Albemarle County Planning Commission
DRAFT Minutes Work Session
September 27, 2022

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a work session on Tuesday, September 27, 2022, at 4:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Corey Clayborne, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Fred Missel; Luis Carrazana; and Lonnie Murray; Karen Firehock (arrived 4:51 pm)

Members absent: None

Other officials present were: Charles Rapp, Director of Planning (via Zoom); Jodie Filardo (via Zoom); Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Tori Kanellopoulos; Ben Holt; Kevin McDermott; Alberic Karina-Plun and Carolyn Shaffer, (via Zoom) Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Clayborne said opportunities for the public to access and participate in the hybrid meeting were posted on the County's website on Planning Commission's homepage and on the County Calendar when available. He said participation would include the opportunity to comment on those matters from which comments from the public would be received.

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Work Session – CPA202100002 AC44-Growth Management Policy

Ms. Tori Kanellopoulos, Senior Planner, said she was joined Vlad Guerillavic, Principal Planner at UPR P.C. She said the work session would be held on the framework for an equitable and resilient community as part of the AC44 process.

Ms. Kanellopoulos provided an overview of the agenda for the meeting. She said since the July work session of the Planning Commission, four round tables had been held with the community—two in person and two virtual. She said there was a corresponding online questionnaire along with two working group meetings.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained there were three steps to Phase 1 of the AC44 process. She said in the first step, they shared the local history of growth management, an overview of the growth management policy, and the initial findings from the land use build-out report. She said they had asked for community input on the current policy as to what should be prioritized in the policy.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in the second step, potential growth management options were developed to consider while reviewing the policy. She said significant community input was received on the options. She noted there was community interest in expanding the conversation beyond the

growth management policy. She said that based on the input, they developed several common themes which were then shared at the previous work session.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in the third step, the common themes were refined and developed into big ideas, and they then requested community input on the big ideas. She said they then took the feedback and ideas and developed them into the framework for an Equitable and Resilient Community.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained two main lenses were used to guide the work of the AC44 process—equity and climate action. She said in 2019, the Board adopted a resolution in support of an equitable and inclusive community. She noted the Board had designated climate action as a top priority and adopted the County's climate action plan in 2020. She said the framework, therefore, prioritized equity, climate action, and resilience as key guiding principles for the policies.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained the framework was developed based on input from community members, the AC44 working group, and the Planning Commission, and on a review of goals in the Comprehensive Plan and research of best practices. She said the next steps for Phase 1 were to present the draft framework with Commission feedback to the Board at an October 19 work session. She said the framework would be finalized based on the feedback from the Commission and Board.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in Phase 2, existing conditions, trends, challenges, and opportunities for each main topic would be considered. She said those topics would include items such as transportation, housing, and natural resources. She said policies would be developed for each topic, and the framework would guide the work and structure of the plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said as Phase 1 ended, the land use build-out was ending as well. She said a draft of the land use build-out analysis was presented to the Commission in May. She reiterated that the purpose of the build-out was to understand the maximum theoretical build-out potential based on land use designations of the development areas and consider if the maximum potential build-out was sufficient to accommodate projected growth and demand in the next 20 years.

Ms. Kanellopoulos noted key takeaways from the build-out analysis. She said there appeared to be sufficient land available for both residential and non-residential growth and demand in the development areas, but the availability was predicated on several assumptions. She said those assumptions included the development would be done at the higher end of recommended ranges, and there would be significant redevelopment and infill.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained rezoning approvals from 2016 to 2021 were reviewed, and they found many were not approved at the higher end of recommended ranges. She said the total number of units approved in that time frame was about 58% of the maximum units recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. She said the lower end of recommended density ranges was not sufficient to accommodate future growth and demand.

Ms. Kanellopoulos noted there appeared to be sufficient capacity for non-residential uses, the list of potential properties that could be developed was smaller when certain size and infrastructure criteria were factored in, notably for office and industrial uses.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said three scenarios for the residential build-out were considered. She said the first scenario was the main focus of the report—the theoretical maximum land use build-out

and an unadjusted pipeline. She said it assumed development at the highest ends of density ranges, such as 34 units an acre for urban density residential.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in the second scenario, the 58% of the maximum units recommended in the Comprehensive Plan approved through rezonings figure was used to adjust the maximum land use build-out down by 58%. She noted the pipeline was adjusted based on the average units at build-out, and they subtracted 1,000 units from Old Trail Village because it was expected to build out lower than the total approval.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained that in the third scenario, zoning districts for each property that could develop were used instead of land use designations. She noted the pipeline was adjusted similarly as in the second scenario. She said while the total potential build-out was higher than the forecasted demand in each scenario, there were several constraining factors that would limit the actual build-out.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said the land use build-out would continue to be referenced in Phase 2, and the framework would provide guidance for policies related to the land use build-out.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said the Big Ideas were developed from community input, equity and climate action lenses, Commission input, the goals in the Comprehensive Plan, and best practices and research of other localities.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained that at the four community roundtables, participants were asked to share input on the Big Ideas—whether the Big Ideas reflected their vision of the community in 20 years; whether the Big Ideas would guide the County to a more equitable and resilient community; and what was missing.

