did not want to come up here and act like she knew anything about the zoning or the well or anything but wanted to state her opinions. She said that it sounded like an established community that did not want change, which completely understood as someone coming from an area where her parents were fighting against a solar farm being built near them. She said that she totally understood, but as a single mom with two kids, one in college at Penn State and another planning to go to college next year, hearing of a potential place to plant her feet and be able to afford it along with student loans was exciting.

Ms. Chisholm said that she would not want to stay there forever, but it would be a good opportunity to get her bearings, save money, and establish a sense of stability. She said that she was aware that affordable housing in Charlottesville with income restrictions was available, but they all knew it was not the safest option. She said that somewhere where they were somewhat established in the Monticello High School district would be safer and she would feel more comfortable for her kids to be there. She said that she heard a lot of complaining about the location, but she was an

employee of a police department, so she knew that the entire County had that problem, and the real problem was getting officers and other public employees to want to take the job.

Theresa Warren said that she was also supportive of the proposal. She said that she was introduced to the project through Ms. Chisolm. She said that she resided in Scottsville, specifically on the Fluvanna side. She said that when she was married, she divorced and had to find a new place to live. She said that she was fortunate to find a suitable location, but she would like to have a place of her own. She said that the option presented by this project offered single mothers or new families the chance to start their lives in a place that was truly their own.

Ms. Warren said that although they may not stay there permanently, it provided an opportunity for them to have their own homes and a sense of stability. She said that there were restrictions with everything, and there probably would be some in place to maintain the property and ensure the land's beauty. She said that the fact that this project existed was significant, especially for single mothers with children in college, as it offered a chance to have a home that was theirs to call their own.

Edward Brooks said that he was the program manager for the BF Yancey School Community Center. He said that he was a native of Esmont, had lived there his whole life, attended Yancey School, and was very familiar with the Chestnut Grove area. He said that their emphasis was that they were striving to build an equitable community within Albemarle County, and he had heard the comments both for and against this particular project. He said that they had their fourth annual retreat meeting this upcoming Friday, and they would look at the data for Albemarle County regarding disparities in income, wealth, and education.

Mr. Brooks said that they were modeling towards closing those gaps; however, that does not address the issues of people who did not have income to meet the average house in Albemarle County. He said that what they were doing for the next generation was to preach and teach what it would take to live here. He said that it would be a long-term process, because the County was inequitable in a lot of these basic, core areas. He said that however, they did have people in the community, himself included, whose parents did direct them towards getting a professional career. He said that there were people sitting in the audience here who lived in Chestnut Grove and in Esmont who had done that.

Mr. Brooks said that not everyone had, but some had, and that was what they were teaching and striving for with the next generation. He said that Mr. Shimp did not even take the time to investigate if there was a community center or community model because he did not have to; the system was not set up to go through them. He said that a lot of the things that could have been explained and shared did not honor the community as it existed right now, and they had heard those comments. He said that they were present under the County premises and auspices to make change, but Mr. Shimp started this project a year ago and went around it and did not involve it, so here they were.

Ms. Shaffer said that there were two speakers signed up online.

Ren Dawson-Olivier said that she resides on Green Creek Road in southern Albemarle. She said that she was speaking to oppose this project. She said that there were many reasons to do so, as noted in the Planning staff report. She said that she would like to focus on two key concerns. She said that the first was the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the atmosphere. She said that climate change, driven by greenhouse gas emissions, was here now, as evidenced by extreme weather events, droughts, heavy rainfalls, flooding, and heat waves. She said that the leaders of many nations had committed to achieving zero net greenhouse emissions by 2050, and Albemarle County had also adopted this goal.

Ms. Dawson-Olivier said that however, according to the County's climate program staff, they were behind schedule in meeting this goal, and they must take immediate action to achieve carbon neutrality. She said that protecting their rural areas, where significant carbon sequestration occurred, was vital. She said that according to the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC), rural and urban forest and tree cover sequestered approximately 900,000 metric tons of carbon per year from 2008 to 2016, accounting for roughly 60% of Albemarle County's greenhouse gas emissions during those three years. She said that it was essential that they prevent the destruction of their countryside through large-scale development like this proposal.

