Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes July 14, 2020

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, July 14, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

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

Members absent: None.

Other officials present were Charles Rapp, Planning Director; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; David Benish; Jodie Filardo, Community Development Director; Bart Svoboda; Amelia McCulley; Vivian Groeschel, Community Development Assistant; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Bivins called the regular electronic meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum. He said this meeting was held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-2(6), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster."

Mr. Bivins said there were no Commissioners attending from the County Office Building, and that the Commissioners electronically present that evening were: Mr. Bivins, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Keller, Mr. Bailey, Ms. More, Mr. Carrazana, and Mr. Clayborne.

Mr. Bivins said the public could access and participate in this electronic meeting by following the links available at www.albemarle.org/calendar, or by calling 877-853-5257.

Consent Agenda

There was no consent agenda.

Item Requesting Deferral

SP202000005 Ivy Proper
Mr. Bivins said the applicant is requesting deferral. He opened the item for public comment.

Mr. Andy Herrick (County Attorney's Office) asked Mr. Bivins to clarify whether the request is for an indefinite deferral, or deferral to a date certain.

Mr. Bivins replied that it was for a date certain, which was August 18, 2020.

Mr. Herrick said if a motion were made to defer this to the date certain of August 18, it would not require further readvertising. He said if the Commission wanted to defer it, he would suggest deferring it with the date certain.

Ms. More moved to defer SP202000005 Ivy Proper to August 18, 2020.

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

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Rapp to ask the Planner involved to transmit this information to the applicant.

Public Hearing

SP201900002 Pleasant Green

Ms. More said she needed to read a statement from the State and Local Government Conflict of Interest Act, which is a transactional disclosure statement, with regard to SP2019000002.

Ms. More said she resides in physical proximity to the proposed project, and may realize a reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect benefit or detriment to the value of her real property in an amount that exceeds $5,000 as a result of the action of the Albemarle County Planning Commission considering this transaction.

Ms. More said she further declares that she is a member of the following business, profession, occupation, or group, the members of which are affected by the transaction. She said this is a group that consists of 3 or more persons owning real property in physical proximity to the proposed project.

Ms. More also stated that she is able to participate in this transaction fairly, objectively, and in the public interest.

Mr. Herrick said Ms. More's declaration will be put on file with the clerk for the record.

Mr. Bivins said it was also in the transcript.

Mr. Herrick confirmed this.

Mr. Bivins said there will be a physical copy as well as Ms. More reading into the transcript.

Mr. Herrick confirmed this.

Mr. Charles Rapp, Director of Planning, said Ms. Megan Nedostup (Principal Planner) was on vacation, so he would be presenting the staff report.

Mr. Rapp said the purpose of SP201900002 Pleasant Green is to amend a previous Special Use Permit (SP2016-003) that was associated with West Glen in order to relocate a stream crossing that was part of that application to a more desirable location.

Mr. Rapp said Special Use Permits are required by County Ordinance for any activity that results in fill within the Flood Hazard Overlay.

Mr. Rapp presented a location map. He said the parcels affected by the proposed stream crossing with the Special Use Permit were highlighted on the map in yellow. He said as a reminder, these were the only parcels affected by the Special Use Permit. He said there are significant developments on the other parcels, but that evening, they were going to talk specifically about the stream crossing associated with the Special Use Permit that impacts the three parcels.

Mr. Rapp said this was west of Downtown Crozet. He indicated on the map to Cling Lane and an existing development with a cul-de-sac; Orchard Drive, which connects to Jarmans Gap Road; and Blue Ridge Avenue. He said all the property is zoned R6 Residential, and indicated to the Flood Hazard Overlay along Powells Creek, which was represented in purple hatch and follows the stream channel.

Mr. Rapp presented an enlargement from the Crozet Master Plan, which showed an area in yellow designated as Neighborhood Density - Residential. He said this is primarily where Pleasant Green and the previous proposed development takes place. He said the area in green, designated as Green Space, is meant to protect environmental features, and can be used for open space and parks. He noted how there was not a crossing connecting to Orchard Drive there; however, in discussing the transportation impacts of the proposed development, it does seem favorable to have this connection. He said there are numerous phrases mentioned throughout the Comprehensive Plan that promote interconnectivity, as well as a Neighborhood Model.