Ms. Kanellopoulos summarized the feedback from the roundtables. She said on the topic of housing affordability and accessibility, the feedback noted several points: There was a need for housing that was affordable to people employed in the County; community members should be able to age in place with housing accessible to all abilities; housing needed the infrastructure to support it; and there was a concern that people who wanted to live in the County had to move because it was no longer affordable.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said on the topic of workforce development and training, feedback noted there needed to be opportunities for local residents, and there needed to be a variety of career ladder jobs. She said the feedback noted the County should continue to partner with educational institutions in the area, and there needed to be more space and support for local artists, small businesses, and start-ups.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said they received feedback that transportation needed to be accessible, safe, and affordable, and simply having connections between locations was not sufficient. She said the feedback had noted that public transit had to be more frequent, reliable, and accessible.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in terms of the protection and enhancement of natural resources, the feedback expressed a desire for enhanced tree canopy throughout the County. She said the feedback noted the need for clean and protected waterways and that development should be concentrated to protect the natural resources.

Ms. Kanellopoulos noted there was support for local food systems as well as for equitable access

to and distribution of resources, amenities, and services. She said there was support for regional coordination on transportation networks and other opportunities.

Ms. Kanellopoulos noted there was an online questionnaire, and they received similar input as the roundtables. She said the responses expressed support for the preservation and protection of natural, water, agricultural, and historic resources, and rural areas. She said support was expressed for equitable and accessible opportunities for all community members, infrastructure to support growth, safe and accessible options for all types of transportation, affordable housing with a variety of options, climate resiliency and climate action, mixed-use development, access to public transit, sidewalks, and bicycle paths, and energy-efficient construction.

Ms. Kanellopoulos summarized the feedback. She said there was substantial support for the four Big Ideas, and there were significant areas of common ground despite potential disagreements on implementation.

Mr. Vlad Guerillavic, Senior Planner UPR P.C., said the community input on the Big Ideas was used in the draft framework. He said the draft was available in the Commission's packet and to the public. He said the purpose of the framework was to find common ground to move forward with a policy direction for growth management. He said the framework would be used to build a foundation of community support. He said the framework could be used to work through disagreements on implementation.

Mr. Guerillavic said the framework would provide specific guidance to the Comprehensive Plan update to implement the Board's initiatives for equity and climate action. He noted the Board gave direction to staff and the consultant to produce a more user-friendly document that was consolidated. He said the framework bridged Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the AC44 process.

Mr. Guerillavic explained Phase 1 was about growth management and incorporating directions from the Board. He said Phase 2 was about turning the input from the community into a policy direction for the different chapters of the plan.

Mr. Guerillavic said the theme of green and resilient communities closely related to the countywide vision in the Comprehensive Plan. He said it talked about a greener future and preservation of natural resources and values for the rural area, and it infused more of the same language of green networks into the development areas along with new building practices. He noted the theme touched on the Board's priority of developing a resilient future in the face of climate change.

Mr. Guerillavic said the focus of the topic of welcoming and equitable communities was on current and future residents. He noted a focus on the equitable distribution of resources for current residents, revitalizing existing neighborhoods, and building more equitable and complete communities.

Mr. Guerillavic said connected and accessible was the next one. He said it related to sentiments expressed in public comments. He noted there was a desire for better connections throughout the County in terms of walking, cycling, and transit. He said it related to the theme of aging in place and providing transportation options for all ages and abilities. He noted it related to the theme of connectivity of natural systems, such as wildlife or stream corridors.

Mr. Guerillavic said they heard substantial positive feedback on the theme of a thriving and prosperous community. He said they heard the County was already doing many of the tasks, but

the County needed to provide well-paying jobs for existing residents. He said the theme was interconnected to the others. He said to have living-wage jobs, there needed to be supporting policies for transportation access and housing affordability.