Ms. Dawson-Olivier said that additionally, they must take steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere. She said that the proposed Chestnut Grove development was very far from commercial areas, which meant that residents would need to make new, long vehicle trips to shop for necessities, thereby adding to the County's already significant transportation sector greenhouse gas emissions. She said that secondly, they must maintain open spaces to provide habitat for biodiversity and ecosystems. She said that the natural systems of their rural areas not only sequestered carbon but also provided vital ecosystem services and contributed to their quality of life. She said that she supported low-income housing development, but it should be located in commercial areas near existing amenities.

Erin Root said that she spoke as a property owner, a mom, and a landscape architect who studied water quality as a graduate student and postdoctoral fellow at UVA. She said that she would like to discuss her concerns regarding the watershed and the two different scales this development would impact, the regional scale and the local scale. She said that she had sent two images ahead of time, which she hoped they had received. She said that the first diagram illustrated the watershed from the site of the proposed development. She said that all surface runoff from the 50 acres of the site flowed directly into the on-site flashing creek.

Ms. Root said that the second diagram showed the creek moving through five other properties, including her own, and then into the James River. She said that the creek that originated from the proposed development flowed 1.9 miles to the James River. She said that her first concern was the regional scale. She said that the health of the James River and, by extension, the Chesapeake Bay, was highly susceptible to fluctuations in how they treated the riparian zones within the watershed.

Ms. Root said that a large-scale manufactured home development like this could significantly impact the larger James River and Chesapeake Bay watersheds by increasing impervious surfaces, leading to increased stormwater runoff, potential pollution from wastewater discharge, and impact water quality due to improper management of septic systems. She said that these factors could result in issues such as erosion, altered stream flows, and degradation of aquatic habitat.

Ms. Root said that her second concern was the local scale. She said that the creek that started on this property collected runoff from all 50 acres of the site. She said that this creek ran through her property, and she, like many other residents, had taken steps to ensure the creek remained clean. She said that they had done this for the benefit of their family and the overall health of their waterways.

Ms. Root said that living on a rural farm provided them with the privilege of peace of mind, knowing that their children could play in the dirt or stream without worrying about contamination. She said that as their older children played in the creek and caught minnows and tadpoles, they never worried about the quality of the water, knowing it came from a clean source. She said that as their children grew older, they hoped they would do the same.

Mr. Missel asked if the applicant would like to respond to any of the comments from the public.

Mr. Shimp said that regarding the Yancey meeting, he took exception to the comment made, as they had attempted to schedule an original neighborhood meeting there, but unfortunately, it was not available at the time. He said that they had to meet at the Scottsville Library instead. He said that folks came out and said that they had to go to Yancey. He said that they were not required to have a second meeting, but they did anyway. He said that during this process, they had engaged with those folks, and had tried to start there, and while he was unsure why it did not happen, they were happy to engage with anyone in the community about these issues, even if they did not agree on them.

Mr. Shimp said that regarding the fire and rescue service, he spoke with the folks involved in the process review and they had added a new shift to the local fire rescue station, which they believed met the criteria for this area. He said that this station met their 17-minute response time requirement. He said that while it may not be as convenient as having a station on Rio Road or in the heart of Albemarle County near Charlottesville, the County felt it was sufficient. He said that this was something they could potentially address at the Board level.

Mr. Shimp said that the environmental questions that arose were complex. He said that when looking at the picture, it was clear that the neighboring land was a pine forest that had been clear-cut and regrown. He said that this had its own set of impacts. If they were to clear all 50 acres and put cattle there, the cattle could potentially run into the stream, as there was no WPO buffer zone in place for cattle farmers. He said that this was not to say that these were inherently bad things, but they needed to recognize the potential environmental impacts of such land use.

Mr. Shimp said that on the other hand, if one was a developer, they were subject to stormwater management regulations, which were not applicable to agricultural uses. He said that there were some protections in place to deal with development issues that were not applicable to other rural area uses. He said that there was a question about the total water usage. He said that to provide some perspective, the County ordinance considered 400 gallons per site acre per day to be the upper threshold for commercial uses in rural areas. He said that over 50 acres, this would translate to 20,000 gallons, which was the benchmark used by the County.

