

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes Work Session March 28, 2023**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a work session on Tuesday, March 28, 2023, at 4:00 p.m.

Members attending were Corey Clayborne, Chair; Fred Missel, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Karen Firehock; and Lonnie Murray

Members absent: Luis Carrazana

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

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Other Matters Not listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were no items from the public.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Firehock motioned to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Missel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (5-0). Mr. Carrazana was absent from the vote.

Work Session

a. ZTA202200002 Zoning Modernization

Ms. Lea Brumfield, Senior Planner II in Zoning and Community Development, stated that this work session was to cover the schedule and progress made to date with the zoning modernization project, to discuss the article review contained in the meeting packet materials, and to review the next steps of the process. She said that the article drafting process was currently in Phase 1 of five anticipated phases in the project, and each phase focused on the different sections of the ordinance that would be updated, organized, and rewritten.

Ms. Brumfield said that the first phase, in addition to the background research completed with the Berkley Group, would require work on articles that would incorporate the general part of the ordinance, the administration, and interpretation and application of the ordinance. She said that the next drafts that they would be looking at would be in regard to the requirements for permits and applications, the execution of the ordinance process, and nonconformities. She said that Phase 2 would include community design subjects such as lighting, landscaping, signs, parking, and entrance corridors. She said that Phase 3 would include setbacks, building heights, stepbacks, lot size, density, and map updates. She said that Phase 5 would be the compilation and adoption of the drafts.

Ms. Brumfield said that the zoning ordinance update was occurring simultaneously with staff's planning work on the comprehensive plan. She said that the plans had separate but somewhat converging tracks, so it was important that community engagement happened at the right time for each phase and topic. She said that the first phase's community engagement initiatives included focus group interviews of staff, Planning Commissioners, and CADRe, a local community development group, because these groups were using the first parts of the ordinance most often. She said that there was also a media release and open house for the general public to explain the project, receive feedback, and tell the community of the opportunities for engagement.

Ms. Brumfield said that the following phases had more targeted engagement planned, with designed focus groups for residents and businesses, public surveys, review forums for the sections that had more to do with public input, design surveys, and other items of concern from the public. She said that a subcommittee would be created and would include staff members, Planning Commissioners, and a Board member to champion for this so that they could translate things more easily and communicate better between staff and elected officials.

Ms. Brumfield said that finally, there would be public hearings, everything would undergo municipal and legal review, and then the new ordinance would launch with a media release. She said that to ensure that the public was aware and had clarity, the Office of Community and Public Engagement was assisting through the Albemarle Talks podcast, email and social media releases, and the project website www.engage.albemarle.org that continued to be updated throughout the process. She said that the timeline and scheduling of the zoning ordinance update was yet to be finalized because of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Bivins asked if developers for some of the recently approved developments such as Greystar could join their discussions about the zoning process. He said that it would be helpful for these larger organizations to explain their experience with zoning issues across the country so that outside perspectives were given consideration.

Mr. Missel said that he agreed with Mr. Bivins and noted that this was tied to economic development.

Ms. Brumfield said that staff could contact those developers.

Mr. Bivins said that having the input of national organizations would strengthen the narrative of community engagement.

Ms. Firehock said that the Planning Commission had desired to host roundtables in the past with local and global experts on subjects to do with the lighting ordinance, market, and planning, but the draft of the zoning ordinance update at the time was halted as priorities changed. She explained that substantial expertise was involved in this process, and that expertise was available locally. She said that they should make use of the volunteered information that was offered to them; it may indicate that the ordinance needs more changing than initially thought. She said that the public had maintained an interest in this zoning ordinance and their consultation may be of great benefit to process.

Ms. Brumfield said that she would follow up with getting those contacts.

Mr. Missel asked how historic resources, sustainability, and climate were integrated in the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Rebecca Cobb stated that some of that would depend on direction from the comprehensive plan, which was why some of the phases depended upon the stage of the comprehensive plan, meaning that they may have to wait or analyze what information they had currently available while waiting for that update. She said that in terms of incorporating some of those items, use standards would be one of the first things likely to have those topics incorporated and the impacts they had.

Mr. Missel asked if a copy of the presentation could be obtained.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had also asked for equity as a subject to be included in the zoning ordinance. He asked if it would be included in the general portion in Phase 1 of planning the document, where the general purpose of the ordinance was stated. He asked if there was or would be a high-level analysis of the public engagement process of Phase 1.