Mr. Guerillavic explained the Comprehensive Plan had 10 chapters, and each chapter had one goal, each goal had multiple objectives, and each objective had multiple strategies. He reiterated the framework served as a bridge between the two phases of the AC44 process. He said the public support for the framework themes could be used as a basis for refinement of the goals and chapters of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Guerillavic said the goals, objectives, and strategies of the growth management chapter reinforced the County vision concept of development areas and rural areas. He said the framework could add depth to the vision and reinforce it further. He said it could help make a robust growth management policy that would inform the other chapters of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Guerillavic said the green and resiliency theme would provide guidance on the natural resources chapter and cultural and historic resources chapter, as well as for chapters on transportation and parks and recreation. He said the themes would aid in the refinement of policies related to the development areas and rural areas.

Mr. Guerillavic said the theme of “welcoming and equitable” was not readily apparent in the Comprehensive Plan. He said they expected the theme to refine most of the Comprehensive Plan, especially the chapters on growth management, housing, and community facilities.

Mr. Guerillavic said in terms of the theme of “connected and accessible,” there was a direct connection to transportation and community facilities. He noted there was also a connection to parks and recreation and natural resources because there were many dimensions of connectedness.

Mr. Guerillavic said in terms of “thriving and prosperous,” there was a direct connection to economic development. He noted there were further connections to the chapters on natural and cultural resources as well as for policies on transportation and housing.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained the Commission feedback would be shared with the Board along with the same draft framework. She said the Board’s feedback would be solicited, and based on the input from the Board and Commission, they would finalize the framework to wrap up Phase 1.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said as they moved into Phase 2, they would analyze and review existing conditions, trends, challenges, and opportunities for each main topic. She said they would then develop policies for each topic using the final framework to guide the work. She noted the framework would be updated throughout the process if necessary. She said the framework would be used to guide the structure of the plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in Phases 2 and 3, they would continue to explore the growth management options that were shared during Phase 1. She explained they were in the process of developing an equity and climate action lens which would be used to evaluate AC44 recommendations. She said the lens would be shared and used during the upcoming phases.

Mr. Guerillavic said the questions for discussion were simple. He said the Commission was asked whether they believed the framework provided a good platform for revising the goals, objectives, and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan. He said if the Commission did not believe the framework was sufficient, then they were asked to provide their comments on what was missing. He said the Commission was asked to determine whether they recommended forwarding the framework to the Board for consideration.

Mr. Clayborne recommended they begin with overarching questions from the Commission. He said they could address each one of the four components of the framework in turn, and after, they could address any other thoughts and questions.

Mr. Murray said they received an email from Ms. Firehock with suggestions in terms of including more local references throughout the process.

Mr. Carrazana echoed Ms. Firehock's comments on using local references. He noted there was new language and focuses that were not in the current Comprehensive Plan. He said he did not notice any strategies to measure success or metrics to measure the goals. He said some of the goals were similar to current goals, such as housing and transportation.

Mr. Carrazana said they had to determine what they were doing well and what they were not doing well. He said they may need a different strategy to succeed in the areas where they were not doing well. He said they should identify ways to measure the progress of achieving the goals. He said if there were new concepts, then there should be associated metrics. He said there could be complications in trying to come up with metrics.

Mr. Carrazana noted the measurement related to the County building out to 58% of the maximum density recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. He said it gave a benchmark as to what density the County was building to and the impact it had on the total capacity. He said there were a lot of areas where similar metrics could be configured to help identify future strategies.

Mr. Missel noted the slide displaying residential scenarios and that it mentioned unit types. He asked if they evaluated specific unit types.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said they did not go into that level of detail. She said that information could be provided. She explained an annual certificate of occupancy report was performed, and the report categorized the data down by unit type, and the data was pulled together from the prior 10 years.

Mr. Missel said it would be interesting to see trends in that area for the County and for other benchmark communities. He asked if specific service providers were included in the public input process—such as the RWSA, RSWA, or VDOT.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained there was an internal staff focus group to gain staff input on the Big Ideas. She said there had been separate conversations with the service providers about process updates and the land use build-out results.

Mr. Missel said they should not overpromise or set overachieving goals. He said they should set goals that they were able to implement. He mentioned the need to be accountable and to set processes to remain accountable.

Mr. Bivins said his problem with the process of comprehensive planning was that it was truly

ambiguous. He noted how the community was multifaceted and how the comprehensive plans tried to please all individuals. He said it was frustrating to try to please all people. He said they saw a large degree of hyperbole that the County could not control. He said the County was not willing to use the tools to impact.

Mr. Bivins said the intimate conflict of holding onto the rural community versus the dynamic development area was how to move through it successfully. He said it would require a magic trick. He noted conversations around similar topics in the County that resulted in a negotiated final product where no one was successful. He mentioned the process of potentially redistricting the school system. He discussed how tense the process became and how it relied on stereotypical views of groups of people; consequently, it never came to fruition.