Mr. Shimp said that it had been an ordinance in place for quite some time, which is why when they evaluated the site, the one unit per acre standard was a consideration for them, given their understanding of sustainable yields in groundwater, which allowed them to stay below the threshold, so it was taken into account. He said that engineering septic systems like this were monitored, requiring a licensed installer and a licensed maintenance individual to inspect it, unlike a private drain field, where there was none. He said that these were issues that were addressed by virtue of other regulations.

Mr. Shimp said that likewise, they could clear two acres per 6-acre lot and put six houses on it, which would be an activity that no one would question. He said that he had to ask himself how that compared to 50 units that were affordable and meaningful to people in those rural communities. He said that furthermore, he would like to address a couple of words that he had heard, specifically "equitable" and "privilege." He said that as someone from a rural area himself, he appreciated the sentiment of how great it was to play in the creek. He said that he wanted to emphasize that the families who lived on this property would appreciate that just as much, because that was an option they currently lacked.

Mr. Shimp said that this was a creek and a small pond. He said that if one lived here instead of an apartment complex, their child could run down and play in the stream, which was not insignificant. He said that he believed they needed to consider these privileges when thinking about rural housing like this, as they should not be confined to the privileged. He said that he took some exception to that statement. He said that he was not faulting anyone for it, but it did not

mean they should not consider the families who would have new opportunities in these communities.

Mr. Shimp said that looking at the equity of housing again, they would say no problem if they cleared this land and put six \$700,000 houses here, and it was seen as normal for the land to be used for that purpose. He said that however, because it was on the wrong side of the line, it could not be used for affordable housing. He thought this was also something that struck him as inequitable, and they needed to consider it. He said that he understood these were big-picture issues, but this project had brought them to the forefront. He said that he believed it was a good project and should be approved. He said that he looked forward to the Commission's discussions on these things.

Mr. Missel closed the public hearing, and the matter rested with the Commission.

Mr. Missel said that he wanted to acknowledge Dr. Stacy Pethia, Assistant Director of Housing for Albemarle County, who was in the audience tonight. He said that if there were any specific questions regarding affordable housing, that was her specialty.

Mr. Moore said that he had a question in terms of the proffers of how the mobile home park would be managed and the measures in place to ensure affordability so that it was at the level of affordability listed on the bullet point.

Stacy Pethia, Assistant Director of Housing, said that she was not entirely certain how to respond to the question, but she could provide some numbers. She said that when talking about area median income, the area median income for the Charlottesville-Albemarle region was \$124,200 annually. She said that 50% of that, for a household of four, was approximately \$62,000 per year. She said that with that salary, an affordable housing cost was around \$1,550 per month, which would need to include lot rent, mortgage payments, and utilities.

Dr. Pethia said that while transportation costs were not typically included in this calculation, there was a separate measure of housing costs plus transportation, which would be slightly higher than 30% but not excessive. She said that however, the location of this property was quite far from shopping and other amenities and job opportunities, which would increase the cost of housing.

Mr. Moore said that it basically gave them a ballpark estimate of the monthly cost for the percentage of units guaranteed at 50% AMI.

Mr. Murray asked what the size of the lots were for each trailer.

Ms. Firehock said that it was 55 feet by 120 feet.

Mr. Murray said that they recently heard from staff regarding ways to more effectively use the rural area and prevent development that they would not go below 2 acres for lot sizes. He said that here, the proposed development was giving each resident significantly less than 2 acres. He said that it seemed to him a very big discrepancy. He asked if staff knew the last time they had an R-4 rezoning in the rural area of Albemarle County. He asked if any had happened in the past 20 years.

Mr. McDermott said that he was unaware of the last time it had happened.

Mr. Missel said that no one remembered.

Mr. Murray said that to do so would be pretty nontypical. He said that right or wrong, currently the way development rights are determined in the rural area was not using the system of development

rights per acre; they used a system of development rights. He said that effectively, this proposal would be inventing out of thin air a significant number of development rights that do not currently exist. He said that from a perspective of fairness, if he was a neighbor of this project, he would question why this landowner suddenly got development rights that they did not get. He said that it was striking to him. He said that also regarding reversibility, he wondered if this were to go belly-up and they decided to move the trailer homes, it would still be zoned as R-4. He said that he wondered what that looked like with the future R-4 property when the trailers were deemed not viable. He said that he had a lot of questions about the potential future issues.