Ms. Cobb said that it was not a part of today's presentation, but it had been discussed at the last meeting in terms of their meeting with CADRe and the Commissioners. She said that what had not yet been shared was the information received at the open house event, but a summary of that could be provided.

Mr. Clayborne said that high-level overviews were helpful when there was a long time between meetings or when working on overlapping projects. He asked if they would be moving between phases when planning or if the proposed schedule was to be adhered to.

Ms. Cobb said that it was somewhat rigid, but not so rigid that the parts of the ordinance would be in conflict or have gaps in information. She said that they would try to be flexible while staying on target and on the task at hand.

Mr. Missel asked if or how they were considering the boundaries of relationships to outside neighbors and the internal neighbor of the City.

Ms. Cobb said that she was keeping up with what the City was doing in terms of ordinance updates through their email list, and when they got closer to seeing where the map details included those entities, they would be involved in the conversations as needed.

Mr. Bivins said that he did not think that they should have common or shared zones with the City.

Ms. Cobb said that it was a piece of the puzzle that must be considered.

Mr. Bivins clarified that in any sort of affair, because he was not involved in it, he would not adopt it.

Ms. Firehock said that the County would not necessarily attempt to make everything totally compatible on the boundary with the City but would attempt to be aware of potential conflicts or concerns.

Ms. Cobb said that Article 1 was primarily based on the Code of Virginia and there were not many policy decisions to be made. She said that they would review the current language and discuss any potential changes the Commission would like to make. She said that it included the enactment

and authority, the ordinance conflicts and interpretations, the establishment and interpretation of the zoning districts map, and the effective date and vested rights of the transition of regulations after adoption.

Ms. Cobb said that in the drafting, the regulation of land development and references to the Virginia Code were added, the general organization was streamlined, reorganized, simplified, then sent to staff to receive preliminary edits.

Mr. Bivins asked if the Planning Commission's counsel was involved in this work.

Ms. Cobb said yes. She said that some of the revisions to note were in §1.2.1, where new text was added to clarify and give detail for the interpretation of the ordinance. She said that text was edited about conflicting regulations and the more restrictive governing. She said that as advised by staff, a statement was edited to say that they were not enforcing easements or standards for subdivisions, but to be more restrictive they had to follow those things. She said that the Zoning Administrator was given clear responsibility to interpret the intent and purpose of the ordinance as well as the zoning map.

Ms. Cobb said that for §1.3.1, it was similar to the current ordinance but clarified that the official map was a GIS layer and added text from the Code of Virginia about filing a copy with circuit court. She said that staff continued to discuss this item, because it appeared to be an old regulation, and information would be shared as it became available.

Ms. Cobb said that §1.3.3 had added Subsection 6 about the uncertainty regarding the map, and if there were uncertainties, the Zoning Administrator had the authority to interpret and decide what the map was saying. She said that if there was disagreement about that, it could be appealed to the BZA, which was clarified in Article 1.

Ms. Cobb said that in Division 1.4, the transition of regulations after adoption, had added existing ordinance language and revised the division to clarify the process of the completed application when approved and with any violations when changes were made. She said that §1.4.6 clarified vested rights in reference to the Virginia Code.

Ms. Cobb asked if the Commissioners found it easy to interpret and understand as a cursory reader. She said that any grammar changes could be sent to staff and would be incorporated. She said that if something were missing from the existing ordinance that should be put into the draft of Article 1, she would ask the Commissioners to let her know and she would work to include them.

Mr. Bivins said that he felt some of the language in §4.4 could be more comprehensive.

Ms. Cobb asked if Mr. Bivins was referring to the section on completing applications.

Mr. Bivins said yes. He said that while the information provided was complete, it was not easily comprehensible. He said that it was possible that that particular area may need to be written that way, but the prior sections were written with a flow that stopped with the language of this section.

Ms. Firehock said that it could be in plainer language, but she hesitated to touch it because she did not know the legalities of what phrasing should be included.

Mr. Missel said that from the viewpoint of an applicant, he read the general provisions of the ordinance to have some language he found possibly superfluous but was uncertain as to whether there was a legal necessity for it to be in the document.