Mr. Bivins said the County was sensitive in how it sat within a community of competing interests. He said he did not know if the Board would be willing to implement the necessary steps to achieve the goals set out in the plan.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there were metrics on how many people participated in the community engagement portion. He asked if there were demographics collected about the participants and whether the responses were received from a representative population of the community.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said in terms of total participants, there were about 115 people who attended the roundtable discussions. She said 24 people filled out the online questionnaire. She said there were optional demographic questions that people were able to fill out at the roundtable discussion, and she approximated about one-third of the participants filled out the information. She hypothesized that the roundtable discussions were more diverse than past roundtables based on race and income demographics, but she did not have a statistical analysis.

Mr. Clayborne said the participation numbers felt light. He confirmed that the County had purchased a van to be able to host mobile community outreach events within neighborhoods.

Mr. Guerillavic said the numbers were only for the latest round of engagement. He noted more survey responses had been received in earlier rounds.

Mr. Murray asked what was meant by more survey responses.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained the growth management options questionnaire received 474 responses.

Mr. Clayborne asked if staff believed, in their professional opinion, whether the responses received were a sufficient sampling for public engagement.

Mr. Guerillavic said they did not receive responses from a representative demographic of the community. He said the situation was getting worse. He noted how the number of people participating in the meetings and filling out the surveys was declining.

Mr. Clayborne encouraged the consideration of innovative ways to get more participation from the public. He suggested that there be more sensitivity devoted to the image selection for the presentations. He noted that “welcoming and equitable” was emphasized and many of the images were supposed to show community gatherings. He said that in those images, however, there was no one who looked like himself.

Mr. Clayborne noted how it was easy to consider “equitable and resilient communities” as two separate policy topics. He suggested that the framework would provide special insight if they studied the topic of “equitable and resilient communities” as an intersection.

Mr. Bivins said it would be helpful to review the Board’s draft FY24–FY28 strategic plan goals and objectives. He said there may be some overlap between the issues identified in both plans. He said the goals and objectives would indicate how the Board may engage with the items in the framework.

Mr. Missel noted how one of the slides mentioned that there was agreement on certain items but disagreement on how to implement the ideas. He asked for clarification on what the disagreement was.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said they usually intended to have high-level discussions at this phase, but sometimes during community input, they began discussing implementation in more detail. She said they were acknowledging that as they progressed through the process into Phase 2 and Phase 3, there would likely be disagreement from community members about what’s the best way to implement the Big Ideas.

Mr. Guerillavic said one of the points of disagreement he noted was funding. He said in terms of transit funding, there were questions about the use of County funds, state funds, or federal funds. He noted there could be disagreement about how to fund a project and still agreement on the shared goal of the project.

Mr. Bivins noted there was a lot of conversation about what the County should do and what it has the ability to do. He said parts of what was said in those conversations was not true. He noted that one individual wanted the County to mandate that each house be required to install a specific type of insulation, 34-R. He said there was a disconnect because if the County mandated the insulation, it would drive up the price point of houses. He noted there would be more efficient homes, but a whole new class of people would be unable to afford them. He mentioned staff could recommend to developers that they use 34-R insulation, but they could not mandate it.

Mr. Murray said he still had questions regarding how the concepts comingled. He noted how the crosswalks were helpful, but without them, the topics were vague, and it was unclear what they applied to. He noted how the rural area and growth area were treated differently, and there were instances in the framework where it was unclear whether the subject was the development area, the rural area, or both. He encouraged staff to be specific about which area they were referring to.

Mr. Clayborne stated the Commission would discuss each of the four areas for 11 minutes each, addressing the first discussion question, “Does the framework for an Equitable and Resilient Community provide guidance to support drafting policies and action steps in upcoming AC44 phases? If not, what’s missing?”

Mr. Murray suggested adding “biodiversity” to the list of protected natural resources. He said the County had a biodiversity plan, so it was important to include it. He noted how the rural area did not receive infrastructure such as trails, sidewalks, or bicycle lanes. He said those were development efforts achieved through proffers. He said the rural area was about preserving what already existed as opposed to constructing.

Mr. Murray stated Ms. Firehock's comments mentioned the importance of green infrastructure, such as green streets. He said the County needed to look at a concept of ecological density, and they should encourage ecological density, particularly in the growth areas. He mentioned the Dell and how it had more biodiversity than some wetlands in the County. He said when they had less space, they needed to do more with it. He said the urban areas had to perform better in the space than the rural area.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Murray to explain what the Dell was.

