

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
FINAL Minutes September 28, 2021**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 28, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

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

Members absent: Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Other officials present were Andy Reitelbach; Kevin McDermott; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Mariah Gleason; Rebecca Ragsdale; Jodie Filardo; Amelia McCulley; Francis MacCall; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum**

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

After Ms. Shaffer called the roll, Mr. Bivins established a quorum.

**Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public**

There were none.

**Consent Agenda**

Ms. More moved to approve the consent agenda.

Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which passed 7-0.

Mr. Bivins asked staff to let the applicant for SUB202100060 Glenbrook Phase III to know that he may move forward, pursuant to this approval.

**Public Hearings**

**ZTA20210002 Public Hearing on Zoning Text Amendment to clarify the Board of Supervisor's authority to approve Special Exceptions, consistent with case law**

Principal Planner Rebecca Ragsdale reported that this zoning text amendment (ZTA) is a clarification and clean up to the references to the Planning Commission or administrative officers that do not actually have the authority to grant the waivers, variations, or modifications referenced in the ordinance. Ms. Ragsdale noted that Mr. Herrick has worked on this a great deal and is available as questions came up. She said that in 2012, there was a significant court case that established that no administrative staff person or Commissioner has the approval to grant waivers or modifications of the zoning ordinance; administrative staff refers to the planning director or

agent, or the zoning administrator. She stated that the planning director used to include variations to codes of developments and application plans associated with plan developments—so those types of actions must be legislative.

Ms. Ragsdale stated that in 2012, the County added special exception provisions to the ordinance, which have been updated since then, and as part of their overall comprehensive zoning modernization project in the board work program, this is on the list to get addressed as part of getting the ordinance ready for more substantive things. She noted that this are the waivers and modifications to the zoning ordinance, but that does not include the subdivision ordinance because there is authority for the Commission to grant those waivers.

Ms. Ragsdale reported that the draft was about 30 pages of corrections, mostly replacing the authority where there were outdated references, and some sections needed to be deleted because they included an appeals process that is no longer needed. She gave an example that if the Planning Commission denied something, it could be appealed to the Board, but currently it would go straight to the Board. She said that the section on administrative waivers needed to be repealed altogether because they cannot do that.

Ms. Ragsdale stated that the sections affected the most are Section 4, Section 5, Section 8, and a few things in Section 20B, the Downtown Crozet District. She noted that this is not the complete list of those sections where someone can seek a waiver or modification, and since 2012 when they've done other text amendment updates or introduced regulations into Section 5, they have updated it so that it is consistent with state law, such as wireless regulations, homestays, lot access, height, lighting, and noise. She said that Section 5 is structured in a way that states the Commission can waive or modify any of those regulations, provided that it's not expressly prohibited in the specific criteria of the regulations.

Ms. Ragsdale said that Section 8 is the section of the ordinance that speaks specifically to the planned development districts, with variations typically needed in the Neighborhood Model District, where they have the most specificity. She mentioned that when the special exceptions were adopted in 2012, the County felt that it was important to have flexibility in these places in the ordinance. She emphasized that it isn't taking away any authority that the Commission has now; it is just remnant updates.

Ms. Ragsdale stated that since staff provided them with a draft and advertised the ordinance, they took a second look at it carefully in terms of a provision where the Commission or an agent would actually be waving something, and the County Attorney has identified some things they do not have to change, and there are also some minor technical corrections. She said that the Commission's motion for approval is shown with changes on Slide 4, and this would move onto the Board for their December 1 meeting for a public hearing for them to review and adopt the text amendment.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Herrick to speak on the item.

Mr. Herrick responded that he didn't have a lot to add to what Ms. Ragsdale had reported, as she has done an excellent job covering this. He stated that this dates back to the U.S. Supreme Court's *Sinclair* decision in 2012, and at that time, some ordinance revisions were made that dealt with the immediate issue. He explained that the Supreme Court ruled that special exceptions were legislative decisions and the local governing body—which in Albemarle's case is the Board of Supervisors—couldn't delegate its legislative decisions either to administrative agents or the

Planning Commission. He said that revisions were made in 2012, and they are just going back to make revisions elsewhere in the ordinance so it's easier to understand and so that there aren't places in the ordinance that give the Commission or administrators powers that are reserved to the Board. He reiterated that it doesn't involve a policy change or shift away from the Planning Commission; it is simply implementing what the Supreme Court said must be done.

The Clerk indicated that there is no one from the public wishing to speak on this item.

Mr. Keller moved to recommend approval of ZT2021-02 as shown in the draft zoning ordinance, Attachment B in the staff report, with changes to the draft ordinance listed on Slide 4.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

### **SP202000016 Claudio Crozet Park**

Senior Planner Andy Reitelbach reported that this is a public hearing for SP2020-00016, Claudio Crozet Park. To help provide context on the location of the park or the property, he presented an area view of Crozet and noted the location of Claudio Crozet Park; he also noted the surrounding areas, including Downtown Crozet, the railroad tracks, and Eastern Avenue. He presented a zoomed-in view showing neighborhoods such as Parkside Village, the Barnes Lumber site, Hilltop Street, Park Road, and the Foothills Crossing subdivision. He showed a different aerial view showing the north and south entrances to the park as well as the surrounding roads.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that the park consists of three parcels totaling more than 22.8 acres, and it is a privately owned and operated park by a nonprofit organization, Claudio Crozet Park. He said the park has an operating agreement with Albemarle County and the Department of Parks and Recreation that outlines certain responsibilities for maintenance and access to the public. He stated that it is important to note that with the SP request, the operating agreement is not proposed to be amended at this time, and the nonprofit is not requesting any funding for proposed park improvements at this time.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that the park consists of three parcels—two larger parcels zoned RA and the smaller parcel to the north, next to Parkside Village, zoned R-6 and allowing six units per acre; all of the surrounding properties are zoned at various residential densities. He noted that the park has several overlay zoning districts, including areas of both managed and preserved steep slopes, and the R-6 parcel alone is zoned Entrance Corridor. He said the SP is for Community Center designation, which is allowed by SP in RA and R-6 zoning districts. He presented a comprehensive plan map showing that all three parcels are designated for greenspace in the Crozet Master Plan, and the park is surrounded by properties of various residential densities—including Neighborhood Density and Urban Density Residential, as well as Downtown Crozet.

Mr. Reitelbach reported that this proposal first came before the Commission on March 23, 2021, and at the request of the applicant, they deferred taking action at that time to allow the applicant to make revisions to the proposal based on what was discussed at the meeting that evening. He said the applicant is specifically requesting an amendment to the existing SP1995-00043 to allow the expansion of the community center use with a proposed larger community center building of approximately 32 feet and two stories, along with a fitness center, meeting rooms, and an eight-lane indoor pool. He said the meeting rooms and fitness center would be the first phase, with the indoor pool constructed in either phase one or phase two, depending on the funding allowances for the park. He said the applicant is requesting new basketball courts, pedestrian pathways,

additional parking to accommodate the expansions, and new landscaping throughout the park. He said the other facilities—athletic fields, tennis courts, existing outdoor pool—would remain.

Mr. Reitelbach presented the proposed concept plan and said he had further explanation of the differences between the March plan and the current plan. He noted the location of the indoor pool and community center building, surrounded by the new parking areas, with landscaping buffers and additional trees located throughout.

Mr. Reitelbach reported that there were four main topics of discussion when the applicant deferred to make revisions to the proposal. He explained that the first is site layout and structures, and the applicant has shifted the north park entrance to the east; he showed the location of the existing entrance and its proximity to the closest residential building and proposed basketball court location. He said the entrance has now shifted slightly to the east and now intersects with Indigo Road instead of intersecting with Hilltop Street. He noted that this provides better site distances for the intersection and a safer entrance into the park, and the applicant is also proposing landscaping buffers to help buffer the area from the residences across the street.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant is also proposing to shift the community center building approximately 25 feet further south from where it had been shown six months ago, so the building is now approximately 55 feet from the nearest property line instead of 30 feet; the extra 25 feet is proposed to have a landscaping buffer to buffer the community center building from residences. He stated that at the March meeting, the applicant had submitted a special exception request to go along with the special use permit, due to the location of the pool and requirements in the zoning ordinance. However, he said, it has been determined that with the shift of the community center building and the location of the new pool, the pool now meets the requirements of the ordinance and the special exception is no longer needed.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that the second main topic is greenspace and landscaping, and the applicant has provided additional buffers and information on what is proposed. He reported that the applicant has identified that impervious surface would increase by about 5 2/3 percent with the additional building and additional parking proposed; the applicant has identified that they would use bioswales to help address stormwater runoff, and they have shown conceptual locations for those on the concept plan. He said they have proposed several additional vegetative buffers around the site to help buffer these new facilities and some of the existing facilities from the surrounding residential areas. He said the applicant has identified that they will do a 3 to 1 tree replacement where they are proposing to remove about 45 trees for construction and plant about 150 trees in their place throughout the site and the parking areas as buffers.

Mr. Reitelbach said the third topic of discussion was stormwater management, and the applicant is proposing to use bioswales and has clarified that the existing pond is not going to be used for stormwater management, so any stormwater runoff would have to be addressed before it goes into that pond. He noted that final design of stormwater management would be addressed by the County Engineer with a water protection ordinance (WPO) plan at the site-planning stage. He said the other main topic was transportation and traffic connection, and the applicant has shifted the northern entrance to the east for better site distance, and turning requirement such as turn lanes would be addressed by VDOT at the site-planning stage. He said the applicant has identified that construction traffic would use the secondary park road entrance from Park Road, with a staging area south of the existing building. He noted that there were some issues that staff had identified that needed to be addressed and have been addressed with these revisions, including

identifying the proposed concession areas at the park and shifting landscaping buffers around to ensure they avoided utility easements.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that access and circulation has been a big topic of discussion for this proposal, and there are two proposed main entrances to the site. He said that currently, there are three main entrances onto the site—a main entrance off of Park Road, a secondary entrance off of Park Road, and an entrance off of Hilltop Street on the north side of the park that is currently for emergency use only. He stated that the applicant is proposing to use the current emergency entrance as a full entrance, in addition to the main entrance on park road, which would provide better dispersal of traffic to all sides of the park instead of funneling all traffic to the Park Road entrance.

Mr. Reitelbach said this also comes about because of the future connections to the north and the east of the park that are going on in Crozet with development of the Barnes Lumber Yard area, there will be connections from Hilltop Street over to Crozet Avenue. He said that as Eastern Avenue becomes fully constructed, it will connect 250 through the eastern portion of Crozet; Park Ridge Drive is also proposed to be connected, roughly paralleling the railroad tracks from Eastern Avenue over to Barnes Lumber Yard in downtown Crozet.

Mr. Reitelbach said with the future connections to the north and east of the park, it would also make sense to have a full northern entrance to capture that traffic instead of funneling everyone around to the south side of the park. He noted that any required improvements to the entrances would need VDOT approval. He added that the applicant is also proposing additional trails, sidewalks, and pathways throughout the park to promote connections between the park facilities and surrounding areas.

Mr. Reitelbach presented a map showing access and circulation, noting the location of Barnes Lumber Yard, Park Ridge Drive, and Eastern Avenue and future pedestrian projects. He mentioned that the graphics are from the Crozet Master Plan currently under development and going to the Board of Supervisors in a few weeks. He said the graphic shows the greater bicycle and pedestrian networks throughout Crozet, with the park highlighted to show various shared-use and bike paths, as well as sidewalks proposed to connect Crozet Park with surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Reitelbach reported that there is one recommended revision from staff before this moves to the Board of Supervisors, and that is to clarify on the concept plan the proposed new location of the playgrounds and tot lots. He said there is currently a playground where the community center expansion is proposed to be, and this would clarify where the playground and tot lot were proposed to be relocated to.

Mr. Reitelbach stated that favorable factors are that the use is consistent with the Crozet Master Plan, and that the proposed use is located within the development areas and is consistent with the uses identified for areas designated as greenspace. He said that unfavorable factors are that the use will generate additional vehicle trips on the surrounding local street network. He said that staff recommends approval of SP2020-00016 with the following conditions, provided that the applicant makes the recommended revision regarding the location of the playground. He stated that the recommended conditions include the typical condition that the development be in general accord with the proposed concept plan, including major elements such as buildings, recreational facilities, pools, and parking area; this would allow for minor modifications at the site plan stage. He said that other conditions include that fencing adjacent to the outdoor pool must provide

screening from adjacent residential areas; the sound from radio, recordings PA systems, and other speakers shall meet noise ordinance requirements; there are several conditions related to lighting and its potential impacts; sales of concessions are limited to the two locations identified on the concept plan; and conditions 6-9 pertain to landscaping buffers, screening landscaping, and lighting, to mitigate potential impacts.

Mr. Reitelbach presented suggested motions for approval and offered to answer questions.

Ms. More said she was wondering about the north entrance to Indigo Road and wondered if he would explain whether that access point was a condition or potential expansion, and whether it would be made a regular access beyond its current emergency use, regardless how the project proceeds.

Mr. Reitelbach responded that with the concept plan, they have identified the northern entrance as one of the major elements of the plan—but staff has not put conditions on that as to whether it would be a full or emergency-only entrance, and that would be up to the applicant.