Ms. Cobb said that these comments were helpful. She said that part of this process was attempting to find what the Commission found applicable and what information they were ready to totally revamp. She said that it appeared that those sections were in their existing ordinance and it had been unclear as if the language was preferred by the County and the Commission.

Mr. Missel said that some of the information could be rewritten to be more simplistic and informative. He said that §1.4.4 could potentially be organized as a checklist so that the tasks could be viewed in a more straightforward way.

Mr. Bivins said that in §1.1.3, there were a number of statements where the declarative statement of the type of community that was desirable was enumerated in the code, but none of it had been vetted by anyone. He said that it had become an embedded history about who they were as a place that he was unsure if it had evolved over time. He asked if the order of items in §1.1.3 was ranked differently than §15.2-2283 on purpose.

Mr. Herrick said that the proposed §1.1.3 mirrored §15.2-2283.

Mr. Bivins said exactly. He said that the order of the items was different between them. He asked if that was intentional.

Ms. Cobb said that it was not in any particular order and was mimicking 2283. She said that it was probably in a different order because different items were incorporated.

Mr. Newberry said that it was copied and pasted from the existing ordinance to the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Clayborne said that the climate and equity vision statements from the Board should be incorporated into the language. He said that he felt it was dangerous to have a list, because it may appear limited when the list was not exhaustive.

Mr. Bivins asked if §10 relating to affordable housing could have shaping of language in that way.

Mr. Clayborne said sure.

Mr. Bivins said that preserving groundwater in number 13 could have expansion.

Ms. Cobb said that because they knew these 13 things were from state code, they should decide if they should branch beyond that. She said that it was true that the list could go on, so they should decide what was important enough to add.

Mr. Missel said that the specific goals and aspirations of the comprehensive plan should link back to this.

Ms. Cobb said that the language about an attractive, harmonious community was in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Bivins said that he had seen nothing in the comprehensive plan that spoke directly to the type of community they wanted, so he would have a difficult time of seeing how the community would get a convenient, attractive, and harmonious community. He said that perhaps the preamble in the comprehensive plan would state how that would be achieved.

Mr. Missel said that it was both aspiration and function.

Mr. Herrick said that he agreed with Mr. Bivins that proposals that came before the Commission should be evaluated against the comprehensive plan. He said that he hesitated to stray too far from the purposes in §15.2.22. He said that this was because what states had enabled the localities to do, giving the purposes of local zoning ordinances in localities. He said that to the extent that if Albemarle County said that the purpose of their zoning ordinance differed from what the state had enabled, it was recommended that the County stay within what the state had recommended.

Mr. Missel asked if they could add to it but had to ensure the content related.

Mr. Herrick said that he would not suggest adding content.

Mr. Missel asked if specific topics such as historic resources, equity, or climate action could be added.

Mr. Herrick said that those items could be considered as part of the Planning Commission's analysis as they evaluated individual applications. He said that he did not think that it was specifically enabled for the purpose of the zoning ordinance under state law. He clarified that all of those considerations could fit within the 13 enabled purposes.

Ms. Firehock said that the comprehensive plan went into depth on all of those topics.

Mr. Herrick said that the evaluation already came within the 13 enabled purposes, but without so many words, which was why it was appropriate for the Planning Commission to make those evaluations.

Mr. Missel said that he understood. He asked if the language about the protection of natural environment related back to preserving agricultural and forestal lands could be amended to expand the scope beyond just agricultural and forestal lands.

Mr. Herrick said that he would suggest keeping the current language of the state law. He said that while some of the language was archaic, the comprehensive plan still was applicable under those terms, such as the facilitation of a convenient, attractive, and harmonious community.

Ms. Firehock said that they must first consult the comprehensive plan when planning or rezoning in order to have that guiding and expanding language.

Mr. Clayborne said that this section should not be edited because of its adhesion to state code.

Mr. Herrick said that he would suggest it be reordered in the same order it existed in state law, or alternatively, cross-reference state law, so that the Albemarle County Zoning Ordinance shall be as set forth in Virginia Code §15.2-2283.

Mr. Clayborne said that he was referring to the entire article as being so dependent on the code.

Mr. Herrick said that there may be areas that they could change, but for the most part, it was best to adhere to state code as possible. He said that they were not at liberty to freelance and make it a declaration of what they might make it.