Mr. Murray explained that the Dell was one of UVA's stream daylighting projects. He said prior to the daylighting, the area was a wasted field of grass. He said UVA brought the stream to the surface and planted the area with 100% native plants. He said they installed a pond for the community. He noted the Dell provided a pollinator habitat. He said baffles were built into the area so it would treat stormwater. He said it was a good example of ecological density. He said there were similar projects, such as the UVA south lawn project.

Mr. Carrazana said as they moved past some of the higher-level graphics and discussion, specific, local examples as suggested by Ms. Firehock would be important. He suggested they provide examples of where the County was succeeding.

Mr. Carrazana said staff should address the conflicts rather than listing the areas where there would be conflict. He noted that a conflict did not preclude both opinions from progressing. He said the conflict would make them think deeper about the topic and consider examples. He said the conversation could move forward by identifying places of conflict and providing examples of how other communities addressed the issues. He said he noted items in the report that were in conflict with each other but did not necessarily have to be.

Mr. Missel said they were talking about the what and the how—what it will look like in 2044, and how they will get there through policies and action steps. He said success was that policies and resources were balanced. He said the resulting policies derived from the planning would be tied to resources. He said in general, the framework provided guidance. He said the four categories were broad and all-encompassing.

Mr. Missel said as staff focused on the starting point—equity and climate action—each topic became about equity and climate action. He noted that the "equitable and welcoming" community topic was unique. He said he agreed with the examples for a "green and resilient community." He said the topic was similar to economic development. He said they considered thriving and prosperous communities in the development areas and throughout the County.

Mr. Missel said knowing clear goals was important as they went through the drafting process. He said they should consider the goals other communities have set. He said UVA had clear goals for carbon neutrality. He said it was important to consider that as well as accountability throughout the process.

Mr. Clayborne stated Ms. Firehock had joined the meeting at 4:51 p.m.

Mr. Bivins said in terms of the plan update, he would push back on the sentence, "As part of the commitment to resilience, the County had encouraged sustainable, regenerative, agricultural practices, and those in turn have been supported by a robust local food system." He said it was

good language, but it would not happen. He explained the County comprised 1% of the state's agricultural business. He said the surrounding counties were around 3% to 8%. He explained the County did not produce vegetables or food items. He said they needed to acknowledge what the County's agricultural business was, and they were not a breadbasket.

Mr. Murray said the figures did not include farms under five acres, so there were several farms in the County that were not included that did produce local food products.

Mr. Bivins said he agreed. He responded that boutique farm markets would not feed the County. He said the County had several boutique businesses, but they did not have farms to the scale required to achieve the goals laid out in the framework, which was to feed the County. He said he was looking at scale and reality. He said they could not feed the County with the agricultural structure that existed.

Mr. Bivins said a five-acre farm would not feed the County, and it would barely be able to feed the people who needed those resources. He said the narrative of the County's agricultural businesses had to be representative of the actual business. He said they were not the breadbasket of central Virginia.

Mr. Bivins said they had to consider how the County would handle climate migration. He said they had to consider when places like Norfolk and Virginia Beach began to lose sizable areas of land. He said those people would likely come to areas like the County. He said the County had to consider energy diversification. He said large-scale solar installations were coming to the area.

Mr. Bivins said if the County wanted to preserve green spaces, they had to move away from the garden-apartment developments that were typical. He said they had to encourage developers to leave that development model because it consumed a lot of land. He said if the buildings were taller than three stories, they would be able to preserve the land. He said they would have to consider vehicle parking regulations. He noted most developers chose the standard paved surface rather than sustainable alternatives.

Mr. Bivins said if they were trying to blend ideas between the rural and development areas, then some of the work had to take place in the construction the County built and what they encouraged people to build. He reiterated the County was not a breadbasket despite the boutique farm market. He said they provided other agricultural resources to the region and nationally.

Ms. Firehock acknowledged the document was supposed to be aspirational, but she noted when she read it, it felt fantastical and too much. She said she did not believe everything in the report could be achieved as it was written. She said she did not want to have a document that was farfetched and presented a perfect world scenario. She said she wanted the document to be humbler, to aspire to certain goals, such as using local food.

Ms. Firehock said the document should reflect the unique aspects of the County—the mountains and scenic views. She said the way the document is written should be indicative of where it was from and should emphasize what is special about the County.

Mr. Clayborne noted the word "green" was vague and watered down. He said he did not want to undermine the importance of the goal. He said when he thought about resiliency as an architect, he thought about the built environment and structures. He said part of resiliency was mitigation and adaptation. He said they should be proactive about climate change.