Mr. Rapp noted that Blue Ridge Avenue is a substandard roadway that is not meant to carry a large volume of traffic. He said utilizing the connection to Orchard Drive would disperse cars onto Jarmans Gap Road, which would provide a safer and more direct connection to Downtown Crozet.

Mr. Rapp said in terms of the history of the property, there have been several Special Use Permits and amendments, as well as a few subdivision site plans over the years. He said in 1990, there was an initial requirement with the Special Use Permit to establish a crossing as a second access point for any additional development above 30 units. He said that crossing was approved in 2016 with Special Use Permit SP2016-003 to satisfy that connection, which he presented on the screen. He said it is a connection from Cling Lane over to Orchard Drive, which had a significant length to it, with a lot of disturbance.

Mr. Rapp said since that approval, several parcels have been acquired by the applicant to the east of this, which allowed for a much better connection, with much less impact to the stream, environmental features, and steep slopes along that area. He said the new proposed location is 925 feet downstream from the location.

Mr. Rapp said there has also been a site plan subdivision plat that was approved for Phase I and that a site plan subdivision plat is currently under review for Phase II.

Mr. Rapp presented images showing the difference between the initial 2016 alignment of the stream crossing compared to the current proposed alignment of the stream crossing. He noted that the areas in red show the impact to the floodplain and stream buffer, as well as to steep slopes in the area, versus the much smaller area on the new alignment of the stream crossing.

Mr. Rapp said the total impact in the 2016 alignment was 1.22 acres within the stream buffer, and 9,660 square feet of preserved slopes. He said the revised location takes this down 50% to an impact of 0.62 acres, and no impact to preserved steep slopes.

Mr. Rapp said additionally, the linear feet is significantly less, from 1,200 linear feet down to 450 linear feet. He said the new alignment would utilize three 10x10 box culverts, and that it has been verified that they would not increase the floodplain elevation of the area.

Mr. Rapp said in addition, the applicant is also proposing to maintain the area of greenway south of Powells Creek, and open space (which is also shown in the Crozet Master Plan). He said the applicant proposes to dedicate an area of greenway for a trail in that location as well.

Mr. Rapp presented an image showing how the proposed roadway would connect to the larger overall development, some of which is currently underway. He noted this was shown in dark gray with the existing road network, and that the image shows future phases and how they tie into Cling Lane. He said if the Special Permit were to be approved, the applicant proposes to develop the additional phases within the by right designation of R6 zoning.

Mr. Rapp said there are several mitigation features that the applicant is also proposing. He said one significant one is the removal of an existing dam and restoration of the stream bank. He said the existing dam is just to the west side of the property. He said it has been heavily supported by the Army Corps of Engineers, who previously stated that the benefits of removing that dam far outweigh any negative impacts of the proposed crossing. He said there are also mitigation plantings along the stream bank, as well as greenway dedication. He noted that a mitigation plan would need to be approved by the County Engineer if this were to move forward.

Mr. Rapp said there are four favorable factors listed. He said the new stream crossing would greatly reduce the impact to the stream buffer, to preserved slopes, and to the floodplain. He said the stream crossing would allow the development of the property to be consistent with the Crozet Master Plan. He said there would be a greenway dedication in the area, as identified in the Master Plan, which would also help to ensure the preservation of that stream buffer. He said the stream crossing in this location also promotes interconnectivity and disperses traffic onto a road network that is built to handle the future capacity and traffic load that would be generated as a result of the development.

Mr. Rapp said the one unfavorable factor is that the Master Plan does not show a stream crossing in this location.

Mr. Rapp said staff recommends approval of SP201900002, with a total of seven conditions. He said the conditions are similar to those from the 2016 Special Use Permit. He said the first one addresses that the stream crossing be in accord with the plans that have been submitted for the Special Use Permit dated May 20, 2019.

Mr. Rapp said the second condition addresses the need to comply with regulations with FEMA, obtaining a Letter of Map Revision for the impact to the floodplain.

Mr. Rapp said the third condition ensures that any of the future residential lots associated with Pleasant Green in the development would not encroach within the 100-foot stream buffer and specifies some additional requirements.

