J.T. Newberry

From: Jennifer Hogg <yennihogg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2026 2:00 AM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: Airport Road Commercial ZMA-2025-00010 Public comment submitted by Airport Acres Road resident

CAUTION: This message originated outside the County of Albemarle email system. DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.

To: Albemarle County Planning Commission members

From: Jennifer Hogg
3585 Airport Acres Road
Charlottesville, VA 22911

Date: August 31, 2026

Re: Airport Road Commercial ZMA-2025-00010 to provide public comment from impacted parties for the upcoming meeting on September 8, 2026, at 6PM

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing as a resident of Airport Acres Road since 2007 to respectfully urge the Planning Commission to deny ZMA-2025-00010 as currently proposed. The proposed rezoning and neighborhood connections would fundamentally alter the residential character of Airport Acres while providing little demonstrable benefit to existing residents.

I have read through the materials attached to the application supplied by Line & Grade. It is the first time that I have had sufficient information in hand to do so, thanks to my neighbor here in Airport Acres, who is directly impacted by the proposed changes. I live on the opposite side of Airport Acres Road at 3585. I was not completely surprised to see that Line & Grade is the applicant of this rezoning request given that we have received numerous letters from them inquiring if we would like to sell them our home. I now understand their sudden interest.

Since moving to the Airport Acres neighborhood more than 18 years ago, my husband and I have enjoyed the quiet neighborhood and friendships we have developed with our immediate neighbors over the years. Most importantly, we have also enjoyed the seclusion that our neighborhood provides given that Airport Acres Road is a loop that has only Route 29 as an outlet. As such, if you do not live in the neighborhood or have specific business to conduct in the neighborhood, then you have no real reason to visit. This results in less overall traffic, trash, vehicular and human noise, and vandalism such as break-ins and porch pirates. While we live adjacent to 29, the mature foliage, significant buffers, and natural spaces promote a healthy and varied wildlife population, adding to our overall satisfaction with the location of our home and its surroundings.

The plan, as currently proposed by Line and Grade, will change the nature of our neighborhood forever, and not in ways that align with our desires or of those of our immediate neighbors. Below I will elucidate my concerns as a property owner inside the Airport Acres neighborhood in response to the rezoning request submitted for your consideration by Line and Grade.

1. The applicant has not demonstrated that a new roadway connection through Airport Acres is necessary to improve traffic circulation. Currently, to access 29 South, we simply proceed to either end of Airport Acres Road and then turn right into the southbound lanes. To access 29 North, one could cross traffic if oncoming traffic will allow, but it is often more efficient to simply turn right and proceed south to Airport Road and make a U-turn somewhere along Airport Road and return to the stoplight. The proposed Airport Road roundabout planned for Berkmar/Innovation Drive appears capable of addressing turning and circulation concerns without introducing a new connection into an established residential neighborhood.
2. The proposed access road into the Airport Acres (AA) subdivision will create a T-intersection. This would introduce vehicle headlights, traffic movements, and safety risks directly adjacent to existing homes that were never designed to front a roadway connection. Further, if someone were to fail to stop, Mr. Vasquez's home is in the direct line of a crash, increasing the overall homeowner insurance costs incurred by the family without demonstrated public need or benefit.
3. The proposed access road into the AA subdivision passes so close to Mrs. Barbara Hensley's home that she will now have to contend with vehicular and human noise, among other intrusions, requiring her to take additional and maybe costly measures to secure her property and well-being. I am aware that there are buffers planned for this roadway, but the proposed slim buffers do not stop the intentional or unintentional trespassing of folks where previously there has been no reason to enter.
4. As referenced in the Background/Existing conditions document dated July 17, 2026, TMP 32-40 has historically stored vehicles on the site. The statement that the redevelopment will bring ORDER to the area is only a result of the demolition plan to remove all uninhabited buildings and remove the auto storage area completely. I doubt anyone in the Airport Acres neighborhood disagrees with taking down uninhabited homes that could invite squatters or the occasional family of bears; however, this rezoning plan is not about restoring order. If that were the case, enforcing the zoning code might resolve the vehicle storage problem. The application appears to prioritize maximizing development potential without fully considering the impacts it will have upon the adjacent residents.
5. It was also noted in the Background/Existing conditions section that the rezoning application requests the removal of existing proffers on the properties as being no longer appropriate for the area, referencing the limitations to auto shops, utility facilities and stand-alone parking. Older folks in our neighborhood have suggested that the reasons why those limitations were in place had to do with some historical soil contamination. Are there any recent soil studies to consult and confirm that soil contamination is either not an issue or has been sufficiently remediated? I respectfully request confirmation that sufficient environmental assessments have been completed prior to rezoning and that they have been made available to the public.
6. In the section titled "Development Blocks", Line and Grade has stated that there is no specific use for the site, only a vision. This vision is speculative and does not take into consideration the existing businesses in the immediate area. Instead, the zoning request merely repeats the types of businesses that currently exist within a one-mile radius. For example, the proposal provides possible uses for Block 1 as a small grocery store or hotel. Line and Grade has not demonstrated a public need for either of these uses. Admittedly, the airport is nearby, however numerous hotel chains already offer shuttles to the airport and there are no fewer than 10 restaurants in the same

radius. Further, given the extreme proximity to the planned roundabout for Berkmar/ Innovation Drive, it does not make sense to approve a redevelopment vision that includes placing either a grocery store or a hotel on the parcels that Line and Grade is requesting be redeveloped. To do so would be a recipe for unneeded congestion and accidents.