Mr. Missel said he did not notice the word “preserve” or “preservation” in the documents. He said the County had so many resources, so they should consider what they wanted to enhance and preserve. He added that it would make the sense of place feel more personal from the document.

Mr. Murray said the main point of the rural area was preservation. He said the urban area was about restoration. He said the rural area was about do-no-harm and preserving what existed. He said the growth area was about redevelopment and regreening.

Ms. Firehock noted how densification and regreening went hand-in-hand.

Mr. Murray said he agreed and commented that understanding how they are interconnected was important.

Ms. Firehock said the County was creating a city around a city with the urban ring. She said they were struggling because it had followed a suburban development pattern, and they were trying to turn it into an urban pattern. She said they lacked the jurisdictional powers of a city. She said there were different visions for the County depending on where someone was on the urban/rural divide. She said some of the items in the document appeared to only be fitting for the urban ring. She said they had to acknowledge the two areas were different landscapes with different associated development aspirations. She said the planning had to cover such disparate landscapes with different goals as to what should be protected, preserved, regreened, or mitigated.

Mr. Missel said there was a third category in addition to urban and rural that covered the boundary areas.

Ms. Firehock said they were referred to as a wildlife-urban interface.

Mr. Murray said if someone lived on a large property, they were able to grow their own foods, had access to local food and personal trails, and had access to natural services. He said the large properties were able to treat large volumes of stormwater and provide biodiversity. He said as the land got smaller, more had to be done with less, and there was a shift from preservation to restoration. He said there was a continuum that changed as the parcel got smaller.

Mr. Missel said that was where the need for partnerships and guidelines came into the planning.

Mr. Murray questioned what would happen when the crosswalk graphics disappeared, and the themes and topics stood on their own. He noted a goal was connected to the rural area that emphasized inclusive neighborhoods with a variety of housing types that were accessible and affordable to all abilities. He said it was problematic because the rural area only had one housing type. He said it would require a major upzoning of the rural area to achieve the goal.

Mr. Murray noted that there was no public water or septic in the rural area, so to build an apartment building, they would have to authorize a private septic system. He said implying apartment complexes in the rural area was problematic. He said they had to separate the housing types and density. He said development in the rural area could be limited to development rights, and the number of units would be equal to the number of development rights.

Mr. Carrazana said they should provide examples and identify how they could begin to measure

areas where the County was doing well. He said locating and centering the document within the community was important. He noted how the community was getting more diverse by the day. He said the County had several different types of housing. He noted how most of the affordable housing was in single-family homes, and that stock was disappearing.

Mr. Carrazana said the crosswalk was a helpful tool, but they needed other tools. He said they should identify the potential conflicts and discuss methodologies on how to measure the County's progress on its goals. He said there were areas where the County was not performing well, such as housing and transportation. He said the idyllic image of the draft framework began to fall apart. He said it was a far cry to say the County would become the breadbasket of central Virginia. He said in terms of affordable housing, they had to determine how they achieved their goals. He said they should consider first where the County had been and where it had succeeded and failed.

Mr. Missel said they should match policies to incentives. He said they should layout how developers should be able to achieve the County's goals. He said funding was not always discussed, and they should consider how to bring funding to make more equitable communities.

Mr. Missel mentioned the definition for complete communities. He said they had to consider how they would evaluate projects that were submitting complete communities. He said they had to determine what direction they would provide developers as to how to achieve the goal of complete communities.

Mr. Bivins said when they developed, they stipulated that sewage and water had to come to a new development. He said they never engaged in conversations resulting in transportation requirements. He noted the County did not own the transportation system; it was operated through a negotiated relationship with the City. He said they should consider what it would take for developments to have transportation included in the planning.

Mr. Bivins said the County had to determine how to encourage the development of starter homes. He said the starter home industry was happening in Green County, Fluvanna County, and elsewhere, so people were moving to those areas to start their lives. He said the starter home issue was a structural problem, especially considering the median income levels and prices.

Mr. Bivins said they could not afford places with low housing stock becoming large districts because it would unbalance the existing district system. He said there were roles for crossover communities, in reinvigorating Esmont and reinvigorating the turnpike from Staunton to Scottsville. He said there were historic places that used to be communities that were abandoned. He asked how they could take those abandoned places, like Esmont, and enliven them again. He said if Batesville were reinvigorated, then the community could actually support a community store.

Mr. Bivins said he was trying to understand the viewshed aspect. He said the preservation of viewsheds was an inequitable act on the land and it transferred value to people without the value returning to the community. He said he would support preserving viewsheds from 1607 or 1744. He said the idea that viewsheds were not reviewed prevented new development, even modest development or development that would be beneficial to the community.