Mr. Rapp said the fourth condition states that the net density of the property must not exceed 6 units per acre, and identifies how net density is to be calculated.

Mr. Rapp said the fifth condition identifies that a greenway trail should be dedicated on an easement plat to the County.

Mr. Rapp said the sixth condition addresses the timeline that this stream crossing must be completed, which is a five-year timeline.

Mr. Rapp said the seventh condition requires environmental site assessment associated with the project be conducted to address any accumulation of sediment from behind the dam as it is removed, which would need to be completed before the final Virginia Stormwater Management Program, or before the final subdivision plat (whichever comes first).

Mr. Rapp said he had draft motions ready and offered to answer questions.

Mr. Keller said he was glad that Mr. Rapp was presenting the staff report because with some of his experience and background, he may be able to answer his question. He said he sees many positives in this, and that Mr. Rapp noted most of them in the favorable factors. He said he has a potential concern, however, and would like clarification.

Mr. Keller said the following evening, the Board of Supervisors would have a work session on improving stream health in the Development Areas. He said he would like Mr. Rapp's take on whether three box culverts, with the bulkheads that they have, really fit that idea of best practices for stream health, and what occurs as high water rushes through those and the effect it has downstream, as opposed to a different type of bridge configuration with piers that would impinge the flow less in the floodplain.

Mr. Rapp replied that he has been involved in a number of projects with stream crossings, some of which did use box culverts, and some of which used a CON/SPAN or another method. He said anything that minimizes disturbance to the bottom of the stream bed would be preferred, and that there are a number of factors that fit into that. He said these include everything from cost to other site challenges.

Mr. Rapp said as far as best practices, they will want to minimize the impact to the stream as much as possible. He said the applicant's engineer, Mr. Scott Collins, was also present that evening and could perhaps speak to if they have explored other options as well, and find out how they arrived at the box culvert solution.

Mr. Keller asked as a follow-up, and in light of the discussion the following evening, if this were something that would be part of that discussion and brought to the Board of Supervisors. He clarified he did not mean this specific case, but the idea of the impact that they are having on stream beds with the type of bridges or culverts they are applying over them in the Development Areas.

Mr. Rapp replied that he did not believe it was a primary topic that would be discussed in much detail, but that it was part of the whole equation and was worth discussing as part of that proposed ordinance.

Ms. Firehock said she would touch on what Mr. Keller was just speaking to that box culvert is far more destructive to the habitat of the stream than is a crossing with a bridge. She said she was imagining, though, that the box culvert was chosen because it is the far cheaper option of the two. She said in her prior life, she ran a national stream habitat restoration program. She said along those lines, her question is what type of restoration will be implemented. She said if they were talking to a more traditional engineer, restoration could entail stabilizing banks with doved riprap; or, if they were talking to a landscape architect, they might be talking more along the lines of bioengineering.

Ms. Firehock said the County itself has actually implemented a number of bioengineering habitat restoration projects that the County actually designed and installed. She said she was not suggesting the County do that in this case, but that she would like to know much more about how the applicant plans to treat the stream banks and what they are doing. She said she was not happy with the box culvert, but that she was assuming it was chosen because it is the far cheaper option.

Ms. Firehock said the question is really to what constitutes restoration. She said she understands removing the dam, but wants to know how the stream banks will be treated, as that was not known at that time.

Mr. Rapp said he believed this was a valid question, and did not believe the application got into that level of detail. He said as Ms. Firehock mentioned, there are a variety of methods, some of which are significantly more environmentally friendly, such as live stakes and all types of things to do versus other types of stream bank restoration where riprap and other things that aren't as desired might be used. He said it was a worthy question.

Mr. Bivins said for Condition #1, the staff report states March 2, 2020, but that there was a different date on the slide.

Mr. Rapp said he had May 2020.

Mr. Bivins said on the staff report, it said, "March 2, 2020." He said he assumed they were going to go with Mr. Rapp's date.

Mr. Rapp said he believed it should have been March and that it was a typo. He said he was looking at the set of plans and it said, "March 2, 2020."

Mr. Bivins asked if when they move forward, it would be the March 2, 2020 date that will be included in the recommendations.