Ms. More said that it could be a by-right thing that the park could do, and she sees it within the context of this application and request that this is a good access point, and the applicant could decide whether it's used all the time or just for emergency use. She clarified that her question was whether it was tied to this request.

Mr. Reitelbach responded that the general location of it was tied to this request.

Ms. More said if it were taking more time, she wondered if the park could go ahead and construct the northern access point without having the ability to move forward on the project immediately because of funding.

Mr. Reitelbach replied that this would be determined by phasing, and if it did move forward, the project as a whole would be approved; at the site planning stage, the park could determine whether they need to phase the project in any way, such as doing the entrance before doing the building in a later phase.

Mr. Bivins asked the applicant to speak.

Mr. Kevin Schafer with Design Develop, a Charlottesville-based architectural design firm that has been involved with the park planning since 2018, and he thanked the Commission for their service to the community. Mr. Schafer stated that he would present refinements to the plan based on the previous comments received at public hearing on March 23, and since that time, they have been working with county staff to revise their project based on the thoughtful questions and discussion topics that came to light during the meeting.

Mr. Schafer said that starting with the 2004 Albemarle County Parks & Recreation (ACPR) needs assessment, Crozet Park has long been a focus of the county as a facility to expand to serve a growing community, and he presented the proposed development in roughly the same location and a similar program as the one they are proposing 17 years later. He said the 2021 Crozet Master Plan draft mentions Crozet Park about 46 times through narrative, text, and maps—illustrating how crucial and vital the park is as a service provider to the Crozet community.

Mr. Schafer stated that with that in mind, they found that the comments gathered fell into three main areas of concern. He said the first and primary would be clarifying their environmentally conscious interventions throughout the whole project. He referenced a diagram that was developed at their very first charette with park board members, and it outlines long-term requirements in preserving green space, bucolic areas of the park, and existing programmed park areas. He said in studying the site, the existing pool and fitness center fall centrally in the park, and it was imperative that they preserve and protect these popular park amenities on both sides of the existing facility.

Mr. Schafer stated that it became clear that they should target any new development within this central area, utilizing existing paved or building areas in lieu of developing on any green space. He said on the diagram shown, roughly 10% is devoted to parking, with 1.6% of the park dedicated to buildings and associated park structure. He referenced a slide showing proposed land use of 4.58% building, 12.55% parking, and nearly 83% remaining as green space, trails, ballfields, and amenities. He noted that large areas of land to the west, south, and east have all remained undisturbed, protected, and preserved throughout the project. He said their proposed building has been placed on a paved parking area to reduce impact on existing greenfield areas, and the majority of the new asphalt parking area occurs only on existing overflow parking.

Equally important to the Crozet Park Board, he said, is the requirement of the park to continue to feel like a park—wild and natural—even as Crozet’s population and density is increasing. He said that in response, major emphasis has been given to landscape planting, including thoughtfully placed enhanced landscaping and tree planting around the pond, park areas, and entrance roadways. He referenced a slide showing the number of trees required to be removed during the construction, with 150 new trees planted and 44 trees to be removed, for a ratio of about three to one new trees. He added that new shrubs, grasses, and native flowering plants would be instituted along sidewalks, the edge of the pool, and in proposed bioswales.

Mr. Schafer reported that many of the Commissioners’ comments revolved around impervious paving and exploring opportunities for enhanced stormwater mitigation measures. He explained that their stormwater retention and treatment strategy is primarily through the construction of three large engineered bioswales, stating that they would collect all rainwater from surface runoff and building drains and capture it in the bioswales found on both sides of the site. He said the water is allowed to be absorbed into the ground at a natural rate after proper filtration, which is a better approach to runoff than impervious pavers, as it allows for more significant filtration through native plantings and organic material—rather than rainwater with parking lot contaminants to seep in place. He added that new curb and gutter around the existing parking lots will shepherd water to these biofilters that previously would not have been retained for filtering.

Mr. Schafer said that while they are not seeking LEED approval, he and other Design Develop members are LEED approved and are employing these strategies for green building at the park: passive heating and cooling techniques, daylighting to reduce electrical lighting requirements, enhanced high-quality continuous insulation in walls, and solar panels on the roof. He stated that the existing structure was built by volunteers in the 1950s; the walls are cinder block with minimal wall insulation and insufficient roof insulation, and all systems are aging and inefficient. He said that beyond the existing facility, each winter, a temporary uninsulated dome is installed to cover the pool, and to heat the dome and the pool, huge propane furnaces burn 200 gallons of propane fuel per day and 50,000 gallons per winter swim season.

Mr. Schafer stated that the proposed project offers an environmentally considerate approach to providing much-needed indoor swimming, exercise, and community gathering facilities. He said the point is that they take the environmental aspects seriously—particularly the desire to preserve the green spaces in the park. He noted that they are adding 46,800 square feet of fitness and recreation, community gathering, and indoor swimming facilities, while only decreasing the park green space by 5.6%. He said they are putting new buildings and parking areas in existing hardscape areas and capturing and filtering rainwater through bioswales; the new building is more efficient and employs green building techniques; and they have supplemented and enhanced landscaping and tree plantings.

Mr. Schafer reported that beyond the site development strategy, many comments from the public came regarding the scale of the building, and a major component of the project design was the need to preserve the views that make Crozet Park a beautiful place. He stated that serious consideration was given to the height of the building, and the top of the exterior wall is 34 feet above grade. He said it was important for them to stay at around 30 feet in height for several reasons, explaining that the existing pool dome is around 30 feet tall, which is also the height of a typical two-story house.

Mr. Schafer stated that the park board sought to provide a structure with mass and height in scale with familiar projects such as the library and downtown structures. He said it was important that they didn't tower over adjacent neighbors to avoid casting long winter shadows or blocking anyone's viewsheds; this includes being mindful of views of park users, and they felt it was important to present the short elevation to the adjacent neighborhood in lieu of rotating the building 90 degrees and having a long façade visible from Parkside Village.

Mr. Schafer explained that they are shielding the building with a significant amount of landscape screening, particularly on the north façade, and the building is set back about 220 feet from the road to respect the adjacent neighborhood. He stated that a primary move to address several of the Commission's comments is to shift the building south 25 feet away from Parkside Village in the adjacent residential lot to the project's north, and the building has moved further into the center of the park—allowing for dense landscape screening on the northern façade, providing a limited amount of visibility from the Parkside Village neighborhood.

Mr. Schafer said that internally, there is a 15-foot bank of office storage areas and coaches' rooms between the edge of the pool and the exterior edge of the building. He noted that their exterior building material is a three-inch insulated metal panel that provides both outstanding thermal insulation and robust soundproofing. He emphasized that between the intense landscape buffer, the internal quiet zone, and high-quality exterior building envelope, sound transmission from the indoor pool to the adjacent neighborhood will not be an issue for residents—contrasted to the existing dome and blower furnaces that turn on and off frequently. He added that this project is significantly less disruptive to the neighborhood in terms of sound, viewshed, and aesthetics.

Mr. Schafer stated that other comments received pertained to the impact of traffic, and the Park Board has Joel DeNunzio, a traffic engineer and analyst for VDOT; they take his expert input seriously, and he is available to discuss the specifics of the revised traffic count that has been included in the submission. He said that after hearing numerous concerns about construction traffic, they will be utilizing the secondary park entrance off of Park Road as the construction entrance; this will avoid conflict with park users while still eliminating traffic through the Parkside Village neighborhood. He added that it is a thoughtful and practical solution to the concerns expressed by community members in March. He noted that they have also revised and relocated

the entrance from Hilltop Street to Indigo Alley per the Commission's suggestion, which was important for two primary reasons. He explained that one was to preserve some of the existing trees along the lot line with the adjacent neighbor, and to provide an entrance that has better sight lines along exiting roadways.

Mr. Schafer said that regarding the central location and vast interconnectivity of Crozet Park to its adjacent context, Crozet Advisory Committee Chair Allie Pesch stated in her letter to the editor in the *Crozet Gazette* that "Claudius Crozet Park is the cornerstone of the Crozet Master Plan's park and greenway system. If you drop a pin in the center of a map of the Crozet Growth Area, it lands on Crozet Park. It has unbeatable pedestrian and bike connectivity; the Crozet trails crew has designed its entire trailway system in coordination with County planners to have Crozet Park as its nexus. The park, as shown on the Crozet Master Plan, is designed along a greenspace corridor, providing alternative connections to the community park other than vehicle connections and access. The proposed parks expansion is also consistent with the parks and green systems goal of providing north/south and east/west trailway connections through the park to the adjacent surrounding neighborhoods."

Mr. Schafer concluded by reiterating that they appreciate the comments and feedback gathered at the previous meeting and the input provided. He stated that Crozet Park is a nonprofit organization here to serve the Crozet community by putting in place much-needed facilities for indoor swimming, health and wellness, community gathering, after-school childcare, facilities for senior citizens, a location for physical therapy, youth outreach programs, etc. He said that a final thought is that this is an enhancement of existing amenities—not a new use for this location—and is a modification of an existing SP to simply provide better facilities than exist currently. He noted that already onsite is a recreation and exercise facility, an indoor pool when the dome is installed, and community gathering facilities.

Mr. Schafer said that as Crozet continues to grow and is already designated as a county growth area, it needs new facilities to serve this growing population. Mr. Schafer emphasized that this is a valuable resource to Albemarle County that is so needed, and they are at a moment in time that has legitimate momentum—and these moments do not come along every day. He said there have been significant resources devoted to this effort, both in time and efforts and financial burden that the park has taken on to provide Crozet and all of western Albemarle County with a much-needed community and recreation facility. He urged the Commission to approve this special exception and the modifications of the existing SP already in place and allow the Crozet Park to provide the facilities so very needed in the community.

Mr. Clayborne stated that his first question is about the pond and asked how deep it could get.

Mr. Schafer responded that the existing pond onsite is manmade and will not be part of their stormwater management plan, and the bioswales are heavily planted ditches or cisterns that help filter the stormwater. He noted on a map the location of the pond that exists now and the heavy planting that denotes the location of the bioswales.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the playground would be fenced in, given its proximity to the pond.

Mr. Schafer responded that building code and safety requirements would stipulate that it be fenced in.

Mr. Clayborne said he didn't see it in the images and wanted to make sure he asked that question. He also said that it did not seem that the parking layout in the site was conducive to a fire truck pulling up to the front of the building, as they often need to go to the front door to look at a panel and assess where the fire is, and it looked like this would be a challenge. He added that he realized that this was just a conceptual plan, but he wanted to be sure to note that.

Mr. Schafer replied that this was a great point.

Mr. Randolph stated that as they look at this, there seem to be four identifiable athletic constituencies: those interested in soccer, those who play lacrosse, a swimming pool, and indoor activities. He said that his question is if this site were 22.806 acres of unbuilt land, whether they would locate the facility with no room in this identified plan for future growth without encumbering proximity problems to the surrounding neighborhood. He stated that the Commission's responsibility is looking at 20 years out—not just today—and what he sees here is a site that's going to be outgrown by the population. He asked if this was really an ideal site, given the intense use proposed. Mr. Randolph did comment him for the proposed plan, which had many positive aspects, but he had concerns as to whether it would meet the recreational needs of a growing community.

Mr. Schafer said he appreciated the forward-thinking question and for the past three years, he has been observing Crozet Park, and he is always amazed at how much of a community hub it already is—with fall festivals, orchestra performances, Peachtree baseball and SOCA soccer teams. He stated that what it means to Crozet as a centrally located service provider to the community is a real asset for it, and in looking at long-term use, this facility could enhance the site and the amount of programming that could be put into it. He said there are some areas still available for development in terms of programs such as a baseball or soccer field, and he pointed out potential locations between the pavilions.

Mr. Randolph said that location would create a proximity problem to neighborhoods, but perhaps they could move things around. He said if they have approval of what they're proposing here, they would not have a lot of future flexibility with land unless they eliminated fields. He stated that from the aerial view, each field and constituency would be loath to give them up.

Mr. Randolph stated that Mr. Schafer has mentioned cycling activity outside of Crozet Park that enables people to get into the park, yet he sees a heavy investment in parking for automobiles. He said that if they were really committing to cycling, they could address future growth on the site by eliminating some of these parking spaces, which would send a message to people that if they want to use the park, they need to cycle over there. He said with e-bikes now, there's no reason people can't access the facility with a bicycle. He added that the majority of the site plan in terms of square footage is committed to car parking, and he didn't see adequate provision for transit of bicycles—and they would have to contend with cars to get in—or parking facilities for bikes to encourage cycling.

Mr. Schafer said that was a great point, and Scott Collins, project engineer, was on the call and would jump in later. He stated that parking is a County requirement as part of zoning, with a use matrix based on building square footage, and limiting the amount of required parking could be a condition applied here, if the Commission could do that—and he thinks the park would be amenable to this.

Mr. Randolph stated there is plenty of talk about putting in bicycle access, yet this plan doesn't have anything for it but does for automobiles, and the master plan came down heavily in support of bicycle connectivity throughout Crozet—yet here is another auto-centric plan and a missed opportunity. He added that you can always fall back on, "The county made me do it."