Ms. Firehock said that the entire property would be zoned R-4, so they could put a different development plan with four units per acre.

Mr. Murray said that it was clear that it would not revert exactly back to what it was before.

Ms. Firehock said no. She said that also on that topic, regarding the notion that it could just be reverted, she wondered what happened when they had a gravel road traveled daily. She said that Mr. Shimp knew the term "effective imperviousness," which meant that with enough compaction, it acted like a paved surface. She said that even when attempting to remove the gravel, the impacts left by years of compaction remained on the land. She said that they could not just magically pull up the gravel and have it return to the forested state.

Mr. Murray said that he could see a proposal where it would be acceptable to have a mobile home park in the rural area if there was a system part of a rural preservation development, even with bonus density. He said that it was true that the impact of one of these was less than a large home on two acres, so for example six development rights could translate to 12 mobile homes being constructed instead.

Ms. Firehock said that they had a cluster ordinance now that allowed a landowner to take the development rights across the lots and compress them to take up a much smaller footprint, thereby allowing conservation of the rural areas. She said that this request was to change the zoning from RA to R-4.

Mr. Murray said that they were trying to apply growth area zoning to the rural area.

Mr. Missel said that the Commission should keep in mind that they were proposing proffers as well.

Ms. Firehock said that they were proffering out some of the uses.

Mr. Missel said that higher density residential was proffered out and they were proffering affordability. He said that it was not as if in the future it would be just an R-4 with no restrictions.

Mr. Murray said that if the zoning was changed to R-4, all it would take was requesting the Board of Supervisors to amend the past proffers.

Mr. Moore said that he did believe they could use better emergency services in southern Albemarle County. He said that hearing about some of the response times was shocking, although he lived off of Rio Road. He said that it was still something he thought their Emergency Services directors should consider.

Ms. Firehock said that they had added an additional shift.

Mr. Moore said that he thought about homes in the rural area that were more affordable for people who worked for wages. He said that they had a long history of building those kinds of homes in

the County, such as Quality Row and some of the more tightly packed affordable housing in Esmont Porter's and other parts of the County as well. He said that sometime he would like to see their existing available inventory of affordable homes in Albemarle's rural areas.

Mr. Moore said that he assumed it was shockingly low. He said that at the same time, they were seeing people who worked in the area being priced out of the County. He said that it was not new news; they had talked about it for months. He said that they did not have redlining anymore, which had been illegal for some time. He said that sometimes when it comes to their rural areas, they had replaced redlining with greenlining, and economic class rather than race, at least explicitly. He said that he did think there was a lot to be said about providing 50 affordable homes at this time for severely cost-burden households.

Mr. Moore said that the idea that lower-income folks would also like to be in nature while saving money was something he would like to support. He said that some of the concerns about water usage were fair, but as mentioned, it was not water being used for crops; it was water that went back into the same water table. He said that regarding the much higher traffic counts for Chestnut Grove and the added vehicle traffic, it was still below 2,000 trips per day, which was considered low by VDOT. He said that these were factors to consider, but the opportunity for people who were not here yet, because the affordable units had not been built, was significant.

Ms. Firehock said that she was in favor of affordable housing, as they had discussed before. She said that she had benefited from the program she was younger. She said that however, approving this project solely because it was affordable did not seem sufficient to her. She said that for instance, they had recently voted to expand a mobile home park in the Crozet area, which made sense given its location in their growth area and close access to services like fire and rescue. She said that she hoped that response times would improve, but they had experienced delays of two hours for an ambulance to arrive and take someone to the hospital, and 45 minutes for a volunteer fireman to respond.

Ms. Firehock said that it was a real problem, despite the County's efforts to add another shift. She said that what she found concerning was that this was essentially a subdivision in the rural area. She said that this raised questions about how it differed from other low-income housing subdivisions that were not trailer parks. She said that their County had chosen to provide development in growth areas to ensure better services, but this also meant that if one was low-income, they may face challenges like limited access to repair services in rural areas.

Ms. Firehock said that for example, she had had to constantly air up her tire because there was nowhere to get it fixed locally. She said that however, without that car, she was severely limited in her ability to get around because she lived in the rural area. She said that given this, she questioned what the possible justification could be for allowing a new subdivision in the rural area. She asked, why not allow subdivisions anywhere in the rural area as long as it was affordable? She said that that would essentially be saying that they were open to subdivisions anywhere in the rural area. She said that this was what they would basically be saying with the approval of a proposal such as this one.