Mr. Rapp replied yes.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Jeremy Swink, representative for the applicant, said he works for Stanley Martin Homes and has been developing in Charlottesville for about seven years. He said he appreciated the Planning Commission hearing the case and taking it under advisement.

Mr. Swink said the genesis of the stream crossing and revised location was a product of the public process working. He said early in the plans for this development, they gathered some of the neighbors from Blue Ridge Avenue and Orchard and all met at the Crozet Park, informally. He said they had the plan on a display board to let people know what they were up to and thinking.

Mr. Swink said they had actually shown the old approved stream crossing location in the plan, and one of the neighbors pulled him aside after the meeting to ask whether, since the applicant acquired the other property that West Glen didn't have, it would make more sense for them to punch the crossing straight across versus snaking down through the stream banks and some of the steep slopes. He said this would be much less destructive than what was previously approved. He said to be honest, he had not thought of this before, and he took it under advisement. He said

Mr. Collins engineered it and figured out that it would work, and they implemented this with the plan.

Mr. Swink said this has been a long work in progress for the applicant, and one they are excited to hopefully bring into fruition to take some of the pressure off of Blue Ridge Drive.

Mr. Swink said as noted, their plan has significantly less environmental impacts. He said its construction will take the current pressure that is on Blue Ridge Drive, and the future pressure that would be on Cling Lane, from the rest of the development.

Mr. Swink said he would like Mr. Collins to speak to the box culvert versus CON/SPAN or other bridge applications.

Mr. Scott Collins (Collins Engineering) said when they looked at the crossing and at changing locations, they did look at other options for the crossing. He said box culvert was chosen for this location and supported from the original design mainly due to the soils there along the stream area. He said there are some highly erosive soils along this portion. He said where the crossing is, the stream is making two bends -- it bends down, then straightens out at the crossing, comes back, and makes another bend.

Mr. Collins said the flows through this with the erosive soils makes it tough to put a CON/SPAN in this location because of the scour analysis. He said when running the scour analysis on CON/SPANs, many times, they actually end up riprapping the stream bed even more than what they would do with a box culvert installation because they are trying to mitigate against the scour analysis and against it failing from the high flows during peak rain events.

Mr. Collins said this was the reasoning why they went with the box culverts, and it is probably very similar to why they went with the box culverts down Jarmans Gap Road (just a couple hundred feet downstream) as well.

Mr. Swink said with those two in mind, they were trying to address some questions that were brought up and their reasoning behind the case. He said if there are any questions, the applicant would like to answer them.

Mr. Bivins said if there were not any individuals from the public, the Commission would come back with any questions.

It was noted that there were no one from the public signed up to speak.

Ms. More said she thinks they successfully established the substandard condition of Blue Ridge Avenue, and previously in discussions with Stanley Martin, neighbors were concerned about construction from a different project, which has impacted Blue Ridge Avenue. She said there was the question of, with new impacts from construction traffic to this new project, Pleasant Green, what the timing would be for this new crossing. She said she would not speak for the developer and would let them respond, but she thought that information given back to the community at the time was that they would try to achieve this crossing as quickly as possible, and then this would become another way of access where Blue Ridge Avenue is the sole access (other than McComb Street, which should essentially be a one-way street) to the site.

Ms. More said she wondered, with all the deferrals and the timing, if Mr. Collins might speak to something that she thinks a lot of neighboring property owners would like to know about timing and how this fits in with the different phases, since they are already building Phase I and there is a huge increase in traffic along Blue Ridge Avenue.

Mr. Collins replied that the applicant has a Certificate of Occupancy for the first five units. He said looking at the plan, the first three buildings along McComb Street Extended are now under construction, and two of the villas that are close to the roundabout are under construction as well. He said there is quite a bit of construction activity, and they are putting a lot of pressure on Blue Ridge. He said soon, they will have [inaudible] and many of those houses will put pressure on.

Mr. Collins said to give a simple answer, the soonest he can get approval is when they are going to push the shovel in the ground. He said he would try to project what a schedule might look like. He said if they were to gain a recommendation for approval that night, and if they get Board approval (although he was not sure what their Board of Supervisors date is, but he would assume it was within 45-60 days), Mr. Collins has already submitted a set of plans to the County, which had one review already. He said they are going to wait on the second review until the Special Use Permit has been approved. He said it was not to be presumptuous or to be wasting anyone's time, but that this was submitted so they could get a jumpstart and try to ferret out any of the issues to help them start construction and get the road open as soon as possible.