Ms. More asked if others were agreeable to hear from Mr. DeNunzio since there were so many concerns about traffic.

Mr. Bivins agreed and asked Mr. DeNunzio to address this matter.

Mr. Joel DeNunzio stated that he is a VDOT Staunton District engineer and was formerly the resident engineer in the Charlottesville VDOT Residency. He said that in this instance, he is representing a park, as he serves on the park board, and he has lived in Crozet for about eight years. Mr. DeNunzio said that he is very familiar with Crozet and the county and the traffic items, concerns, and questions that often come up in these types of situations. He stated that he ran some numbers with ITE trip generation to determine what they expected the increase of trips to be, and he used the square footage of the proposed facility versus the existing one.

Mr. DeNunzio said the proposed facility is just over 53,000 square feet, including the proposed pool; the existing facility is about 17,500 square feet. Using trip generation rates, he said, he came up with an increase of approximately 847 trips per day, defined as a car entering and exiting, so each car entering and exiting constitutes two trips, so that would be about 425 cars. He stated that there were some existing traffic counts the county did for the park over the years, but they were based per week, so he took the count of 2,314 vehicles per week and converted it into trips and looked at it compared to their existing facility and ITE trip generation numbers and found them to be fairly similar. He noted that this was Land Use Code 495—Recreational Community Center, which is similar to the type of facility they are building, with one difference being that many of these facilities include a daycare, which they are not having. He added that sometimes these include a pool, and they are including a pool, so he used that in the trip estimation. He stated that using 847 trips is on the upper end of a conservative estimate and would be based on demand.

Mr. DeNunzio said that the back entrance serves a pretty important purpose once the other improvements are made, with what he refers to as Library Avenue Extended and Eastern Avenue, and this will shorten trips—especially for Parkside, Highlands, and the area east of the park along the Route 240 corridor that may typically go down to the four-way intersection, which is often congested and is one of the higher accident areas in Crozet. He said that this can keep some of the traffic out of this intersection, Tabor Street, and Route 810, and will provide access for Parkridge Road. He said he did a 60/40 split and estimated that 60% of traffic still on the main park road and 40% on the back entrance, and he came up with about 339 trips out Indigo Road once everything is built and in place.

Mr. DeNunzio stated that another nice thing about the back entrance is that Hilltop Street and Indigo Road are both more up-to-date local road designs, with pedestrian facilities and street parking, and it is a good entrance versus Park Road in many ways because there are pedestrian and bicycle facilities from the new road on Library Avenue Extended all the way to the end of the park—which would not happen until the county built sidewalks along Park Road, identified in planning but not yet funded at this point. He stated that overall, the park's central location and access in both north and south directions is a good access point; it meets multiple location and connectivity requirements, and traffic due to the expanded facility will be accommodated by

providing the second access point and connecting to a road system with the existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Mr. DeNunzio asked if there were questions.

Ms. More said that she didn't but found it helpful as it moves forward.

Mr. DeNunzio said that Mr. Reitelbach had made a comment about VDOT approval in the future and any improvements there, and those were specific to the two entrances—the existing and proposed—and were related to traffic counts, turn-lane requirements, and sight distances. He stated that VDOT would require that they meet all of those things prior to issuing a permit for this, and those are mandatory, so having them in the site plan phase is a normal operation that the park will comply with.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing.

The Clerk read the protocol and time limit for speakers.

Ms. Miki Salzburg stated that she is a 10-year resident of Crozet and the Old Trail subdivision and said that she is speaking in favor of the expansion of the Crozet Park and Aquatic & Fitness Center. She stated that she has been on multiple waiting lists for after care for her elementary-aged child, as her daughter was on three different waiting lists this summer for care and finally got a spot on the Crozet ACAC after-care program in early September. Ms. Salzburg said that local social media message boards were full of parents posting for after-school care, and the expansion of the park's center would lead to much-needed local summer camp and after-care opportunities for the community. She said that Crozet is a designated growth area and is growing exponentially, and with that, the needs for the community also grow—and they need the expansion for the care needs now required.

Ms. Sandra Houseman stated that she is a resident of Hilltop Street and is speaking as a resident and observer of the park for many years. She said that Crozet does need improved recreational facilities, but this is not the place to put a large new recreation center and another 115 parking spaces. She stated that the reality is that a relatively small number of people would access the park on trailways, and most people would drive, and this neighborhood is not equipped for this kind of traffic. Ms. Houseman said they don't even have sidewalks on Hilltop, and she's been asking for them for years—and it's unsafe to drive on the road now because of people with strollers and on bikes.

Ms. Houseman stated that this park is just too small to host additional construction or traffic, and the residents of a modest surrounding neighborhood are being asked to sacrifice their quality of life so that everyone else can enjoy what should be a public amenity, conveniently located, owned, and operated on the taxpayers' behalf by their elected representatives. She said this is a private park, and talking about this is giving the county a pass. She emphasized that the county owes residents a facility and needs to figure out where it can put a recreational center without inconveniencing folks who already live here. She said that the 847 trips will mostly be on Tabor, Hilltop, and Park, which are narrow streets that lack sidewalks. She stated that Crozet Park is second only to Darden Towe in usage, and that is trending up, according to developers.

Ms. Houseman said the National Recreation Association suggests that community parks be 25-50 acres, so Crozet Park is on the small size at 22 acres, and the County is continuing to approve

more and denser residential developments here. She said there is also general agreement among planners that 50% of parkland should be set aside for active recreation, and Crozet is devoting less than 12% of its parkland to active recreation. She said that this plan gives the county a pass it doesn't deserve; as the population grows, the county should be planning for current and future recreational needs by setting aside more land and finding ways to pay for its development.

Ms. Houseman said that land in the development area is very expensive now, and they need to look at the periphery on Route 240 or Route 250 and make that available for construction of a recreation center, and reserve the rest for soccer fields, baseball, pickleball, tennis courts, and other forms of recreation. She stated that Indigo is a tiny street—virtually an alley—and is already parked up for pickleball almost every day, and it's a fantasy to think that 300 more trips could be allowed via Indigo.

Ms. Catherine Genovese stated that she is a resident of the county, not Crozet, but wants to commend the park board for the wonderful facility they currently enjoy. She said that she and her husband go six to seven days a week to walk animals along the beautiful trails, and she goes almost any day water aerobics is available. She stated that the pool is getting old, and she's not sure it will be repairable in the future—and she believes the new facility is essential. She asked the Commission to approve this expediently, as they have been contemplating this for 18 years and could use it now.

Mr. Brian Day of Emerald Ridge stated that he is affiliated with the CCAC but is not speaking on their behalf. He stated that he worked 40 years in the environmental sector and is speaking on behalf of the improvements to the park. He said if you look at the history of this park, it was created by the community, and the first baseball field was built with a handful of people's donations 35 years ago; the bubble was put up by community donations. He stated that the park is in the center of the development area and has exiting trails coming to it, and there's no question that the county is desperately behind in putting in sidewalks that would provide access to such facilities. He stated that for many years, this has been a critical facility, and it is in the right place because they don't want to create a whole lot more driving. He stated that the changes made to comments made earlier in the year were taken into account, and the fact this is being designed with environmentally focused building is critical. He asked the Commission to support this as soon as possible.

Mr. William Brown stated that he is a resident of Parkside Village and is speaking on behalf of their HOA, with the village bordering the park on its northern boundary. He said the developer's current application includes an access road that intersects with Indigo Road and crosses a parcel that the park acquired by deed from Weatherhill Homes, developer of Parkside Village. He said improvements on the parcel, including the access road and landscaping, grading, fencing, lighting, etc. must be approved by the HOA's architectural review board (ARB). He said the deed states that the parcel, which was gifted to the park, is subject to Parkside Village covenants, conditions, and restrictions and makes clear that the parcel shall be considered a lot under such covenants. He stated that Article 10 of their covenants, which were shared with the park board and the Planning Commission earlier in the week establishes the authority of their ARB to review and approve any improvements proposed for any lots, including exterior lighting, landscaping, fencing, driveways, and grading or changes to existing grade. He said therefore, the park will need to engage with the Parkside Village ARB for the portion of their currently proposed project that intersects with the parcel under discussion.

Mr. James Hargrove stated that he is a resident of Rookwood Place in Albemarle County and has lived in the county for 20 years, witnessing the growth in Crozet and the western portion of the

county. He said the park is already a great asset for the county and the community, and the new facility would only enhance both. He stated that he had two sons who swam for the Western Albemarle swim team, and the park has been a great facility for both the high school men's and women's swim teams, as well as the year-round swimming program. He stated the new facility would also create a wonderful place for the county to create a learn-to-swim program, and it will provide a wonderful place for families to gather with the gym and the meeting spaces for everyone across all generations. He stated that he hoped the Board would approve this new facility, as it would only enhance the community and county.

Mr. Dan Bledsoe stated that he is a resident of the Western Ridge neighborhood in Crozet, and he is a teacher and coach at Western Albemarle High School, the parent of a teenage son who attends that school, and a member of the Crozet Park Board. He expressed his support for the new facility proposed for the park, and he understands that people oppose this because it changes their neighborhood park—but it must be understood that Crozet Park is a community park that serves the fast-growing population of Crozet and the surrounding communities. He said the new facility would greatly enrich the lives of citizens in the community, and outside of local schools, there isn't an indoor recreation center that can meet the needs of the population.

Mr. Bledsoe said that when school is canceled due to weather, he does not have to worry about what to do with his child, but for many families that is not the case; they must take off work to watch their children or can take them to the Brooks Family YMCA in Charlottesville. He stated that the new fitness and aquatic center would provide families a safe place to bring their children when they're not in school. Additionally, he said, it would give people across the age spectrum year-round exercise opportunities.

Mr. Bledsoe stated that regarding the aquatics facility, competitive and recreational swimming are popular activities in this area, with a large number of swimmers using the outdoor facility daily. He stated that the summer swim team typically has more than 225 swimmers, with the Crozet Gators having more swimmers than that between ages 5 and 18. He said the Western Albemarle swim team last year had 50 varsity athletes. He said that water exercise also allows the elderly to get in shape without putting excess strain on their bodies, and because it is not weight bearing it's easy on the joints and is a full-body workout that keeps the pressure off their hips, knees, and spine.

Mr. Bledsoe said that most importantly, the new facility would provide an opportunity to teach water safety. He stated that according to the CDC, drowning is the number one cause of death among children ages 1-4 and the second-leading cause of death for children ages 5-14. He stated that while drowning prevention requires layers of protection, swim lessons have been shown to reduce the risk of drowning by 88%; the new aquatics facility would meet the needs of the various groups that demand time. He stated that the new fitness and aquatic center is needed for the community, and the Crozet population was projected to reach 12,000 people by 2030, and this facility will not only meet the needs of the current population but will also be able to handle the growth in Crozet.

Ms. Samantha Masone stated that she is a resident of Skyline Crest Drive in Charlottesville and has been a group exercise instructor at the Crozet Park for the last nine years and has experienced two different managerial organizations: the YMCA and ACAC. Ms. Masone said while the policies, procedures, and pay scales have varied from one management to the next, the one constant has been the participants—and some of them have been in her classes as long as she's been teaching them. She said she feels fortunate that this group of people finds value in

the community they've created together and that they prioritize the time they spend together each week; this would not be possible if the park didn't provide the facilities and opportunities for them to gather. She stated that Crozet Park is a resource and asset not just for the citizens of Crozet but for the greater community. She said she does not live in Crozet, and neither do some of her regular class attendees—some of whom travel from as far away as Afton and northern Albemarle—and expansion would allow for increased class sizes or additional programs.

Ms. Masone stated that as one who leads outdoor classes, there are some days when they would all appreciate the ability to move indoors, either due to inclement weather or noise and traffic from groups using the adjacent community, but this is not possible due to COVID restrictions and limited indoor facilities. She noted that she is speaking as someone who has experience with the current facility and the members who pay to use it, and as an instructor, she would appreciate the opportunity to offer more flexibility to class participants. She said as a community member, she would be interested in and appreciative of a recreational center that offers increased space and a broader menu of classes and programs, and she urged the Commission to support the Park Board site plan and special use permit for a new and expanded recreational facility that will benefit not just Crozet but the community at large.

Mr. J.R. Hippel stated that he is a resident of Golf Drive in Crozet and is excited about having a modern aquatic center in Crozet, which will be a remarkable asset for the health and wellness of the community. He said that he has five reasons why he thinks this project reflects the characteristics of winning communities in the future. He stated that it provides critical infrastructure for the senior population to remain physically active and combat the silent killer of social isolation. He said the fastest growing segment of the population is people over 65, and pools provide an active, diverse community event every single day.

Mr. Hippel said that his second reason is that it supports the local school system's ability to integrate learn-to-swim programs and ensures a drown-proof western Albemarle/Crozet community. He said third, it creates competitive opportunities for both children and adults that are proven to lead healthy lives of character and resilience now and throughout their lifetimes; swimming has been key to his fitness when his knees became a challenge. He said that fourth, the facility would create jobs in sports and recreation, including lifeguard training—which is badly needed, as there is a shortage of lifeguards around the country. He said that fifth, it would be a source of pride and place where even more citizens would participate and support this wonderful community.