Ms. Firehock said there were examples out west where people paid ranchers to stay in business solely so they could continue to see the ranch from their home. She said it enabled the rancher to stay in business.

Mr. Bivins said the County had supported activities that the broader community was not benefiting from. He said if they were to discuss equity and greening, they had to balance them. He acknowledged he lived in the rural part of the community. He said resistance to certain improvements froze options for other members of the community.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to resist the view of rural areas as preserved spaces where nothing changed. She said she wanted to think about the rural areas as places where people really lived, and places where they needed the crossroad communities. She said they needed to consider different zoning models. She mentioned the notion of centers. She mentioned how they wanted developers to provide what were essentially mini towns with a commercial center.

Ms. Firehock said they should move away from expecting complete towns from developers, and instead, developments should be contextual to their location. She said commercial centers did not necessarily have to be in the center of each neighborhood. She said they should be intentional about where they wanted commercial centers. She noted there may be areas that already existed but needed reinvestment. She noted a school unfortunately closed, but the closure allowed several social services to fill the space, and there were now community classes held in the space. She said the activities could have happened while the space was used as a school, and reinvesting in the community was still possible.

Mr. Clayborne noted the importance of broadband access and defined the vision for an equitable community.

Ms. Firehock noted there were five minutes left in the meeting.

Mr. Murray noted the section was important. He said through the work of the Sewer and Water Conservation District, they had encountered families in the rural area that had no running water and no septic system. He said if they wanted to be welcoming and equitable, they had to ensure people were able to continue to live in their houses. He said they should help people preserve their homes in the rural area, and doing so would preserve affordable housing.

Ms. Firehock noted the County had undertaken related efforts.

Mr. Murray noted the County had a funding program that provided assistance, but there was not a septic funding program. He said one of the reasons the Batesville store struggled was because of the lack of septic.

Mr. Bivins said if there was a population that could support the investment in a new septic system, then it would help the business. He noted how if an area was surrounded by vacation homes or sparsely populated, then the investment would not be worth it because there would be no return.

Mr. Murray said there was not enough physical space to put in the new septic. He noted the reason Ivy was no longer a growth area was because it had run out of water. He said there were neighborhoods such as Peacock Hill where the wells ran dry. He said there was a history of development encroaching into the development area, and the reason it stopped was that they were unable to provide water and septic.

Ms. Firehock said they did not have to just take the model. She said they could put something in a new place with adequate traffic access and vehicle traffic coming by to support it. She said

something like Crossroads Store would not be allowed today, yet it was providing a lot of business space. She said that was an exception to the usual Albemarle way. She said that was the type of thing that was helpful because it had condensed things into a center instead of having the interspersed. She asked if they were out of time.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said it was their scheduled time to eat.

Ms. Shaffer said they must be in Lane Auditorium by 6:00 p.m. to start the next meeting.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Missel to speak.

Mr. Missel asked if resources and infrastructure fit within these categories or if it was a separate category. He said there was much vision, but it would take resources and infrastructure, and he thought it might need to be as up-front as these four are. He said he would recommend forwarding it to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Bivins said he agreed.

Mr. Carrazana said that the things he thought were missing were examples of areas that were headed towards these goals. He said picking up on the things being done well already and fitting into the vision were important and may help when the crosswalk went away to talk about exactly what was needed. He said he would not shy away from the things that needed improvement and perhaps implementing a new strategy to get these things done.

Mr. Bivins said in dealing with the duality of the different areas, looking at the entire piece, there was a lot of infrastructure that was green park space that was inaccessible to people in the development areas. He said he could not get to Walnut Creek Park or Mint Springs Park unless he drove there. He said if they were trying to provide access to green spaces, they must figure that out. He said bicycles were transportation unless it was a recreational activity. He said within the area that they wanted people to inhabit, they needed sidewalks. He said he did not need a bicycle trail instead of a sidewalk to keep people from walking in the street. He said the connectivity of green infrastructure was a big piece. He asked how they would deal with the existing things they had and improve them in a measurable way. He said he could not make the argument that 100 miles of bike trail for bikes in the rural part of the community would have a demonstrative effect. He said 100 miles of sidewalk would allow many people to move.

Mr. Murray said it was a question of funding. He said there was some federal funding for larger corridors such as Three Notched Trail, but generally speaking, there was a national bike route through the County before—and it was a deathtrap. He said they could not get bike lanes on a national bike route through Albemarle County. He said where it said in the rural area there were multi-modal options for walking and bicycling that coexisted with cars and buses, there were no buses in the rural area. He said that was a challenging phrase for him, or it was aspirational. He said as a rural area resident, he would say to not ruin the areas where there was low traffic. He said he did not know how friendly the roads were to walk. He said it was about preserving what they had. He said he would love to see regional greenways in the rural area, but he did not think there was funding.