Mr. Collins said ideally, in the best case, they were driving out in the spring, if everything works and the approvals go swiftly. He said they have a contractor who is ready, willing, and able, and that the applicant is financed to construct the bridge as well. He said they were looking at early spring, if not sooner.

Ms. More thanked Mr. Collins for his response. She added that initially, when construction started, it seemed that deliveries were happening, and some people were trying to come down McComb Street, which is very narrow. She said she noticed some signage that the applicant has put up directing traffic, which she appreciates (as do the neighbors) and thinks is very helpful. She said she was sure delivery drivers appreciate that so they do not end up on a tiny road where they cannot get through to get to the site. She said she has noticed an attempt on the applicant's part to try to help send people down Blue Ridge Avenue, which at this point is the safest way to access the site.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Collins for clarification as to if it were a matter of fact that they have financing for the bridge and that there is a contractor, or if it was a matter of when they will have financing for the bridge and when they will find a contractor.

Mr. Collins replied that they have the financing and capital in place, and that he has a signed contract with Contour Construction for the work as wrapped in the Phase I approval.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to commend the applicant for doing a much better design that is much less environmentally destructive. She said she was very pleased with what the applicant presented that night. She said she did want to have some follow-up on her earlier question she posted. She said they will be taking down a dam, for which she has some experience with that kind of work, and will be restabilizing the stream system. She said she wanted to know more about what methods the applicant proposes for stabilizing any of the stream bank work that they would need to do.

Mr. Collins replied that as far as the mitigation along the stream bank, they are proposing to do some mitigation, plantings, and restabilization of some of the areas that have been identified along the stream bank as erosive and are unvegetated at this time. He said they are following up and doing a mitigation plan for those areas with the work that is being done on the dam and the crossing.

Ms. Firehock said there are stabilization methods that are extremely destructive to habitat, and she wanted to be assured. She said she has done designs and used riprap at the toe of the bank where extra structure is needed. She asked if the applicant would be using vegetative structural measures versus just putting in riprap.

Ms. Firehock said VDOT recently did a stream down by her neighborhood in Howardsville, and it is a nightmarish highway stream now where they have "stabilized" it. She said she was looking for more assurance from the applicant that they will not be riprapping the stream bank from top to bottom.

Mr. Collins replied that this was not the intent at all. He said they are not looking to use riprap as a measure for the mitigation areas. He said they are fixing portions of the stream that have eroded so far. He said they are not looking to do that with riprap.

Ms. Firehock said she did not think it would need to be conditioned and that she would go with trust.

Ms. More said having followed this closely, when Southern Development was doing the West Glen application, and with some of Ms. Firehock's questions that are specific to the stream crossing and the dam, she wanted to point out that the entire dam issue was the result of Southern Development creating an issue about the dam. She said it had been suggested that this land had previously been used historically for orchards and perhaps things were sprayed, and that there is a sediment gathering behind the dam.

Ms. More said it is her knowledge that the dam was never a huge concern in the Crozet community but then, at a Board meeting regarding the original stream crossing request for West Glen, it became a central topic because there was a suggestion made that there could be some sort of toxic things in the sediment, and there are children playing in the area in pools.

Ms. More said she was not going to argue with the Army Corps of Engineers about removing the dam or about getting rid of the sediment being the better way to go because if that's what needs to happen, that's what needs to happen.

Ms. More said all of this came up because it was made an issue by Southern Development. She said as far as she knows, the initial testing of the sediment showed only normal amounts of what one would expect to find in that sediment. She said at the hearing with the Board, there was a fear of having children swimming around in toxic sediment in that area. She said this is not what is happening, per the original testing that came back. She said she knows there is a second round of testing, but that for the sake of history and how this all came to be, she wanted to mention this. She said she didn't think anyone ever had an intention of messing around with that area, but that they are the ones who brought it up and offered it, so now, it is carrying over to the developer they have there now.

Mr. Bivins closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

Mr. Bailey said he appreciated the revision of the plan and the commitment to take down the dam. He said he thinks this is in the best interest of the watershed there and is a much better design than the original.

Mr. Carrazana said he thinks it is a great plan.

Mr. Keller said he concurred and that his questions had been adequately answered.

Mr. Randolph echoed what Mr. Bailey said. He said the Crozet Master Plan does identify a road with a stream crossing in this vicinity, but not in this specific location. He said the Master Plan location was hypothetical and was prospective (not prescriptive and determinative). He said therefore, he finds the new crossing location completely consistent with the stated intent of the Master Plan and therefore, considers the new location as fully acceptable, more so especially because of the reduced environmental impacts in this new location.

Ms. Firehock added to Mr. Randolph's comments that this new design meets multiple objectives in County's Comprehensive Plan for natural resource protection.

Mr. Clayborne said he was on board with the proposal and had nothing to add.

Ms. More said she had a few things she wanted to add. She said before she would start, she wanted to say that for the purpose of keeping the Commission on track, she would not go into specifics, but there were some questions from the neighbors which is perhaps something staff (i.e. Ms. Nedostup) can help with, as she has a list of neighboring property owners that she can help connect with the developer about the speed limit and the way the intersection will happen with McComb and Blue Ridge, as well as the entrance. She said there are some questions about high-speed internet being run through the area to those properties, but not available to their properties. She said she would like to put this out for Mr. Swink to consider, and they can have people work through that at a later time.

Ms. More said she wanted to be very clear that she understands that this is a by right project, and the matter before the Commission that night is the stream crossing (not the Pleasant Green development itself).

Ms. More said she stated this at the beginning of this public meeting, but wanted to reiterate that her comments are in no way related to her proximity to this development. She said if this project were located elsewhere in Crozet, she would have the same comments.

Ms. More said to be fair, Stanley Martin is planning to build a trail along the creek, as has been worked on with staff with regard to the trail, which has been mentioned in staff's report. She said they are also planning to build a small park/sitting area at the corner of Jarmans Gap and Orchard Drive. She said these are things they do not have to do and are offering to do. She said these things are appreciated, and they will benefit the Crozet community.

Ms. More said with this said, when an infill project occurs (which Pleasant Green is an infill project), they talk about size, scale, and how it relates to the character of the neighborhoods that are already there. She said in her opinion, there is a lost opportunity here on the part of Stanley Martin, as they have made absolutely no attempt to use size and scale creatively to help maintain the character of that which already exists in this area. She said specifically, along sections of Blue

Ridge Avenue and Cling Lane, where the visual impacts are extreme, Stanley Martin could have dealt with these impacts in a more responsible and respectful way.

Ms. More said the small park and creekside trail are appreciated, but they are similar to putting a few bows and ribbons on a bad gift. She said the bad gift that Stanley Martin is giving is not just turning their backs to the character of the existing neighborhoods. She said the bad gift is to the whole Crozet community. She said it is the approximately 237 units achieved with R6 by-right calculations. She said when adding this to the 126 units built by Pinnacle Construction called "The View," which is also located on Blue Ridge Avenue, this totals about 363 units that will impact already stressed road systems and school capacities. She said the community will be left to deal with this, just as other areas in the County have the same issues from intense growth.

Ms. More said this is seen more and more as a major consideration in the applications that are before the Planning Commission. She said she understands that Pleasant Green and The View are both by-right developments, and they are doing what they have the right to do. She said she brings these things up because she thinks the Planning Commission and the Board need to have conversations about these issues as they become more and more critical.

Ms. More said existing road conditions County-wide are more often the single most critical issue in applications they receive, and she believed Commissioners could agree they are seeing this trend change, at least in the time that she has served. She said current conditions in some areas are failing, and the decision to add more pressure on these roads truly is a decision of health, safety, and welfare. She said infrastructure lags behind in areas where development rushes forward. She said conversations and solutions need to be of utmost importance.

Ms. More said also (and as always), she believes that they need to continue to have a conversation about gross versus net density. She thanked everyone for listening, noting it was the short version of everything she had to say. She said she was prepared to make a motion.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of SP201900002 Pleasant Green with the conditions recommended by staff.

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

Mr. Bivins informed Mr. Collins that the Planning Commission has recommended to the Board of Supervisors that they pass the Special Use Permit. He said Mr. Collins heard some questions and comments that night that would hopefully be helpful as he continues to plan this particular subdivision and also do the work that is before him.

Committee Reports

Ms. More said the Crozet CAC met last week and at that point, staff and the CAC are continuing to go through the Master Plan revision process with the new challenges they face with regard to the way they interact with the community. She said she thinks staff are coming up with many creative ways, such as with surveys, in a huge attempt to get out as much information as possible, topic by topic, to get community feedback and for staff to be able to digest what it means before bringing it to the Crozet CAC.

Ms. More said it is a challenge, and she understands that the County needs to move forward with this project and get the Master Plan reviewed. She said she is very worried, however, as they are

seeing things such as 60% of respondents providing an answer to a question, but then seeing that only 17 people filled out the survey.

Ms. More said one thing she has been thinking about a lot that week is that it seems that with surveys and emails, and with so many people working from home, they might get more feedback from people, as they see it and take the time to answer the survey questions. She said they are seeing higher numbers in things that people like to talk about, such as bike and ped connections. She said she thought about it some more, and realized that she is home a lot, and everyone is dealing with the situation they are in in different ways. She said just because some people might be working from home doesn't mean that life is less stressful for them. She said in some cases, people might be less inclined to open emails and fill out surveys because everyone is managing the situation in a different way.

Ms. More said she didn't know what to do with this information, but there was a lot of thinking she has been doing. She said the assumption she went into this with was thinking that they would still be able to actively engage the public in this remote type of way. She said to then see numbers coming in that do not feel like the Crozet that she knows, she was trying to figure out why that might that be, what people are going through and the different things that are impacting their lives, and why they may not be taking the time to fill these surveys out. She said they are actively helping the County, and the County is actively trying to create solutions and ways to get more responses.

Ms. More said she is concerned that with a target of trying to stay on track and get a plan adopted in the first quarter of 2021 means that she is depending on what staff believes will happen down the road. She said no one really knows. She said a huge part of the Master Plan will have no face-to-face public meetings, which are really valuable.

Ms. More said last week, they almost did not even have a quorum with their CAC, which is very unusual. She said they did not have people saying that they were going to be on vacation and the like. She said she could not think of a time in the last 3-4 years that this has happened, where they have 15 members and almost could not get a quorum, which finally happened about halfway through the meeting. She said this is very unusual. She said it was hard to chalk it up to it being summertime and vacations because members are typically very responsible in informing the chair that they cannot come.

Ms. More said she wanted to put that out there, and that she knew staff is working hard to take this in manageable chunks. She said staff took an opportunity at that meeting to even pose a question to get a yes or no from the group, which did not work well. She said it was unclear if the public that was attending was able to answer and vote on those questions, so staff is realizing that how this experience went didn't go as well as they had hoped, and that they would learn from that and be back at it next month.

Ms. More said this was concerning. She said she has been waiting a very long time to do the Master Plan review and certainly, it was not what anyone intended for staff to be trying to manage it in this way, during this time. She said this was the bulk of their meetings right now, and any community meeting they hold will be an extra meeting. She said all regularly scheduled CAC meetings for Crozet will be Master Plan oriented meetings, moving forward.

Mr. Bivins said the whole piece was around how any of the Commissioners will be doing community engagement, and about one of the new, undiscovered, and yet successful ways they

will go about doing this. He said it was good to be reminded about this, and that they have to continue to be diligent and creative as they engage with people throughout the various processes.

Board of Supervisors Meeting Update

Mr. Rapp said the Board did not meet the previous week. He said the following afternoon, he would be presenting a request for an appropriation to fund the Rio Road Corridor Study, which he knew the Commission has felt a strong need for as well. He said hopefully, this will help the County with future developments and planning along that corridor.

Mr. Rapp said the following evening, although he missed the first round with the Commission, he would get to experience the Yancey Lumber application with Mr. Bill Fritz, which he was sure would be an engaged group.

Old Business/New Business

There were no items.

Adjournment

At 6:55 p.m., the Commission adjourned to July 21, 2020, 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)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 08/04/2020
Initials: CSS