Ms. Kathy Riddle of Windemere Lane in Crozet stated that she and her husband have been living there for about 9 ½ years, and she comes before the Commission to express support for the new aquatics and fitness center. She stated that some constituents have addressed the afterschool and summer camp opportunities the new facility would support, and her understanding is that there are currently 35 seats at Crozet Park—and the new facility would increase this to 150-250 seats. She said most recent data from the pre-COVID school year is that Brownsville, Crozet, Maury, and Meriwether Lewis had a total of 123 students waitlisted for after-school programs.

Ms. Riddle said that this facility will provide excellent spaces for meeting, and as the community grows, it's important that new community members feel welcome and involved. She said others have addressed the year-round recreational facilities this would provide, and she wanted to provide a group of statistics from the CDC. She stated that the current obesity rate among children pre-COVID was 19.3%; for adults, the obesity rate is 42.4%. She noted that these rates have increased over the last 20 years. She stated that it's important that they have both indoor and

outdoor recreation, after-school, and summer camp opportunities, as well as those that enable to meet, learn, and grow.

Mr. Scott Kasen stated that he has been a Crozet community member for 16 years, and his residence borders the northern boundary of Crozet Park on Indigo Road. He thanked the Commission for reading the email he had sent them the previous Sunday. Mr. Cason said the proposal asks for the park's surrounding residential streets to bear the entire burden of traffic for the benefit of the Crozet community, but the roadway network is not designed to support the projected traffic levels that would come with a park expansion—the most acute example of this being the new north boundary entrance that connects to Indigo Road.

Mr. Kasen said that traffic using this roadway can only flow down Hilltop Street, an old residential road that receives heavy foot traffic, as it serves as the only connector between 80 (soon to be 100) residences, the park, and downtown Crozet. He said that vehicular traffic is always driving around pedestrians, forced to walk in the street, because the asphalt sidewalks have been crumbling for years and are literally unusable, with sections that literally disappear into the landscape under dirt and grass that has overtaken them. He stated that the sidewalks on this exact street have been considered among the highest-ranking pedestrian improvement projects from the Albemarle County transportation priorities list, which considers the most critical projects within the entire county—and that was from FY18, four years ago. He stated that Hilltop Street is an old road that has been neglected and does not safely support the pedestrian and vehicular traffic today—and certainly not street parking, as the traffic engineer stated this evening, nor the additional 27 vehicle trips per hour during peak times that are estimated to come from the new park entrance. He said that until the ground for new sidewalks is actually broken, it is too dangerous, and the proposed entrance should be struck from the plan.

Mr. Kasen said his second point is tied to his first, and the application makes numerous mentions of how the park expansion supported infrastructure projects that are proposed, but history has shown that these projects missed schedules by years, and repeatedly, there are project approvals in Crozet that rely on infrastructure that has yet to be built. He emphasized that it is time to let the infrastructure catch up to the development in the western part of the county; the community can use such a facility, but this is not the location for it.

Ms. Amy Life stated that she has lived in Crozet for 18 years and most recently is a resident of Sparrowhill Lane, and she is speaking as the chairperson of the Crozet Gators swim team, a role in which she has served for the past eight summers. She stated that the Crozet Park pool is their team's home, and she is speaking in favor of the expansion project at the park. She said that each spring, she meets with the head of the aquatics facility to discuss the number of lanes they will need, as their team has 230 swimmers during a typical summer—with about 190 of those attending regular daily practices. She said they are a summer team but start practicing in mid-May and are only guaranteed six lanes during the afternoons for those 3-4 weeks until school is out; each year she asks for an additional lane or all eight for their afternoon hours, but because the team needs to share its lanes for family swim time and lap swimmers, her request is declined.

Ms. Life said that as a result, they run 4-5 shortened practice sessions over a longer period of time every afternoon, which cuts into dinner and homework time, keeps coaches there later, shortens practice sessions for swimmers, and forces parents with multiple swimmers to make multiple drives. She stated that building an additional pool will allow them to use all eight outdoor lanes for those tricky weeks. She said that they switch to eight lanes once school is out and use the entire pool for over three hours through the end of July, and they need all of the lanes and

more. She emphasized that they have lots of hardworking swimmers who devote each morning to summer swim team practice, and they fill their roster every year. She said that with an additional pool, parents could swim laps while their kids are practicing, younger kids could take lessons or swim with a parent—allowing the whole family to exercise in a pool at the same time, modeling the lifelong healthy habits that swimming affords. Ms. Life added that families might opt to stay at the improved facility to work out, swim, or walk the trails, instead of dropping off and picking up.

Ms. Life said that the Gators' executive team has spoken at length about how to best build a swim team prep group for younger swimmers who might not be ready for competing but are more than ready for just a swim lesson. She stated that it would be great to offer this building-block program, and they are seeing increased interest in the Crozet Gators program each year. She said that nearby pools like Boar's Head and Fry Spring already have very successful mini programs for their youngest swimmers, and there is a huge demand for this in the community already. She stated that she hopes the additional lanes at the Crozet Park facility would allow this and other programs to become a reality.

Mr. Rob Rule stated that he lives on Village Drive in Waynesboro but formerly lived on West End Drive in Crozet, and he is the head swim coach at the Shenandoah Marlins Aquatic Club, and they swim at the Crozet Park pool. He said they are a swim team based in Crozet and want to make swimming available to as many people as possible in Crozet. Mr. Rule said their focus is on giving kids in the community the ability to be part of a swim team and learn how to swim. He said he is also head coach of the Crozet Gators swim team, and this summer, they did have some space issues—with 230 swimmers on a team and 30 on a waitlist that were not able to swim this past summer. He emphasized that they don't have the space, but he anticipated that all of the teams would continue to grow and need the extra space.

Mr. Rule said that one reason he decided to be a coach in Crozet is because he loves swimming and wants children in the community to have a year-round competitive swim team and not feel like they need to drive into Charlottesville to swim—as it's not fair for kids in this community to drive into the city to be on a swim team. He stated that this was the first year he was coach of the Crozet Gators summer team, and it was a fantastic experience, with all parents getting involved and numerous meets held at the Crozet facility, including running a portion of the Jefferson Swim League meet here. He said there were a lot of people and community involvement, which makes this a great parks and recreation facility, and the project is needed in Crozet and would be very good for the community overall.

Mr. Rule said they swim outside until October, even though it's chilly, and they also swim under the bubble. He added that the kids would be competitive with anyone, but it would be nice for those in the community to have comparable facilities to those of surrounding communities. He stated that the new recreational facility would allow them to provide additional opportunities for swimmers now and in the future—including those learning how to swim. He noted that those who swim on the team are the ones becoming lifeguards and teach the young kids in the community, which is sorely needed now and into the future.

Mr. Phil Kirby stated that he has lived on Cranberry Hill in Crozet for 20 years, and the developer's proposal to amend the existing regulations to construct a building with over three-quarters of an acre footprint and an additional 192 parking spaces should be denied. Mr. Kirby said that using a small private park to build a facility intending to be occupied by a for-profit business means that much parking should be considered unconscionable. He said that he also heard earlier that the park was not requesting public funding, but in their newsletter, they indicated that they plan to

ask for public funding. He stated that what the developer wants to do with this park goes against all the reasons people live here, and the Crozet Master Plan urges for green spaces. He asked what study was done to determine the building was the right size and in the right location.

Mr. Kirby said the developer downplayed the size of the building when it presented to the Commission in March of this year because it is too big, and when confronted with that reality by the Commissioners, the developer submits the same-sized building in generally the same place but hidden on the plan in a way that 300-foot-long, 32-foot-high façades magically disappear. He said they also did not number the parking spaces in the presentation, but that did not change how many spaces there are. He stated that the comparison of this proposal to the Harris Teeter on 250 is an accurate representation of what this developer is proposing, and it should give everyone an idea of what Crozet Park will become if this developer is approved.

Mr. Kirby asked how the developer became an expert on traffic, as they have no idea what VDOT will require on Indigo to accommodate the north entrance, and that giving the applicant that entrance without those knowing those requirements is wrong. He said that developers should not be the ones who control development in Crozet—that is the job of the Planning Commission—and he urged then to deny this proposal because it does not fit in the plan now and will overwhelm surrounding neighborhoods in the future.

Mr. James “J.J.” Sullivan said he is a resident of Parkside Village and is neighbors with Mr. Kirby. Mr. Sullivan stated that he and his wife moved to Crozet about a year ago from Charlottesville and decided to do that because of the park, which is four doors down from them. He said he missed the first few minutes of this item because he was at the park coaching t-ball. He said that he is quite conflicted about the growth and at this point is not in favor of the expansion. He stated that Mr. DeNunzio was competent and walked through his assumptions, which was appreciated, but he is a member of the Board and an independent study is needed to determine if 847 is accurate—as it may be low.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he did not hear any discussion of the Glenbrook at Parkside, which is going in literally behind his house. He said he heard about some feeder roads in the context of traffic but did not hear anything about the 31 lots going in behind him and would increase traffic. He said that one speaker that mentioned the traffic on Hilltop, as that road needs some development and construction to manage the traffic; it is not uncommon to see families walking and biking in the street, and he is afraid that it will not handle the growth that's being asked for. He added that he hoped the county would pick this up and do the analysis, and he is in favor of growth, but the way this is presented, a great deal more infrastructure needs to be included before that can occur.

Mr. Alan Freeman said he has lived on Longmeadow Lane in Crozet since 1972, and over the past 48 years, the park has responded to the changing needs of Crozet and western Albemarle, the need for recreation, and the space for building community spirit and pride. He said that when he moved here, the park was limited to a seasonal pool, small community building, baseball field, and a few picnic tables; the surrounding area was mostly vacant. He said his two sons have learned how to swim at the park, played t-ball at the park, attended summer camp, and played soccer there, and the park board has responded to the increasing need, building soccer playing fields, covering pavilions, and building a dog park. He said they built the cover for the pool and tennis courts that are also used for pickle ball, and he is amazed by the number of people he sees walking in the morning there, and there are workout stations on those trails. He stated that they built the indoor fitness center, which is now maintained by ACAD, and every time the community

needed additional activities, the park board has reacted positively raising money for the pool cover, lining the tennis courts, etc. He stated that the park is ready to expand again, and it's important that it does, as it's about more than parking spaces and traffic but is about the community spirit and having space for activities. He encouraged approval of this item.

Mr. Joe Fore said that he is a resident of Amber Ridge Road in Crozet, stating that he supports the park plan in its current form and hopes the Planning Commission will advance this important project. Mr. Fore stated that Crozet area residents desperately need a recreational facility like this one, and Crozet Park is the only active public park for the community of more than 10,000 people who live here now. He said the recreational center won't only be a gym and a pool but would serve as an important gathering place for the whole community.

Mr. Fore stated that he wanted to address two concerns, including traffic, as Mr. DeNunzio pointed out. He said there were a number of projects in the works, and the Crozet Master Plan includes catalyst infrastructure projects specifically designed to alleviate the exact traffic concerns that neighbors are expressing. He stated that the new master plan features pedestrian-oriented projects, prioritizing sidewalks in these exact neighborhoods; Park Street, Hilltop, and Tabor are all prioritized sidewalk projects. He said it also calls for improvements to the Crozet trail from Westhall to the park, which will encourage increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Mr. Fore stated that there are four new road projects that will reduce connection: the redevelopment of Barnes Lumber Yard, which will provide an east/west connection from downtown to Park Street; the extension of High Street from Tabor to Library Avenue, which increases more south connectivity and reduces the need for people to use Hilltop; the southern portion of Eastern Avenue will connect the park to 250, encouraging drivers to access the park from the south side, bypassing Parkside Village; and the proposed extension of Dunvegan Lane, which will also allow drivers to access the southern part of the park directly from Crozet Avenue, again by passing Parkside village on the north.

Mr. Fore said that regarding concerns people have addressed about removing greenspace and the idea that this project diminishes park amenities, the only greenspace they are using here is a mowed, grassy field. He stated that it is important to note that this is a part of the park that is the least used, northwestern part of the park. He noted that he is at the park several times per week with his preschool child, and since the pandemic began, they have specifically spent their time in the northwestern part of the park because there is no one else around and it's easy to socially distance there.

Mr. Fore stated that lastly, this project doesn't reduce anyone's opportunity for free outdoor recreation, and the new facility doesn't displace the walking trail that Mr. Freeman mentioned, the soccer and baseball fields, the basketball courts, the dog park, the pickleball courts, or the large playground on the east side. He said the only thing the project will disturb is the playground on the west side, and that is being replaced with a brand new one. He reiterated that this ambitious and important project would not diminish any facilities or any opportunities in the park, and he urged them to advance the project.

Ms. Allie Pesch stated that she lives on Mint Springs Road in Crozet and was born and raised here, grew up going to Crozet Park, and continues to coach softball there several times a week. Ms. Pesch said she very strongly supports this project and wants to echo everything that Mr. Fore just said and everyone who has spoken in support of it, which she feels is long overdue and sorely needed. She added that she is very proud of the community for taking this initiative and building

the facility that the community has already grown to need, and she hopes that the Commissioners see how hard the applicant has worked to listen to neighbors' concerns and provide the facility for everyone who lives in the western part of the county. Ms. Pesch added that she hoped the Commission sees how much this is needed and how it will benefit the community as a whole.

Ms. Deborah Ferrera stated that she is a 21-year resident of Hilltop Street in this wonderful town that she has seen explode in growth in that time, with many developments that have gone up close by and further out—which has come with increased traffic, noise, and trash thrown out of car windows. Ms. Ferrera said that it is less safe to walk down Hilltop Street or High Street to walk your dog or head out to play ball with your child, and that has gotten more difficult over the years. She said she agreed that this type of facility is needed and what it will bring to the community with all its programming, and she supports and appreciates the efforts there—but she is very concerned that the things she mentioned will increase, especially rush-hour traffic around people's workout times and weekends.

Ms. Ferrera said that she knows progress happens and you can't stop it, but she hopes there will be some consideration and sensitivity to the street letting out into Indigo into Hilltop, as the street is overgrown and has lots of cracks in it and has had to be redone several times. She noted that you can trip over the sidewalk, which is terrible and has never been maintained since it went in when the Parkside Village went in.

Ms. Ferrera stated that it's a small street, and a lot of changes would have to be made or improved to make it work, and perhaps even the times of access to Hilltop could be limited so that it's not constant in adding to what has already been increasing over the years she has lived here. She said she hoped they don't lose the charm and sweetness of the neighborhood and that it's still livable for her and her neighbors, adding that it's easy for those who don't live on this road to speak highly about the need for this—but she does support it. She thanked the Commission for the opportunity to address them.

Mr. Mark McKenney of Park Road stated that he is fully in favor of this project and hopes the Commission approves it, and he wanted to raise two main points. Mr. McKenney said that it was 50 years ago that Crozet was designated a growth area, as part of the 1971 revision of the county's comprehensive plan; they are now on their third Crozet Master Plan, with numerous infrastructure projects as part of that plan. He stated that the infrastructure challenges that everyone is talking about are on the shoulders of the county and VDOT, with poor planning over the last five decades to get them to this point.

Mr. McKenney said he supports this plan and has three children with a fourth due in about five days, and they need this park. He stated that he coaches baseball at this park, and his family is at the park five days a week. He stated that he is a permanently and totally disabled veteran—one of 400 who live in Crozet—and he needs a place to swim. He said he can no longer run, it hurts to walk, and there are many other residents who have physical and mental disabilities; having an expanded park will help their quality of life improve.

Mr. McKenney stated that they needed this probably two decades ago and cannot wait another 20-50 years for the infrastructure projects in Crozet to finally catch up before they do this park project. He said they need the park for the community, and he applauds the park board for putting this plan together, and he hopes that the Commission approves it.

Ms. Valerie Long stated that she is a resident of Welbourne Lane in Crozet and expressed her support for the application. She said the applicants have done a very good job of balancing the needs for active recreation space and open space, as well as addressing all of the comments that have been raised by the nearby neighbors regarding the new exit/entrance, landscaping, and shifting the building. She noted that they have also incorporated all of the comments raised by the Commission at their March meeting. She added that this is an existing use that has been in this location for more than 50 years, and it is reasonable for the park board and the community to be able to work together to increase and approve the amenities here.

Ms. Long said it should be no surprise to anyone that it's appropriate for a facility of this age to be expanded and enhanced, particularly with the amount of growth they have seen in the community. She said that as others have indicated, the ability to substantially increase the capacity for after-school programs for local elementary schools addresses a serious challenge for families in the western feeder pattern for public schools here. Ms. Long emphasized that it is devastated for working families to not have safe, affordable after-school care for their children, and it's particularly detrimental to lower-income families and female head of households. She added that it has a significant impact on the ability of many women to further their careers if they have to choose between safe and affordable childcare.

Ms. Long stated that this will provide an incredible benefit to the community in that regard, in addition to all of the incredible recreational amenities and improvements that the facility would provide. She said that it is a good balance between open space and improvements, and she particularly applauds the way the applicant has focused the new improvements to be in areas that are already disturbed to the greatest extent possible. She said she appreciates their focus on these issues and thanks the Commission for their time.

Ms. Jennifer Kirby stated that she resides at Parkside Village in Crozet and has lived in this neighborhood for 20 years. Ms. Kirby said when she moved here, she knew she was moving into a high-growth designated area of Albemarle County, and she was expecting that there would be infrastructure in place or developed before a facility of this size would be considered. She said she was also expecting that land use and zoning ordinances would protect property owners from developments of this size and scale to be considered before infrastructure was in place. She stated that she also expected the master plan to be used as a guide to manage future development, and it would also be used to protect the unique character of the community.

Ms. Kirby stated that she is opposed to this facility because she feels it is completely out of character and scale for the adjacent neighborhoods and property owners, and it would contribute to traffic issues that they're already dealing with in Crozet, as well as creating an unsafe environment for pedestrians, cyclists, vehicles all trying to access the park on Hilltop. She said she can't imagine how a building of this size and scale would be a good fit for any residential development in Crozet, and she feels that there is an area better suited for a building of 35,000 square feet.

Mr. Bill Johnson, a member of the Claudius Crozet Park Board of Directors, stated that he is speaking in an individual capacity and his remarks have not been reviewed or impacted by the board. Mr. Johnson said he is a father who lives in fear because he has teen drivers, and he is also a 27-year veteran of the U.S. Army with 11 years overseas in three combat tours, including 15 months in some of the most violent areas of Iraq. He stated that he's seen a lot of things that he's unable to forget, but nothing quite as senseless as the deaths that occur every year on the roads of Albemarle County—which is pretty high up in terms of dangerous roads.

Mr. Johnson said their rural roads are among the most dangerous in the state, and Ivy Road is a particularly dangerous stretch, as is I-64, contributing to lost loved ones along those routes, which should not be ignored. He commented that not having adequate amenities where they live puts more vehicles on some of the most dangerous roads in the state, and the statistics are clear that increased traffic congestion does not kill people—the speed and rural nature of Albemarle's roads kills people. He said in 2020, the death rate for 1,000 people on county roads was .24; in Fairfax County, the most populous county in the state, the death rate was an order of magnitude less at .05.

Mr. Johnson stated that planning for pastoral views and rural greenways requires that the growth-designated areas be provided with right-size recreational facilities and amenities, and failure to do so comes at the cost of human life on those rural greenways. He emphasized that they are presently not right sized for recreational facilities in Crozet, and his family is on those roads every day to get to adequate facilities in Charlottesville. He said that this is why he is speaking tonight, and he has been fighting for the right amenities here for 10 years.

Mr. Johnson said that the truth is that the proposed project does not increase traffic, as the footpaths in Crozet all lead to the park, which is surrounded by residential areas. He said that not approving the project or moving it out of the residential area to a busy portion of Route 250 just puts more traffic from the roads—not less. He stated that the park is where the project belongs, and denial of it will simply increase traffic and put the community at greater risk. He stated that perhaps those opposing the project because of traffic concerns just haven't looked at it logically or haven't had enough senseless death seared into their memories to weigh the seriousness of the danger that long drives on Albemarle County represent. He recommended that they stop by a few of the memorials before complaining about a few cars passing their house to get to the local gym.

Mr. Johnson stated that he requests that the Commission approve the special use permit and help them keep Crozet local. He thanked them for their time.

Mr. Steven Goadhouse of Cranberry Lane said he is a neighbor to the park and is speaking on behalf of himself and his family. Mr. Goadhouse expressed appreciation to the park and the developers for moving the construction entrance to the south, and he sees that they took in some of the comments from March, which he appreciated. He stated that he has specific requests, which he hopes they also consider. He said that with the new northern entrance, he requests that a speedbump or similar traffic-calming measure be added in the same way that the existing southern entrance and exits have. He said he also requests, whether VDOT requires it or not, that a stop sign be added—which is something for reasons he doesn't understand doesn't exist on that southern entrance.

Mr. Goadhouse stated that his understanding is that when a special use permit is granted, it is almost like a “blank check” being given to the park and developers, and he requests that some stipulations and periodic reviews be added. He also mentioned the horrible sidewalk on Hilltop, which was a requirement from the county many years ago from the developers of Parkside Village—but no requirements were given, so they ended up with what they have now, which is in a horrible state. He said that with the size of this project, he fears that without any oversight, similar travesties could occur.

Ms. Erin Rothman stated that she lives on Cranberry Lane and is speaking as a resident. Ms. Rothman said that while she is impressed by the plans for this facility and appreciates the improvements over the original plan, she still has serious reservations about the increase in traffic. She said that earlier in the presentation at this meeting, there was a quote saying that Crozet Park has unbeatable pedestrian and bike connectivity, as if that somehow supports this plan. She stated that it is quite misleading, as the current connectivity to and from the park is severely lacking and unsafe. She said that her family lives next to the park, and her son was hit by a car while biking to Crozet Elementary with her husband several years ago.

Ms. Rothman stated that the crumbling sidewalk on Hilltop is incredibly uneven, so it has many tripping hazards for pedestrians and is too narrow to be practical for biking. She said that few use it, and people constantly walk, run, or bike in the road. She said that Park Road, the intersection at Hilltop, High, and Tabor, and the part of Tabor without a sidewalk already feel unsafe to navigate on foot or bike due to current traffic levels. She stated that with increased traffic, she is concerned this will make it even less safe for pedestrians and cyclists and ironically make people less likely to engage in these healthy activities in an expanded center.

Ms. Rothman said while the solution to this seems pretty straightforward—putting in sidewalks and bike lanes—information obtained through a FOIA request from the county makes it clear they have no plans to fund these projects any time in the near future, despite the recognition that these improvements are badly needed. She stated that there will already be another increase in traffic on these same roads due to the construction of homes next to Parkside Village and the park at Foothill Crossing, so they need to look at the cumulative effect from both of these projects.

Mr. Thomas Adajian stated that he lives on Hilltop Street in Crozet, and his property touches the park; he can see the pond and blue dome from his deck. Mr. Adajian said he shares concerns about the traffic, as people don't use the sidewalk but walk in the road instead, and you cannot park on Hilltop between the and High Street, contrary to what the park board member suggested. He stated that he worries that the county is proposing to "kick a bunch of problems down the road," or the sidewalk—in some cases, roads and sidewalks that don't exist, which doesn't seem responsible.

Mr. Adajian said that the county is proposing to contract out its recreation responsibilities to the park board, and he doesn't think that board is accountable to the community in any real sense. He added that they certainly aren't accountable to the neighbors, as several Commissioners pointed out at the March meeting. He noted that in addition, the park board is going to contract some functions out to ACAC—again removing the county from any real oversight. He said he liked the earlier suggestion that there would be some stipulations for the county to review and have some oversight over granting a special use permit, but he thinks the entrance on Indigo is badly thought out and in need of a study—not an informal report by the park board. He concluded by stating he feels there are still problems here.

Ms. Pamela Beasley stated that she is a resident of Cranberry Lane and is a concerned resident of Parkside Village speaking on behalf of herself and her husband, Alba. She said that she believes the infrastructure simply does not exist for a problem of this magnitude, and though she thinks this project is badly needed. She emphasized that the infrastructure must come first, and Parkside Village alone has about 120 vehicles, so when they add in the new Foothills Crossing homes coming online, they will have nearly 200 cars—which currently have only one way in and one way out to their homes. She said this is already unsafe with an emergency situation in mind, and when they add to that more cars, those who have waited at rush hour already to get in and

out of their neighborhood while park traffic leaves would disagree with the report given tonight, which baffled her as it did others.

Ms. Beasley emphasized that this is a recipe for disaster, and the Indigo entrance is not a suitable solution, and Parkside Village is already dealing with some traffic and visibility concerns with that area as it intersects with Hilltop, especially when the pickleball participants choose to park on both sides of the street, as residents already do. She said that the visibility leaving Cranberry and the alley behind the homes on that lane is problematic, and some near-miss accidents have already occurred. She said there is also currently an issue with cars speeding on the now-open dead end and straight stretch of Indigo that leads to the new development behind Cranberry, and the addition of more cars and activity will potentially make this worse and more dangerous for residents.

Ms. Beasley stated that the current streets like the old section of Hilltop and High were never planned to carry the traffic load they are handling now, and there are no proper sidewalks on Hilltop. She noted that it is already necessary to utilize extreme caution to avoid hitting pedestrians, who are often kids walking to and from the pool, or bicyclists who have no choice but to occupy the streets. She said the streets are too narrow, and when residents on the older section of Hilltop park on the street, all of those issues are compounded. She stated that High Street at Hilltop is already crumbling along the edge from the weight of construction vehicles as a result of recent construction in the area. She said with the current development in Crozet, residents who are close to the downtown area are already dealing with the need for traffic lights at Tabor and Crozet Avenue instead of the stop signs, which is also true at the four-way stop.

Mr. Jacob Feldman stated that he lives on Hilltop Street in Parkside Village and has lived there with his wife and daughter since February. He said that in March, he spoke against approval of the special use permit for a variety of reasons—including the questionable suitability of a large enterprise building in a park, and the increased traffic from the perspective of being a neighbor. He stated that after reviewing the proposed plan, he still did not believe these concerns were being addressed, and Crozet Park is still his two-year-old daughter's favorite place. He said that they are at the park every day and love its greenspace, and they don't want the view obstructed by a very large building.

Mr. Feldman said to date, there has always been enough parking, except for when it's a sports day, and then there isn't enough field. He urged them not to decrease the amount of greenspace in favor of excessive parking lots, as this park is the green center of Crozet—and few members in the community want to lose that. He stated that a 30-foot-tall rectangular building of glass and concrete does not belong in a park, and this feels so intuitive.

Mr. Feldman said that from a traffic standpoint, the developer has written about how there will not be a negative traffic experience for the driver, but this does not adequately address concerns of the neighborhoods that will experience those cars. He stated that just this week, his daughter drove her dump truck down Hilltop Street while some slightly older children drew chalk pictures in the middle of the road. He said neighbors love these quiet streets, and that's where the kids play. He said in portions of the neighborhood, he has significant safety concerns; in the intersection of High and Hilltop streets onto Indigo, there is a dilapidated that many residents with a stroller or scooter choose to walk around. He stated that locals walk in the road, which is fine in terms of generally low traffic levels in the Parkside Village community.

Mr. Feldman stated that the park and its corresponding developer never reached out to the

Parkside Village community, and he is relieved that they proposed routing construction traffic through the already constructed gate on Park Road; should this project be approved, this gate should be used for incoming and outgoing traffic as well. He said it would only be a minor expansion from the already proposed paving of the parking lot. He urged the Commission to not grant creation of the Hilltop Street or Indigo Street entrances to be a by-right condition to the applicant.

Mr. Tim Tolson of Highlander Way in Crozet stated that he is chair of the Crozet Independence Day planning committee and the Crozet Community Association, but he is not speaking on behalf of either group. Mr. Tolson said he is speaking as a Crozet resident who has spent a lot of time at the park over the three plus decades he and his family have lived here. He stated that he got to see an early presentation of these plans at their Crozet Community Association meeting in the park's newly renovated radio building, the day before Governor Northam declared the quarantine in March 2020.

Mr. Tolson stated that since then, he has seen the park board and their designers work to engage the public and be responsive to their concerns. He said their revised proposal presented tonight has made numerous changes that mitigate or eliminate the majority of the community's concerns regarding construction traffic, tree cover, and green space, as well as noise levels. He stated that the new plan only replaces the playground in the front, and that will be replaced—not eliminated—so what is there at the park, as the plan showed, will not be eliminated.

Mr. Tolson pointed out that this increases the recreational possibilities in Crozet, and the current space is too small, with Crozet residents asking for updating and increasing of that facility's size for a very long time. He stated that this adds recreational changes without diminishing the existing outdoor recreational opportunities at Crozet Park; it keeps the walking trails, the soccer and baseball fields, the basketball and pickleball courts, the dog park, and the large playground. He noted that they would build a smaller playground to replace the one thing it removes. He said they are offering more than just an indoor pool and a gym; it will be an important space for much-needed after-school program expansion.

Mr. Tolson stated that locating the proposed facility central to Crozet is important, and a lot of housing central to it will mean people are incentivized to walk and cycle to the park rather than drive. He said the park is on the greenway path and near to downtown, which also increases the odds of people walking or cycling to the park, so he believes it is the right location to build this proposed facility. He stated that this all comes at no cost to the taxpayers of Albemarle, as the park board will raise the funds necessary to fund the community center, fitness center and pool—and make it available to the public, just as they have done for 50 years. He emphasized that Crozet Park has always been central to greenspace and recreational opportunities in Crozet, and this proposal enhances those opportunities. He said this is the right facility at the right place, and he supports it and urges the Commission to do so.

Mr. Earl Pomeroy stated that he lives on Park Road and abuts Crozet Park, having lived here for 20 years and working with the park and contributing to it, including serving the park board for a decade. He said he was very familiar with all of the efforts the park board has put into the design and outreach to the community through surveys over the years, to accommodate the overall desires and needs of the community, and this representation is the plan before them currently. He stated that he believes this project is absolutely needed, and as has been stated by many others before him, it's late in coming, and the park is overwhelmed with use as it is right now. He said that this facility will provide an entire spectrum of opportunities for all ages within the

community, and it is absolutely necessary. He said the fact that they have done such a marvelous job of reading all the concerns from the March meeting and those previous, he thinks the Commission should approve and push this project forward with conditions.

Mr. Pomeroy acknowledged that there are issues, as stated by residents of Hilltop and Parkside Village, and he pointed out that the traffic studies need to be addressed and they need to look at traffic on all the streets. He said that having lived here for 20 years, he knows that infrastructure is lagging way behind the rapid pace of the development, and this facility is more than needed, and the park board has done a great job with their design team to deliver something that will work and will accommodate most in the community, although they can't satisfy the needs of everybody. He stated that he has lived on Park Road for 20 years and has seen the hundreds and hundreds of houses that have been developed east of the park and all of its subsequent traffic, with sometimes 3,000 cars a day going past his house and most of them going past the posted speed limit. He added that Park Road and Hilltop are exactly the same size, with no sidewalks.

Mr. Lee Grimes stated that he represents his kids and used to live in Crozet but are still active in the community. Mr. Grimes said he echoed the comments in support of this plan and thinks it's long overdue and exactly what Crozet and the western Albemarle community need. He stated that they haven't heard tonight from children, which is the group that probably more so than anyone else will take advantage of this new facility—which needs to be considered by the board. He said the problems they have heard about traffic and entrances/exits are ones that can be solved, and the kids are exactly where the focus should be. He said they would support the project, and the Commission should too.

Mr. Bryan Garey stated that he appreciates all sides of this issue, noting that he lives on Fairwinds Court in Crozet and has been here since 2008. He said he walks and cycles to the park on a regular basis and has family memberships to the former YMCA in Crozet Park, with a current family membership in the Crozet Park ACAC. He said that the park is a valuable resource in dire need of upgrades, and he sincerely appreciates the concerns of residents surrounding the area and urges them to work on ways to support more park visitors rather than allow a pool and park buildings to continue to deteriorate. He stated that he respects concerns but thinks they can be mitigated and urges everyone to continue to move past that so they can have this resource for many years to come to serve even more neighbors and residents in the area. Mr. Garey said he appreciated the park board's good work and urged the Commission to approve this project.

Ms. Kathy Floyd stated that she lives on Decca Lane in the Ivy area and visited the park the previous evening for several games of pickleball with friends. She said it was a beautiful evening with the smell of fall in the air, and the activity level in the park seemed to be at a crescendo. Ms. Floyd said the athletic fields were full, with young kids running around in preparation for their next games; parents arrived to pick up their kids from the after-school program; the pool had the splash of water from swimmers. She stated that families were out for a stroll walking their dogs; young and old couples were walking hand in hand; parents were chasing toddlers in the grassy areas, which created a safe place away from the traffic; under the pavilion, an exercise class was in process.

Ms. Floyd said that community at its best was happening, and the word is defined as "fellowship with others as common attitudes, interests, and goals are shared." She stated that for years, the park has served as community within the greater community of Crozet, and she applauds and celebrates the past of the park that has been here for years and enjoyed by many throughout that time—and she basks in the present as many enjoy time to play in the park and recreate year-

round. She said she anticipates the future as they look to expansion and improvement of this new facility so the park can continue to be enjoyed for years to come, and she supports the improvements of this park and the new facility.

Ms. Floyd urged those who have Crozet's interests in common to please support this effort as a rich tradition of community continues for their children and the next generation—for all to come together for recreation, play, fellowship, and sharing. She said she strongly supports the park board as they have worked diligently to bring a plan forward, and she is grateful to be able to make these comments.

There being no further public speakers, Mr. Bivins closed the public hearing and thanked those who spoke and those who provided written comments to the Commission. He offered the applicant's representative five minutes to speak.

Mr. Schafer asked Kim Guenther, president of the park board, to speak.

Ms. Kim Guenther stated that she is president of the park board and thanked everyone for participating in this process, noting that it was amazing to have so many people calling in to comment. She said that whether they supported or opposed the project, signed up to speak, wrote a letter, or just listened tonight, they are all participants because they care about the same thing: the Crozet community. Ms. Guenther said that regardless of what happens tonight, the park board will continue to fine-tune these plans to address concerns and is receptive to any feedback the community wishes to provide.

Mr. Johnson stated that the park was originally built 50+ years ago, with the original pool hand-dug by residents of Crozet. He said that since then, they have seen improvements to the pool and the fitness facility, replacement pavilions after the derecho, addition of the dog park, and the walk park made available through donations—so the park has grown along with every step of the growth of the community. He noted that they can't grow in size where they are, but they can grow in the facilities they provide and would continue to grow as best they could; this project was providing that growth along with the growth of the community to keep it going and allow people to bask in that tradition.

Mr. Bivins asked to hear from Kevin McDermott on the infrastructure citizens have been talking about in this particular area.

Mr. Kevin McDermott pulled up a map that Mr. Reitelbach had shown earlier, which comes from the draft Crozet Master Plan update, and he pointed out the park in the center, Hilltop Street along the northern edge, and an east/west road that is currently a dead end but was being extended. He explained that Barnes Lumber was extending that road out to the west to meet up with Crozet Square, and it would also connect to Library Avenue into a new grid pattern—so there would be a western connection over to Crozet Avenue in the future, and it is currently in design. He stated that in addition, the Glenbrook at Foothills development is constructing a road that would head out towards the east from the other end of Hilltop, and that road extends all the way over to the existing Park Ridge Road, which extends back out to Route 240. He commented that those are fairly significant connections that will be made on the northern end of this to open up Hilltop, so there will be changes in traffic flow and other options to get out of Crozet.

Mr. McDermott said that in addition to those changes, one of their big focuses is to extend Eastern Avenue out to Route 250 across Lickinghole Creek; the project is not funded yet, but it is identified

in the CIP for it and is currently making applications for additional state funding and anticipate the project happening in the coming years. He stated that once that happens, it will allow a lot of the neighborhoods in the central area of Crozet to use the Eastern Avenue connector to get out of the residential neighborhoods to get to either 240 or 250—which will significantly change those traffic patterns. He noted that Park Street goes along the southern end and carries the predominant amount of traffic for people going to Westhall, although now they can get out by going north to Park Ridge.

Mr. McDermott stated that the county does have prioritized projects for bicycle and pedestrian connections, which are still being evaluated and identified for funding in future years and are not planned or programmed at this time.

Mr. Bivins said he would ask Commissioners to provide their comment in order: Ms. Firehock, Mr. Clayborne, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Bailey, Mr. Keller, and Ms. More.

Ms. Firehock stated that she would like to commend the design team on actually listening to the Planning Commission's comments and wish they had come in with a greener plan from the start. She acknowledged that they are planting a lot of trees, and it will take decades to take the new young trees to replace ecosystem values being lost with the larger mature trees. She said that she also wanted to request that the development team actually put some effort forth to try to provide adequate planting beds for these trees—and unfortunately, the county does not have tree-planting standards right now, and she hoped that would be addressed in the future zoning update happening in the future, but she is concerned about the viability of the trees to survive. She said she would like to see a lot of attention given to design and adequate soil volume for those sites.

Ms. Firehock stated that she is very conflicted about this project, as she really appreciates the attention given to the Commission's comments but is still worried about the impact to residents on surrounding streets who thought they were buying homes or moving to residences on a relatively quiet street and now would be subject to a lot of additional traffic. She said that she did not have a conclusion at this point about how she was going to vote, and she was leaving it to say she wants to hear the perspectives of the other Commissioners first.

Mr. Clayborne stated that he shared his comments at the beginning of the meeting and was in support of the project, which seems appropriate to him. He said that it's hard for him to vote against something that encourages healthy living, and he supports this project.

Mr. Randolph stated that his thoughts on this proposal were as divided as the Crozet community seems to be. He said that he sees the advantages of this year-round facility and additional recreation space and, like Ms. Firehock, appreciates the applicant for listening to the Commission's concerns from the March 23 meeting—but he is equally troubled that a long-term residential community surrounding the park would be significantly adversely affected by more traffic into and out of this proposed expanded facility. He said that it's important to be clear that a large swimming pool and athletic facility sited within a park is not a usage normally seen adjacent to a residential community. He said that Charlottesville's YMCA is in a park but is sited on a major state road—not within an existing community—and Darden Towe has had residential units built on its southern flank years after the park itself was created.

Mr. Randolph stated that the lack of provision for cycling facilities and lanes is a serious omission in such a bike-intensive community as Crozet, and the lack of mutual open dialogue between the

park board and adjoining neighbors and neighborhoods remains an issue of concern. He said that regardless of what the Commission and Board of Supervisors decide to do with this proposed application, the actual park features of CCP will be residual and won't change regardless of what happens with this application. Mr. Randolph said he was like Ms. Firehock also in that he would like to hear from other Commissioners, as he is on the fence.

Mr. Bailey stated that he would echo the sentiments expressed by his fellow Commissioners, and he was encouraged by the applicant's response to the concerns raised by the Planning Commission—including moving the building back to accommodate that. He said that because he lives in a similar neighborhood with a large athletic facility, the SOCA fieldhouse, he understands the shock of that when you see something that looks bigger than the renderings and towers over existing trees. He stated that when he moved into this area, they knew SOCA fieldhouse was coming and was a planned feature, along with the center of everything else in this neighborhood. He said that he shares the concerns raised for a residential community that knew a park was there but didn't know a gym and large athletic facility would be coming in and presenting this type of traffic.

Mr. Bailey stated that he heard the residents describe a lot of parking going on with some of the roads already to make use of park facilities in a de facto, non-authorized access on the north side of the park, with people traversing across to get to the pickleball courts and other facilities. He said that he is having a hard time supporting it at this point, particularly the northern entrance, and the Crozet Master Plan shows capital projects to improve the sidewalks around High Street and Hilltop—but without having that infrastructure in place while increasing traffic at this time is a concern to him for the safety of the residents and children who use this area. He stated that at this time, he is still struggling to be able to get behind the project, although he fully recognizes the need for these facilities for Crozet as a community because the location and traffic/infrastructure concerns are still concerning to him.

Mr. Keller said that this has been a great evening of discussion and civil dialogue amongst the people of Crozet, who have expressed their love for their community, and it is also a great time to hear his fellow Commissioners thoughtfully share their concerns. He stated that he addressed this project in their March meeting and expressed a number of concerns about this and whether it is the best long-term location for the proposed uses. He said that as he reflects on it more, what really came home to him was the person who talked about this for the kids—and he thinks about projects in Charlottesville and Albemarle that have not happened in his lifetime for three or four generations. He said that he is inclined if they can get conditions in this, with some of them being almost outside their purview.

Mr. Keller stated that he would like to make recommendations to the consultant to pull some concentric rings and do some original work, rather than just using the Crozet Master Plan. He suggested that they take this and indicate bicycle time, walk time, and the numbers of residents that could possibly benefit from a 15-minute pedestrian or cycling approach to the park, so the Supervisors have a realistic view of whether a larger number of people will access it through an alternative to driving or parking. He said that his biggest recommendations for them to grapple with are how they can get improvements to the streets and sidewalks adjacent to the park because a lot of concerns he heard expressed, other than the increased traffic count, were about the terrible conditions that force people to walk in the street instead of being able to use sidewalks and possible bike lanes. He asked if they could make it a condition on the applicant that they have to provide these improvements, so they have the clout to come to the county and tell them they need them to proceed with these facilities.

Mr. Keller stated that he wanted to follow up on a comment from Mr. Randolph regarding parking, and in looking up Cadillac Escalade, they are 18 feet long and 7 feet wide—and he would like to know what parking space size is required by the county and the realistic size of what people are driving, along with the impact they have on the parking spaces that are actually there. He contemplated whether this might mean they needed to look at something like permit parking on the adjacent streets so there won't be spillover from this, which already happens.

Mr. Keller said he also wondered whether they could discourage parking adjacent to the building completely, which could allow for the better traffic flow that some people were concerned about for fire engines and rescue vehicles, as there are unfortunate occurrences in aquatic centers. He suggested that maybe those would be places just for bicycles or smaller vehicles, and he wondered if they could push parking away as a discouragement for people to drive when they could walk or ride a bike there. He noted that this would ask staff to think outside the box, and he wondered what their mechanisms are for being able to waive those.

Mr. Keller stated that if those things could come into play, he feels that he could support this because if this is something that can be built in the next two years, they don't lose a generation of kids and would actually have kids in junior high school who would have an opportunity to use this in high school.

Ms. More said that they have heard from the applicant and the public, including those who emailed and spoke, and she wanted to remind people that the uses for the expanded indoor facility were already happening at the park. She stated that this request is to expand to provide more because there simply isn't enough space, and she also wanted to remind people that all the free outdoor recreational opportunities will still exist. Ms. More said she feels that the new proposed design addresses the concerns the Commission raised at the last meeting, and in looking at the location of the building, there's a huge attempt at a thoughtfulness that's trying to make the best of a situation.

Ms. More acknowledged the frustration of traffic impacts—a lot of which have to do with residential development that's sprawling in that area, while the county still hasn't achieved those connections. She said it doesn't sit right with her that they would say the park is "too much" yet the build house after house after condo and all those things, and they need all those people to have these places to go. She noted that in thinking about the master plan update, the Commission unanimously supported the ability to do more density in some of these areas—yet when it comes to offering facilities to the community, they have a problem with traffic, but it has been addressed in the master plan.

Ms. More said that all this more residential development puts more pressure on the streets and more people who need to have a facility like this, and she liked Mr. Keller's suggestion of estimating the number of people who could bike or walk, given the density of the surrounding neighborhoods. She noted that this sends kind of a mixed message by putting it in a neighborhood, as it creates traffic but also provides different types of access. She stated that as much as she likes this location because it's what they have, she thinks there is a create effort to take underutilized space that is now overflow parking to create the facility. She said this is in a location with hundreds of homes that can walk or bike to this area, but they still need to remember that they heard from people tonight who will have to drive, just as they do for other amenities like the library.

Ms. More stated that it would make zero sense to put a facility in some area on Route 250 where everyone would have to drive to it, and currently there are people coming from all over the rural areas to use the existing facility. She said that the Commission read the narrative from the park board and heard all the comments tonight, as well as knowing all the things the park would offer. She stated that all of that would continue, and the request is to allow for the ability to provide that for more people—and she can find no reason not to support this effort and is open to ideas from other Commissioners as to ways to tweak it or put conditions on it, such as how to get sidewalks built.

Ms. More emphasized that every time new homes and developments are built, she has to remind herself that concurrent infrastructure isn't really that way; the more these areas have pressure, the more people are on the hook to respond to that and step up. She said the projects in the last master plan are carrying over, but they are there and are identified. She stated that she doesn't want to minimize concerns about safety, but it shouldn't hamstring the park and their desire to serve more people in the community.

Mr. Bivins stated that he is supportive of the plan and was pleased that the applicants heard the Commission from the March meeting and have done some significant work to the plan and the concept to reflect their conversation and that of others in the community. Mr. Bivins said he also thinks this would become one of the legs in a stool of revitalizing the whole downtown area, so with Barnes Lumber, the library, and the park, you would start to diffuse some of the activities down there and some of the connections Mr. McDermott has spoken about. He stated that he has something in mind that he thinks would work well in enlivening that area that would be helpful.

Mr. Bivins said that he doesn't know how to say to a nonprofit they have to deal with infrastructure issues on High Street that the county hasn't done, as this feels harsh to him, but he would like to have them as partners. He commented that he did not know whether the sidewalks were put in incorrectly or weren't properly maintained, but it is a public road, so he didn't think they would be covering that as a condition. He said he did feel there was some wisdom in figuring out a different way to do parking there and make it less car-centric or send signals to people about rethinking how they might get to the park, but he didn't know how to do that and asked counsel for input.

Mr. Herrick stated that Mr. Reitelbach has suggested conditions in his staff report, and to the extent the Commission would like to impose additional conditions that mitigate the impacts of the proposed use, they are free to put those in a motion before them.

Mr. Bivins said they had some conversation to pick up on in terms of what Mr. Randolph and Mr. Keller have put out there in terms of creating a parking pattern that might send the signals to not park close to the building, and perhaps think about ways of creating parking or encouraging it to create more open space for bicycles and strollers so they have a place to go.

Mr. Keller stated that he knows Mr. Randolph and Ms. Firehock have spoken about these in the past, but there are examples from all over the world of shaded bicycle parking areas that then serve as a place for solar arrays on top of them. He said if those kinds of things were adjacent to the building, they would also serve as a place for bicycles to be left.

Mr. Bivins asked how they would come to a place of adding that as a condition.

Mr. Keller responded that he didn't think they could get into the specifics of it, but these are the types of things that get into the record as a "shopping list." He said that he would like to go back

to the point made that because it's a nonprofit, they don't put anything onerous on them—but if the county doesn't stipulate what they have to do to get the improvements, it is making them reach out to the adjacent neighborhood, where there have obviously been some issues. He stated that if they know they have to come up with some sort of plan or proviso for that, they can use their political clout with the county or VDOT to try to get improvements, so he wouldn't just give them a free pass on those adjacent streets and sidewalks.

Ms. Firehock said that they could, without getting into specific site plan details, say they would like to see additional bicycle facilities added to this development, and didn't know if Mr. Herrick would find it to be too vague. She stated that perhaps it could cover things such as bike lockers, places to park closer to the building, and better bike lanes on the streets themselves. Ms. Firehock noted that serving as a city planning commissioner for eight years, they were able to reduce the amount of parking required in exchange for demonstrating that people would be able to reach the site by alternate transportation such as bike or bus; they had a specific element in their code that allowed them to reduce the parking requirements if alternate transportation were provided.

Ms. Firehock stated that the county does not currently have variable-space sizing, which requires less space, but she has been told by the county that if they use that sizing, they have to make the travel lanes wider—which makes no sense and seems bizarre to her. She said that they need to fix that, which is on the list as part of the zoning rewrite the county would undertake in the next year or so, and she wasn't sure how fast this would be developed once it was approved, but there might be room to come back and amend the site plan to shrink the parking footprint with new standards. She said that perhaps they could word something along the lines that the applicant would endeavor to provide additional bike facilities, shared spots, and other elements within the plan—which are all inexpensive.

Ms. Firehock stated that regarding the lack of sidewalks, it's been floated anecdotally that the parks board plans to eventually ask the county for some support for building this facility, but the Commission could say that they would like the county to use part of the investment, should it occur, in actually doing the infrastructure repairs on the surrounding streets and sidewalks. She said it is not uncommon to require the developer to put in sidewalks around a new development, but she wants to be aware that this is a nonprofit organization and a very large site. She said the sidewalk work would likely be enormous, but if the county were to benefit from having a new expanded recreation that it didn't have to build but needed to build, it behoves the county to actually invest in the infrastructure to accommodate the safety of the residents who live around there—and the Commission could make a strong statement on that.

Mr. Bailey said that he liked where Ms. Firehock went with her statements, as these two segments are the priority segments in the master plan, as funding comes available. He said that the project times are three to four years, and if this is built and will generate the demand he anticipates, there is a potentially safety concern with this in terms of getting people off the streets as they're being used in these neighborhoods. He stated that as a longtime resident of the county with an office here as well, he is walking distance to the downtown ACAC facility and has often used it, and he agrees with Mr. Bivins that this is a feature for revitalization downtown—and it is something his company considered when they contemplated buying their offices, so they could provide facilities for people work out at lunch. He noted that this is an attractive feature for a small business owner, and he has a colleague and good friend who has offices now in downtown Crozet. He stated that the park is a feature that he likes having here, but his biggest concern is infrastructure, and he wants to ensure that residents who live there and have lived there a long time are heard, and that the county is providing a mechanism that can help prioritize these projects to provide that type of

safety. He said if they can figure out a creative way to do that, he can put his support behind the application.

Mr. Randolph said he agreed with everything that has been discussed by previous Commissioners, but he wanted to emphasize that it wasn't just about enhancing the parking but access to the facility in a non-automotive fashion. He stated that they want people to be utilizing either walking or cycling to this facility as much as possible, and this is an ideal location because it's flat all around there and easily accessible by either motorized or unmotorized bike. He said he could be supportive of the project if they are able to reduce the amount of traffic, because that's what implicates the project from the outset, affecting the character of the community. He said that reducing the automotive traffic allows them to provide a residual dimension for the existing community because bikes don't make noise.

Ms. More stated that the trails crew and county worked together on this, with the trails connecting to the park as the nexus, so the walking and biking opportunities don't just exist along broken sidewalks. She said that all the trails connect in, and there were examples given of existing trails and future enhancements to trails that will all lead to the park and get people completely off the road. Ms. More said she wasn't sure if Ms. Firehock was feeling like the conversation about investment and infrastructure was something they capture in the discussion and minutes, which all goes forward to the Board for consideration—and she wasn't sure how to capture that in a condition without putting all this burden on the park, when some of it should have been placed on all the other development.

Ms. More stated that in thinking about growth and change and having just gone through the master plan update, some of the angst in the community about middle density designation aligned with the same things they were hearing now—that traffic is already a problem and the connections have already been on the lists for such a long time, yet the county seems satisfied with areas for more homes. She said that tons of people were concerned about safety and pedestrian access, and they let the plan address those issues, yet when it comes to the park, they seem to be asking this particular applicant to take more responsibility.

Ms. More stated that there seems to be a mixed message in that the county is satisfied to have a chapter that talks about the projects will be prioritized, but when it comes to a park that wants to provide a space to serve the people who would move into all these houses and residences, now they want to have more said about infrastructure. She said that she is not saying that she disagrees with it, she just wants to clarify what they see as their vehicle—that the Board hears this discussion and takes it more seriously, or that it's not represented accurately in the master plan. She stated that these things are already so important, and so many places have been allowed to develop with the assumption that they have to have these connections, and the park doesn't change that—and to her, it doesn't fall in the park's lap.

Ms. More added that the same pertained to the bike amenities, and whether that fell on the park board or was a signaling to them to come to the Board of Supervisors with a little more information. She said there may be places where the applicant thinks bike storage can happen and that wasn't seen in the slides because they were focused on other things that they had changed to address concerns.