Mr. Missel said that in §1.3.1, it referenced the zoning map adopted on December 10, 1980, as amended by all the zoning map amendments after that date. He asked if there was ever a point where they referenced the new map.

Ms. Cobb said that the 1980 map was the new map.

Ms. Brumfield said that was the date when the County established the Rural Area, and many regulations since then had been tied to that. She said that there was a forced rezoning of many properties across the County at that time.

Mr. Murray said that significant revisions may be made during this process.

Mr. Newberry asked if instead of listing out the items of state code it would be preferable for staff to cross-reference to the section of state code.

Mr. Murray said that he would prefer to reference the state code, but he asked that the PDF documents include links to the specific state codes for viewers to access.

Mr. Herrick said that the preference in the County Attorney's Office was to cross-reference the state code, so it was designed to allow viewers to access the relevant state code section.

Mr. Clayborne said that it was vital to include that for access.

Mr. Missel said that the language should not include only state code, but the references were helpful for context and detail.

Mr. Newberry said that he appreciated the feedback.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was attention given to §1.2.1-3 and 4 where it said when regulations and the ordinance conflict with each other, other County ordinances and federal laws, the more restrictive regulation will govern. He said that above that, it said that the stairs of this ordinance were the minimum required. He said that it meant that if they were in conflict, the more restrictive was used.

Mr. Bivins said that he did not see any code associated with this sentence, so it could be reworded to say if there was a code more restrictive, the more restrictive code would apply. He said that in 5 of that same section, it said that a building structure in use which was not legally existing on X date may not be made lawful solely by adoption. He asked if this was about nonconformity.

Ms. Cobb said yes.

Mr. Bivins said that they could be layered. He said that in §1.3.3-7, the appeal process and BZM, the BZM did not have the power to change substantially the locations of the district boundaries.

He said that it appeared that they were not looking at zoning map amendments but looking at zoning text amendments. He asked what “substantially” was defined as.

Mr. Herrick said that this was declarative of existing law. He said that the Board of Zoning Appeals had the ability to appeal the Zoning Administrator’s interpretations of district boundaries. He said that the Board of Zoning Appeals did not have the authority to change the boundaries but a role in interpreting the boundaries as they currently existed.

Mr. Bivins said that they had the ability to review a ZMA.

Mr. Herrick said that if there was an ambiguity regarding the location of a district boundary, they had some role in settling the ambiguity. He said that it did not have the ability to change it wholesale.

Mr. Bivins said okay.

Mr. Clayborne mentioned § 1.31D and asked how other localities addressed access to information and accessibility.

Mr. Newberry said that state code was ambiguous about what had to be kept at the County in terms of the zoning map. He said that he was not aware of accessibility technology that would aid people with visual impairments in reviewing GIS maps.

Ms. Cobb said that there were online sources with screen readers and text readers that could be utilized.

Mr. Bivins noted that § 1.4.6A discussed vested rights, and he asked whether special use permits were considered vested rights.

Mr. Herrick responded that vested rights were a case-specific determination. He said that one of the basic principles of having a vested right requires a significant, affirmative governmental act. He said that the section was indicating that the zoning ordinance was not the final arbitration of a vested right.

Mr. Murray asked if an applicant would be required to build to new buffer standards in the ordinance if the project was previously approved under different standards but not yet completed.

Mr. Herrick said that it was a fact-specific determination based on how much the applicant relied on the approval.

Ms. Cobb said that it was addressed in § 1.4.4.

Mr. Newberry said that it was also referenced in § 1.4.5. He clarified that it stated that any approval prior to the adoption of the new ordinance would continue to be allowed under the old ordinance.

Mr. Bivins noted that vested rights could be sold.

Mr. Herrick noted that theoretically, the prior approval impacted the market value of the property. He said that courts protected vested rights because they recognized a financial value to the owners of the property.

Mr. Murray said that some County approvals should contain time limits so that projects cannot come back after 100 years. He said that projects should have to become compliant with the present ordinance after a certain amount of time rather than continuing under the old ordinance they were approved under.

Mr. Bivins noted that they did not have the local authority to set time limits.

Mr. Herrick stated that was correct. He said that Mr. Murray's suggestion was beyond local control and governed by state or common law.