Ms. Firehock said that she thought they should have more trailer parks and that they could be a useful tool, but she was skeptical about their affordability due to the fact that they could not easily move them once they were in place. She said that they were taxed as personal property, not as a home, and they did not receive the same tax benefits as a home. She said that ultimately, her concern was that their comprehensive plan did not support this development in this location. She said that if they approved it tonight, they would essentially be saying that everything with affordable housing should be allowed anywhere in the rural area.

Mr. Moore said that he believed he had more flexibility in terms of where they might want to build these types of developments.

Ms. Firehock said that this was down in one of the farthest southern reaches of the County, where it was difficult for residents to get to schools, jobs, and even basic necessities like milk. She said that it was a really inconvenient place to put something like this. She said that from VDOT's perspective, traffic counts were low, with hardly any cars on the road now, so the potential added trips were not significant. She said that however, it would be a real change for someone living on a quiet road like Chestnut Grove, which she used to have to drive daily, as their road collapsed and required months of repair. She said that a substantial increase in car trips on that road would have a profound impact on the community's quality of life.

Ms. Firehock said that it would not be as big of a difference on roads like Route 6, Route 20, Rio Road, or Route 29, but it would be a huge impact on the quietude and enjoyment of that community with that volume, and even though VDOT's stance may be that the road could handle it, they did not live there. She said that in her opinion, this project did not align with the comprehensive plan elements that guided development in rural areas, and this should not be shoehorned in solely for the purpose of affordable housing. She said that affordable housing was a worthy goal, but she was unwilling to support this project in this location unless they revised the comprehensive plan, which was currently in the process of being updated. She said that however, they were still bound by the existing comprehensive plan.

Mr. Missel said that he agreed with Ms. Firehock's comments. He said that he wanted to add one thing, which was that the Commission's primary role was to serve as the advisory body to the Board to promote orderly development of the County and its environs to accomplish the planning, zoning, and land subdivision objectives set forth in state law and Albemarle County Code. He said that this was their role. He said that he struggled sometimes with affordable housing, because it was a missional goal that they all wanted and knew they needed. He said that it was important and there was no question about that.

Mr. Missel said that his view tended to be more about the land use-related pieces of it, and he hoped they could accommodate and add space for affordable housing where appropriate, but getting back to the idea of this location, he supported the mission, and then the site and location considerations and adequacy of services. He said that it quickly turned towards how they could be approving this, to use Ms. Firehock's term, this subdivision in the rural area. He said that he probably would not use language that would presume approval of this application meant that they would approve every other subdivision in the rural area; they were not setting precedent.

Ms. Firehock said that they were not, but they had a hard time arguing against doing it if their only reason was affordable housing.

Mr. Missel said that he thought that was right. He said that he did not want to take the time to restate a lot of what had already been said, but things like clearing the land, the watershed, and the traffic, he understood what the applicant said about watersheds, while also hearing the reality of what was likely there. He said that regarding transportation, they talked about affordable housing so much in the context of how to make transportation work, and they were essential. He said that without repeating everything that had already been said, he would state that he would not be in support of this proposal. He said that from an administrative standpoint, they had three items in front of them, the rezoning, the special use permit, both of which required motions from the Commission, and the special exception, which did not require a motion.

Ms. Firehock motioned the Planning Commission recommend denial of ZMA202300017 Chestnut Grove Manufactured Home Park, for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded

the motion, which passed (3-1). (Mr. Moore voted no; Mr. Bivins, Mr. Carrazana, and Mr. Clayborne were absent.)

Ms. Firehock motioned to the Planning Commission recommend denial of SP202300020 Chestnut Grove Manufactured Home Park, for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded the motion, which passed (3-1). (Mr. Moore voted no; Mr. Bivins, Mr. Carrazana, and Mr. Clayborne were absent).

Mr. Missel said that the Commission did not need to vote on the special exception.

Mr. Missel called for a four-minute recess.

Adjournment

At 8:15 p.m., the Commission adjourned to Tuesday, December 17, 2024, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 4:00 p.m.



Michael Barnes, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 01/14/2025
Initials: CSS