Ms. Firehock said in terms of the infrastructure, she thinks that captured on the roads and sidewalks surrounding the parks as a recommendation to the Board. She stated that she is sensitive to what residents also comment about that they do set priorities to the county, and then

a decade goes by, so she wanted to be sure that them putting a big star on it doesn't necessarily make it happen soon enough. She said that capturing this conversation as a strong recommendation to the Board that they prioritize infrastructure improvements around the park proper would be prudent. She noted that the Crozet Master Plan has lots of things for bikes on roads and shared uses, but they are talking specifically to accommodate the additional traffic and address the neighbors' concerns around this particular park because of the increased use anticipated with increased facilities. She said they are already people swimming there, but now there would be more people swimming, and that means some traffic.

Ms. Firehock stated that the bicycle aspects could be done as a condition, and she did a quick draft of her suggestion: "Applicant to add additional onsite infrastructure for bicycles, including but not limited to bike racks, bike lockers, bike lanes, sharrows, and other on-road or adjacent bicycle access." She said that if they needed to be more specific, they could say "to accommodate 50 bicycles" in terms of imagining that at any one time.

Mr. Keller said that he agreed with comments made by Ms. More and Ms. Firehock, stating that he has done a lot of work with national parks and national park concessionaires—and this would be a nonprofit concessionaire. He said he didn't know whether they really should be treating nonprofits and for-profits differently in terms of their responsibility to the greater community, as they both need to serve that, so asking them for the same things within the realm of possibility is a bad thing to do, especially when they're talking about a change that runs with the land into perpetuity.

Mr. Randolph said he would echo what Mr. Keller said and liked Ms. Firehock's proposal.

Mr. Herrick stated that before they get to the point of crafting conditions, he wanted to caution them that conditions need to be related to the impacts attributable to the proposed development itself. So before a condition is imposed, they would need to determine that there was nexus and rough proportionality to the impacts of the proposed development itself. He said that for example, it might be appropriate to have a bicycle condition if they thought this development would be generating that amount of bike traffic.

Mr. Herrick pointed out that in terms of requiring offsite improvements to traffic, that would be a little more challenging because there's been a lot of talk of how traffic has increased over the neighborhood streets for years. He said the question is whether that was attributable to the park alone or to other factors, and there would need to be some showing that the additional traffic was attributable to a park before they condition offsite improvements. He noted that many of the improvements would have to be made to what is now private property, and to put that onus on an applicant might be seen as not having that nexus or rough proportionality.

Ms. More stated that in light of Mr. Herrick's comments, she would let the conversation stand as a message to the Board about the things the Commission discussed and the community shared and not condition those in. She said that she also wanted to protect them from assuming something might happen, but she needs to remind herself that this is a park, and they have every reason to want there to be places to store their bikes and have all the tree plantings done that they're worried people won't do. She said they want to protect themselves and capture everything in conditions, but this is the park, and they have every reason to make the project be as thoughtful, safe, and fun as possible for more and more people to enjoy.

Ms. More moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP202000016 Claudio Crozet Park, with the conditions and revisions as recommended by staff in the staff report.

Mr. Keller seconded the motion, stating that he would like to see some of the things they've discussed be included, but he would second it so they could move on.

Mr. Bivins commented that they could continue the discussion and decide if there's any modification to be made and include it in the staff report. He said they've had rich conversations about trying to make this more bike and pedestrian oriented and back away from it being more car-centric, and the question is whether they should incorporate what Ms. Firehock drafted as a friendly amendment or if their conversation at large is enough to move it forward with extreme support of those issues discussed. He clarified that this meant the infrastructure on the streets, not having this be so automobile-centric, and to be intentional about having alternative ways to come to and be at the park that don't rely on automobiles, regardless of their propulsion.

Mr. Randolph noted that the role of the Commission is only to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors and has no legislative power, so the county doesn't incur any liability if, in the judgment of an impartial person or body, they have somehow violated the doctrine of proportionality. He said that he felt it was important to reflect the points made by Commissioners tonight, and he didn't feel comfortable making a recommendation for approval without them. He stated that they are trying to get a "yes" on this project, and he did not feel they were proposing anything burdensome. He said he would actually make the argument that they are embracing proportionality because they are proposing to reduce automobile traffic, which is consistent with the Albemarle County Climate Action Plan—the number one strategic issue of the county and the number one global issue of our time. Mr. Randolph said if not now, when do they address it.

Ms. More asked for that intent to be specifically articulated, stating said that she was responding to Mr. Herrick's remarks and was trying not to make a recommendation to the Board that they couldn't actually approve. She said that she didn't catch all of what Ms. Firehock said, but it certainly could be added in if desired—but she was hoping to lift that up through their discussion tonight rather than conditioning in something the Board can't carry into their conditions. Ms. More emphasized that she completely agrees though if they want to add that language.

Mr. Bailey stated that the sticking point for him is the proposed new entrance, which is now the emergency entrance, and he doesn't know if there is a way to make it bike only or some other multi-modal non-vehicular route. He said that he didn't know if there was a compromise there, because it would bring additional traffic by having that north entrance to the park that currently doesn't exist.

Mr. Bivins said he would have a hard time making that a limited access road, as one of the issues with the park now is there is only one way in and one way out; he noted that one resident pointed out that they are the same-sized roads on both sides.

Ms. Firehock stated that the neighborhood to the north would eventually be connected to other routes, so people would be coming in that direction. She said that to Mr. Herrick's points, the Commission is able in its role to condition special use permits, which this is as an amendment to an existing SP. She stated that the impact to this is expanding the volume of usage, so there's going to be more traffic—so they are trying to minimize those impacts by channeling some of those potential car trips into bike trips, which less noxious for air quality and noise.

Ms. Firehock said to encourage cycling, they need to create some facilities within the site itself to make people feel comfortable moving through the site on their bicycles and to be able to safely store their bikes. She noted that she was a bike commuter and spent many miles riding to and from work, and the facilities on the other end make a big difference as to whether or not she feels like doing that. She said that she has a vague-enough condition to attach to the motion that would not unduly hamstring the park board or fail a rough proportionality test.

Ms. Firehock stated her proposed condition: "The applicant to add additional onsite bicycle infrastructure, including but not limited to bike racks, bike lockers, bike lanes, sharrows, and other on-road or adjacent bicycle access." She said this leaves quite a lot of wiggle room, but at least something is done, and she noted that this is not an expensive element in terms of the scope of this entire project. She said she would like to make sure that this site is as accommodating as possible, given the number of trails leading to this site.

Ms. More said that she would accept that amendment.

Mr. Herrick clarified that he wasn't suggesting that no condition be added—he was just suggesting the grounds on which it would have to be added, and he was glad Ms. Firehock has gone back and explained the basis on which there is that nexus and rough proportionality. He said that procedurally what would need to be done is a motion to amend the existing motion, and then the discussion would take place on the suggested amendment.

Ms. Firehock moved to amend the motion as stated.

Mr. Randolph seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Herrick clarified that the original motion as amended is now the motion on the floor and the subject of the discussion going forward.

Mr. Keller stated that he would still like the Commission to figure out some way to say something officially through him and Planning Director Charles Rapp as they can regarding repair and improvement of the adjacent streets and sidewalks, which were a significant portion of the public's concern. He said if that could be addressed by the county as part of the project, there would be a lot less negativity within that portion of the community that spoke.

Mr. Bivins noted that this entails both streets—Park and High—coming in from Crozet Avenue, as they have similar conditions.

Mr. Keller said given his exposure now of Smart Scale projects and funding mechanisms, without putting Mr. McDermott on the hot seat too much, he wondered what his thoughts are on how those things might realistically be handled.

Mr. McDermott said he would start by noting what was on the ground and what they are seeing related to this development. He explained that with this application and in the concept plan, which they would hold the developer too according to the conditions, the county asked them to make additional connections from the internal pathways that they already have onsite, to make those out so they could be connected in the future to new sidewalks on Park Street and Hilltop Street.

Mr. McDermott said the idea is that if they wanted to extend a sidewalk away from the park property, it would have a connection through the park property as well, and that is part of the

application. He noted that they also propose improvements in their application plan to the sidewalk on the northern section right at the curve of Hilltop Road, so those onsite improvements are included in the application. He also stated that the problematic sidewalk on the south side of Hilltop Street is not within public right-of-way and was constructed many years ago outside of it, with no official easement recorded; it is just an asphalt path that someone got agreement from the property owners to lay in front of their property.

Mr. McDermott explained that if the county wanted to do anything with that, they would need to either acquire easements or right-of-way for that; if a private group wanted to work with those property owners and do that, they could do any improvements they wanted to—although, that's a lot of owners they would have to work with. He said that staff evaluated the idea of making sidewalk improvements from Tabor Street to High Street and down Hilltop, and a consultant came back with a fairly exorbitant cost because of the right-of-way issues related to it, so the county had to back away from it at the time because they didn't have the capital to put into a revenue-sharing project for that.

Mr. McDermott stated that if they wanted to move forward with any improvements as a county, they could go for Smart Scale, although it would be a difficult application given the competitive nature of the process. He said they could also do revenue-sharing, which would require the county to have capital funds put towards it, which were approaching \$1 million to make the full connection from Tabor to this site. He noted that they could make applications to those, and the Board would have to identify funding for it in their capital program. He said Park Street and High Street have no facilities and no right-of-way available for sidewalks currently, so those would also be expensive projects to connect to the internal system that exists in the park—which they are proposing to extend to the edges of their property to provide a public connection.

Mr. Bivins thanked him for the information and asked Mr. Keller where he wanted to go with what he had posed.

Mr. Keller responded that he did not quite know and was continuing to contemplate it.

Mr. Herrick said that perhaps one way to address this would be for a Commissioner to make a motion that they further recommend the county prioritize the installation and/or repair of certain sidewalks, and then name the applicable streets. He stated that the Commission can make recommendations on any subject without necessarily making them conditions of a special use permit, and that could be done as a separate motion or amendment to the existing motion.

Mr. Keller responded that this was an excellent recommendation, and he would be very pleased with that.

Mr. Bivins suggested that it be a separate motion.

The original motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Keller moved that the Planning Commission further recommended that the county prioritize the installation or repair of sidewalks on High Street, Hilltop Street, and Park Street.

Ms. More seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Bivins commented to the applicant that they have heard the Commission's thorough dialogue about the project, and a number of items would be in the record and would be discussed with the Board and staff moving forward. He suggested that the applicant spend some time considering the input received this evening and hoped it would be reflected in what they presented to the Board.

Mr. Schafer thanked the Commission and stated that they appreciated all of the thoughtful feedback, comments, and direction.

Mr. Bivins commented that the Commission has had some complicated matters recently, and he feels good about the work they have done for the community over the last few months.

### **Committee Reports**

Mr. Bailey reported that they had a good discussion at the CTAC meeting. He said they also had a joint CAC meeting regarding the Rio Road corridor study and the location of the traffic study at the corner of Rio and John Warner, as well as getting the proposed line and grade alternate location closer to Dunlora. He noted that there has been concern about traffic circles in general—especially two-lane traffic circles as a replacement. He said that he thinks it is a Smart Scale project, and there is some question about the location there, and there was conversation at CTAC as to the use and applicability of traffic circles as an alternative mechanism for traffic flow.

Ms. Firehock reported that the ACE Committee met on September 13 and recommended one purchase of development rights property to the Board, which was more disposed perhaps to consider both applications, but there are limited funds in the county to pursue these projects. She noted that these are easements that help protect properties that are worthy of protection from development and erased development rights, and these are all volunteer at the owners' request.

Ms. Firehock reported that there would be an online community meeting to be held September 30 for a convenience center in southern Albemarle, and she would be joined by Mr. Randolph and both Supervisors from the area. She said this was very exciting because for residents like her in the very southern tip of the county, it takes her 45 minutes each way to drive to Ivy to go to recycling, and constituents will now also have a trash facility, which are scarce in that part of the county.

Mr. Keller said that the MPO Tech Committee met, with discussion points being Rivanna River bike and pedestrian crossing stakeholder engagement process, a process on the Smart Scale pipeline, and updates on the 29 Corridor Study update.

### **Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – September 15, 2021**

Mr. McDermott reported that the RST Development went to the Board and was approved with a 5-1 vote, with Supervisor LaPisto-Kirtley voting against because she felt additional work could have been done with the community to address some of the concerns.

He also stated that the Panorama Farms natural burial site was unanimously approved, and they also heard updates on Southwood and the ACE program.

Mr. McDermott reported that the pipeline projects that Mr. Keller mentioned involve VDOT helping the county evaluate some of the highest state-identified priorities in the region, covering two areas

in the county—both on Route 250. He said the first was in the Pantops area, and the one segment they have not done any improvements to yet are from Peter Jefferson up to Rolkin Road at the top of the hill; the other was further east at the Route 22/Milton Road intersections, which was discussed during the Breezy Hill rezoning and the problems with those intersections. He noted that there would be public involvement and public engagement opportunities coming forth for those.

### **Old Business/New Business**

There was none.

### **Items for Follow-Up**

There were no items.

### **Adjournment**

At 10:13 p.m., the Commission adjourned to October 5, 2021, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



---

Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 10/19/2021
Initials: CSS