Mr. Bivins noted that the Board had considered adding the item to its legislative agenda.

Ms. Cobb said that Article 2, Administration, contained sections on the Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission, Board of Zoning Appeals, enforcement, fees, and taxes and expenses paid prior to applications. She said that the County code section was based on state code, so there were not many changes. She said that there were often references to state code in terms of staff and staff requirements or other items, and in those instances, greater sections of the state code were provided in the County ordinance so that readers would not have to reference a separate source.

Ms. Cobb said that to § 2.1.1, the powers for the Zoning Administrator, they had added additional powers from state code, such as making findings of fact and determinations, and making reasonable administrative procedures necessary for administering the ordinance. She said that in § 2.2.1, they added text referencing state code and County Code Chapter 2 Article 4 regarding the Planning Commission. She said that several localities had a separate section in the code detailing the Planning Commission.

Ms. Cobb said that in Division 2.3, text about the Board of Zoning Appeals had been organized and cleaned up for ease of reading, and a section had been added, Division 2.3.3, related to meetings and procedures. She said that Division 2.4 was related to the ARB, and they made the text similar to the BZA to make the text consistent and similar throughout the document. She noted that they also made a meetings and procedures section.

Ms. Cobb said that Division 2.5 was enforcement, and they had created clear procedures for how violations and complaints were initiated. She said that they reduced text in terms of the staff requirements.

Mr. Murray asked about what would happen if the County did not have the funding or staff to enforce an ordinance.

Ms. Cobb responded that several localities had a complaint-based enforcement system, and they did not have staff patrolling.

Ms. Brumfield said that a specific part of the ordinance assigned rights-of-way. She noted that the County was a complaint-based system.

Ms. Cobb said that the section had been reviewed by the County Attorney, and adjustments had been made based on the review. She said that § 2.6.1 was related to fees and charges, and they

had removed all individual fees and referenced a fee schedule. She said that they anticipated the fee schedule would be adopted.

Mr. Missel suggested that there should be language in the preamble of the Planning Commission section about why the section lacked detail and where more information could be found.

Ms. Cobb noted that the preamble referenced the state code and County code chapters.

Mr. Missel noted that the meetings and procedures section was missing from the Planning Commission section because of other language. He suggested that it be included or a clear reference to the schedule be made in the section.

Ms. Cobb asked if using the same format as the other sections for the Planning Commission section would be helpful.

Mr. Missel said that it would be helpful. He noted that the format for the other sections was a good primer.

Mr. Bivins said that the sections should be treated the same.

Mr. Clayborne said that the sections should be treated the same.

Ms. Cobb said that they could align the Planning Commission section with the formatting of the other sections, but they did not want to repeat the information.

Ms. Brumfield noted that the BZA did not have its own section in Chapter 2.

Mr. Herrick noted that the Planning Commission had its own article in Chapter 2 of the County Code.

Mr. Bivins asked why Item 7 was needed in § 2.1.1 when Subsection A defined the authority.

Mr. Herrick responded that Item 7 indicated the authority defined was not an exhaustive list, and there may be other powers that the Zoning Administrator had that were not defined.

Mr. Bivins said that § 2.2.3G was very complicated.

Mr. Herrick said that the section was almost verbatim from the state code.

Mr. Bivins noted that in § 2.4.2, an ARB member must have a demonstrated interest, competence, or knowledge in architecture landscape or architecture site design, but the ARB addressed entrance corridors. He said that the entrance corridors had few unified sections to design.

Mr. Missel said that he understood it to be the design principles which applied to all entrance corridors. He said such principles included pedestrian scale, design density and massing.

Mr. Bivins said that he did not know if the ARB members were qualified according to the County code.

Mr. Missel noted that it was likely determined through the application process, and the Board would determine if the nominee were qualified.

Mr. Newberry said that the section was pulled from the County's existing code section. He said that the County created the body and regulated it, so staff did not want to change the ordinance. He noted that the ordinance was ambiguous on purpose so that the Board could choose the right person for the nomination.

Mr. Missel noted that not all ARB members were architects, and they had diverse job and experience backgrounds.

Mr. Bivins suggested that some of that language be added to the ordinance.

Ms. Cobb asked whether Mr. Bivins wanted the section to be reworded.

Mr. Bivins said that he liked what Mr. Missel said related to the design principles.

Mr. Clayborne asked whether the eligibility requirements had to be in the legislative language or if they could be included in a job description.

Ms. Cobb said that it could be done at the County's discretion. She said that including the eligibility in the ordinance provided a determinant source, and the language left the decision open for nominees of various backgrounds.

Ms. Brumfield said that the ARB staff member requested that historical preservation be added to the eligibility requirements. She noted that it had accidentally been left out of the draft.

Mr. Bivins said that they should make sure the role of the ARB was made clear so that there was less confusion about jurisdiction.

Mr. Murray noted that there had been previous efforts to make much of the architecture in the area Jeffersonian. He said that the ARB should be focused on implementing community design standards and developing properties sustainably.

Ms. Cobb said that there would be another work session in May to discuss permits and applications. She said that they would address nonconformities in May, and in July, they would wrap up the Phase 1 work. She said that they would have another presentation to the focus group and then decide next steps.

Committee Reports

There were none.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: March 15 & 22, 2023

Mr. McDermott said that the items on the agendas were fairly small. He said that he would provide an update on the outcomes of those items at a later time, but no major issues came up.

AC44 Update

Mr. McDermott said that they were at a point of transferring from stage one of Phase 2 to stage two. He said that they would discuss the planning toolkits, growth management, and land uses. He said that they would come before the Commission at the end of April for a work session to get feedback on the proposals. He said that they would return to the working group for a meeting to get them started on community outreach. He said that there would be multiple roundtables to get public feedback. He said that the first segment of Phase 2 was successful, and they had received about 532 responses on the public survey. He said that the working group had also received feedback. He said that staff would provide a summary of all the feedback received at the end of April.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the County had a marketing or media team that followed the AC44 progress.

Mr. McDermott said that they held regular meetings with the community and public engagement department. He said that they published social media information, and the website was constantly updated. He said that every month, they did a promotion on NBC29. He said that there was a mailing list to receive information.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the events were documented.

Mr. McDermott said that they did maintain a list of what was happening at the events, but he was unsure if the information was publicly available. He said that they were looking to make the information accessible. He noted that they photographed public engagement events, and those pictures could be published.

Mr. Murray suggested that the pop-ups should be located at higher foot-traffic areas or at peak hours of traffic.

Mr. McDermott said that many of the locations for the pop-ups were chosen from suggestions by supervisors.

New Business

Mr. Bivins suggested people review the School Board's budget proposal. He noted that the capital projects were listed, and there was an elementary school proposed for the southern feeder pattern and elementary school for the northern feeder pattern. He noted that it discussed the school building capacity and age. He asked for a briefing on the School Board's budget proposal.

Mr. Murray suggested that the capacity information should be overlaid on a map of the County.

Mr. McDermott said that they were performing outreach to ACPS and the School Board due to comprehensive planning, and they had provided updated data on the pipeline. He said that the School Board was considering the option of redistricting to alleviate some problems in the schools.

Mr. Missel said that he attended a community open house in Batesville regarding the replacement of the historic bridge. He said that there seemed to be a lack of communication from VDOT at the meeting.

Mr. McDermott noted that VDOT provided a monthly report that was distributed to the Board, and there was a quarterly presentation of the report. He said that was one of the major ways the County disseminated information about road and bridge maintenance. He said that the Batesville bridge had been omitted from the report, and they were in discussions with VDOT about why information was not provided.

Mr. Bivins noted that the City received more media attention than the County, and the media helped to bring attention to issues that needed addressed.

Mr. Murray said that many of the transportation issues were planning issues. He said that there were planning implications to the transportation infrastructure decisions.

Mr. Missel suggested a report on VDOT be given to the Commission on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Clayborne said he would discuss the suggestion with Mr. McDermott.

Mr. McDermott noted that one of the Board meetings was a budget meeting on March 22. He said that the two items on the March 15 public hearing were the Scottsville transmission line, which was approved, and the Springhill development rights amendment, which also was approved.

Old Business


There was none.

Items for Follow-up

There were no items for follow-up.

Adjournment

At 5:44 p.m., the Commission adjourned to April 25, 2023, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 4:00 p.m.



Kevin McDermott, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 04/25/2023
Initials: CSS