7. As a resident of the AA neighborhood, I am particularly concerned about the proposed vision for the proposed Development Block 2. Line and Grade suggests a self-service storage facility or flex office space to be located immediately adjacent to a neighborhood of single-family homes. Currently, there are 3 self-storage facilities located almost on top of the intersection of 29 and Airport Road: 1) beside the BP station, 2) just past the Southern States off Proffit Road and 3) one under construction behind the former Walgreens. To have a third self-storage facility inside of our neighborhood seems as ridiculous as having a gas station on all four corners of the 29/Airport Road intersection. There has been no demonstrated demand or unmet need for more self-storage. The intense, artificial lighting from the self-storage facility, if it were to come to fruition, would disturb all the neighbors and the wildlife living on the southern side of the neighborhood. Additionally, the fencing required to protect the self-storage facility property would degrade the natural, rural feel of the neighborhood. Buffer or no, chain link fences are not a selling point for future owners if any of us ever decide to sell.
8. Another proposed vision for Development Block 2 is Flex office space. I am aware that office space can be hard to find in Charlottesville, and when one does, it is often at a premium price. Therefore, I can understand the motives for Line and Grade to propose such a use; however, the AA neighborhood was not created nor built to house something as large as a 20,000 square foot, three-story building for flex office space. Neighborhoods such as North Point or the townhomes beside and behind Target might have been created as a live/work space, but not the AA neighborhood. Further, a 30-foot screening buffer is wholly insufficient to create a natural transition from a commercial property to a residential one, particularly if the commercial property were to exceed the height of all surrounding properties. A three-story office building adjacent to single-family homes raises legitimate concerns about traffic, privacy, visual impacts, and the overall compatibility with the existing neighborhood character.
9. While Line and Grade has cited the definition of Neighborhood Residential from the County code and asks that the Planning Commission support their idea that the surrounding uses of adjacent parcels change the character of lots 32A-01-0B-4, 32A-01-0B-3, 32A-01-0B-2 such that they are not really a part of a single family home neighborhood, I ask that you reconsider. Someone must live near the entrance to most any neighborhood, unless there is a lovely boulevard entrance like in the newer, luxury estate home subdivisions. Our neighborhood is one from the 1960's where expectations were a bit more modest, but it is still a lovely place to live, and where you feel like you can rest from the pressures of the world. Please do not allow rezoning in such a way as to allow a developer to build installations that bring the city traffic, lights, congestion and noise all the way to our driveways simply because the lots on Airport Road are commercial. Had I envisioned living next to an office building, a grocery store, or a self-storage facility, I would have chosen to live elsewhere. Instead, I actively chose an off-the-beaten path neighborhood specifically because I did NOT want to reside in a live/work community where there is light, noise and movement all the time.
10. Accompanying the proposed roadway connection in the redevelopment plan is a pedestrian connection that is supposed to connect our neighborhood to whatever mixed-use development that will go into the R-1 parcels. According to Line and Grade, the pedestrian connection goes along with the County's "Development Areas Transportation Objective 2: Improve pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and connectivity to support future land use policies… and convenient walking travel for people of all ages and abilities." The objective is laudable, however once a

pedestrian enters our neighborhood via the pedestrian connection, where does Line and Grade believe all those walking and bicycling folks are going to travel? Airport Acres Road is not a through road to anywhere. The pedestrian connection, similar to the connecting road, is purely speculative and might inadvertently promote wandering and vagrancy. It would be more beneficial for the Planning Commission to consider designating space to create more sidewalks or travel lanes for those persons who want to walk or bike a distance along the 29 North and South lanes like has already been done on 29 South from Target to the Hollymead North stoplight. If located along Route 29, those sidewalks and travel lanes would be equally accessible by the residents of the Airport Acres neighborhood.

To summarize, the rezoning and redevelopment plan submitted by Line and Grade is speculative and fails to consider the existing businesses and needs of the area and the residents of the adjacent neighborhood. For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission recommend denial of ZMA-2025-00010 as currently proposed. At a minimum, any future application should eliminate the proposed roadway connection into Airport Acres, provide substantially greater buffering between commercial and residential uses, and demonstrate a clear public need for the intrusion into a single-family neighborhood.

Thank you for your service to Albemarle County and for considering the concerns of the residents most directly affected by this proposal.

Sincerely,

Jennifer L. Hogg