Ms. Firehock asked if in reading this entire document that there was enough emphasis on the need to provide more green space in the urban areas and the idea of the County investing in that.

Mr. Carrazana said this was where they must embrace opposites, where they would embrace the density and development but preserve historic resources and natural resources. He said they knew that solar farms were inherently in conflict with agriculture. He asked what the viability of the land was, what they should use it for, and whether they should be using land for energy. He said if they embraced these conflicts, they could begin to think about adding green and adding agriculture to the different layers of the urban sector. He said there were people who had gardens in the City, so they should think about it qualitatively and quantitatively was how they could perhaps begin to grapple with these conflicts. He asked what Mr. Missel had called VDOT earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Missel said he used the term service providers.

Mr. Carrazana said yes. He said Mr. Missel also called them a partner. He said that was important that they think about how they connected with service providers as partners. He said the more people involved and the diversity of thoughts that came into play, the closer they got to finding a solution to these conflicts. He said there were ways to deal with things that seemed to be opposing forces.

Mr. Bivins said while the area seemed to be thriving and prosperous, the BLS statistics for this area showed that the median wage was $59,000. He said he was thinking about how they could generate taxes and if they were a place that could have an impact in that way.

Mr. Missel said that was helpful.

Ms. Firehock said she thought the median for the County was $95,000.

Mr. Bivins said he was referring to jobs. He said the top occupation in their area offered admin support to 12,000 people being employed at that mean wage of $41,000. He said that was even below the mean wage for the area. He said the secondary education holders and other professionals were making money in the $80,000 range. He said he wondered where they would get the money to do this since they tended to be a community that resisted any opportunity for the Board of Supervisors to raise taxes at all. He said most of the industry was supporting the few big entities around here, which were the local government, the school system, the medical system, and the university.

Mr. Carrazana said this was where examples were important to have. He said he would like to see what economies were working there. He said they may be well-positioned for some industries to move there. He said this was a vision for the future, so the issue at hand was how they created the land use to incentivize businesses to come there with all the value systems they were putting in. He said there was a biotech corridor from Richmond to Roanoke, and Charlottesville was right in the middle of that. He said there were resources there and thus there were opportunities. He said the question that remained was how they should think about land use. He said he liked the concept of preservation versus restoration.

Ms. Firehock said in terms of business incentives, she had brought up the idea of the entrepreneur, and an entrepreneur did not usually begin their start-up with 10 people. She said it was usually one or two, and 10 people may be the maximum number of people for their business model. She said they still had very draconian rules for running a business out of a home. She said she had a mediation business but did not mediate for anyone in the County and was told by

someone in the County who said not to bother trying to get a small business license for the house because the process was so stringent.

She said that Charlottesville was much more lenient with small business practices, so to foster that, they needed to make it easier to have a business at home. She said many businesses did not have clients coming directly to them and they must think about those various small businesses and their next step up when they needed small office space. She said economic development was set up for large factory jobs, which they did not have much flat land for.

Mr. Bivins said it would be biotechnological manufacturing.

Ms. Firehock said she was not against biotech, but that should not be their sole business model. She said they did an economic development plan and the Board hired it out, and it was poor and vague, even including beer as food. She said it was so vague, with no infrastructure behind it to foster any of it to grow.

Mr. Murray said a friend of his had mentioned there were many wasted opportunities in developing a recreation-based economy in Albemarle County. He said he visited Luray recently, and they spent a lot of money on race tickets, ate at restaurants, rented a cabin, went to Luray Caverns, and went to the gift shop, where his children purchased things. He said they had gotten a lot of his money because they hosted one race, so he thought there was a big opportunity for a recreation-based economy that they were not really looking at in terms of economic development but should.

Mr. Missel said it was a framework, so it was idyllic, but by starting with the ideal, what they would end up with would be much better. He said they had done that, and he would hope that as a County, at the end of this, they were being honest with themselves.

Ms. Firehock said too much idealism may sound fake.

Mr. Missel said there should be a time after all the policy was created and there were action plans where they stopped and looked back at these to decide if any of them could not be met.

Ms. Firehock said there would be a 10-minute recess before the regular meeting.

Adjournment

At 5:48 p.m. the Commission adjourned to September 27, 2022, Albemarle County Planning Commission regular meeting, 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium. The next Planning Commission work session will be held Tuesday, October 25, 2022.

_____

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:
Initials: