

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Final Minutes October 24, 2023**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a work session and regular meeting on Tuesday, October 24, 2023, at 4:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Corey Clayborne, Chair; Fred Missel, Vice Chair; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; Karen Firehock; Nathan Moore; Lonnie Murray

Members absent:

Other officials present were: Kevin McDermott, Interim Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll. She noted that Ms. Firehock was present remotely via Zoom.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum. He asked Ms. Firehock to provide her reason for participating remotely as well as her present location.

Ms. Firehock said that she was located in Howardsville, Virginia, and her reason for participating remotely was due to an illness in her family that required her to stay close by for caretaking.

Mr. Murray motioned to allow Ms. Firehock to participate in the meeting remotely, which was seconded by Mr. Carrazana. The motion passed unanimously (6-0). Ms. Firehock abstained from the vote.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Clayborne clarified that there were no items on the consent agenda today.

**Presentation
Economic Development Update**

JT Newberry, Interim Director of Economic Development, said that key team members would assist him in this presentation. He said that to provide some context as to how they arrived at this point today, it was essential to understand that the Economic Development Office was not formally created until 2015. He said that in the early aughts and mid-aughts, the Board of Supervisors had been setting aside resources because they recognized that there would be projects, they wanted to undertake. He said that in 2017, a crucial aspect of their history was when the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the Economic Development Authority came together to adopt guiding principles that were instrumental in developing the rest of Project Enable, which could be found in the bound booklet version.

Mr. Newberry said that in the first six months, the staff team developed the goals, objectives, and strategies that would be in today's discussion. He said that the Board formally accepted them at the end of 2018. He said that they had almost 18 months until the pandemic hit in March 2020. He said that at that time, they paused Project Enable efforts to focus on a business continuity strategy. He said that this involved pivoting from their previous goals and objectives to secure the foundation for their work.

Mr. Newberry said that one of his office's key contributions was distributing support money throughout the community with the help of partners and the Board of Supervisors' support. He said that they provided over \$5 million to organizations offering critical services. He said that as the pandemic began to subside, they could return to Project Enable. He said that their community had been somewhat insulated from many economic shocks, although they still impacted them. He said that they had made significant progress in achieving their goals.

Mr. Newberry said that the whole conversation today was really meant to be preparation for what the economic development chapter in the new comprehensive plan would say. He said that the Board was very clear that all of their work was to be consistent with the comprehensive plan and it would be an important part of their work going forward as they worked under AC44. He said that he would go through each of the first six goals. He said that much like the comprehensive plan, they tried to order their goals in some order of priority.

Mr. Newberry said that they began with their business retention and expansion program, which was a fundamental service of every economic development office in the country. He said that it involved going out and meeting with businesses, finding out what their challenges were, and trying to come up with customized solutions to help them overcome those. He said that they had a specific position in the office dedicated specifically for this purpose, which was Ms. Ashley Hernandorena's role. He said that they had had a lot of great experiences going out into the community and figuring out what were the things that businesses were really struggling with.

Mr. Newberry said that for an example of BRE, he felt that Willow Tree hits across a number of different goals, but primarily, he wanted to discuss the company that was at risk of leaving their community. He said that they had opportunities in North Carolina, Ohio, and Colorado. He said that it was through their Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City that they approached them and asked if there was any way the County could help them land.

Mr. Newberry said that they undertook the public-private partnership that resulted in the redevelopment of Woolen Mill, and as a result, this company is now thriving. He said that the company had recently been purchased for more than \$1 billion and now employed over 300 people. He said that their parent company, which is Canadian, had encouraged them to continue doing what they do best and to keep investing and growing in Albemarle County. He said that from all of their conversations with them, they intended to do so.

Mr. Newberry said that goal two was focused on improving the business climate by addressing controllable barriers. He said that two companies that exemplified this goal were Bonumose on Pantops and Castle Hill Gaming in Stonefield. He said that Bonumose was thriving in their community, receiving investment from major companies like Hershey and Domino Sugar. He said that they were looking for where they could do their next expansion and ultimately landed at the State Farm Building, but not without significant challenges. He said that the owner of that building was not interested in leasing space of less than at least 100,000 square feet, and Bonumose was really looking for only about 50,000 square feet.

Mr. Newberry said that the zoning of the site required a special exception to complete R&D activities, because there was a maximum of 4,000 square feet permitted, and the Board authorized a special exception for them to exceed that. He said he was happy to say they were thriving there. He said that they had invested well over \$25 million in that site. He said that they continued to grow and continue to execute their plans for national and international growth, and they were headquartered right here in the County.

Mr. Newberry said that Castle Hill Gaming was a company located further up Route 29 and they were looking for a place within an opportunity zone. He said that the County had two opportunity zones, and through a connection to a developer who was willing to build just a residential site, they were able to have a conversation and say that a creditworthy tenant was interested in leasing nonresidential space on the first floor.

Mr. Newberry said that through making that connection, it facilitated a height special exception to go up another floor, so now there was a headquarters for Castle Hill Gaming, which produced gaming machines located throughout the United States. He said that some of the jobs located here were really interesting, and included artists, mathematicians, coders, and others who contributed to the daily population within Stonefield and midweek commercial activity for their businesses.

Mr. Newberry said that goal three was the longest and most dense goal in the plan. He said that a few of its objectives will be discussed later tonight, including North Fork. He said that a specific strategy in their plan is to support North Fork's success. He said that on the right-hand side of the screen was the beginning of the extension of Lewis and Clark Drive. He said that his team was involved in expediting permitting to get that project started. He said that earlier this year they had been awarded, in collaboration with the UVA Foundation, a \$3 million grant from the Economic Development Partnership, the State Economic Development Agency. He said that consequently, they were looking to prepare a little over 30 acres for an economic development prospect.

Mr. Newberry said that two other companies he would discuss were Potter's Craft Cider and AgroSpheres. He said that Potter's Craft Cider had benefited from multiple expansions supported and matched at the local level. He said that their tasting room, which they may be familiar with on Route 29 South, also had a new production facility on Broadway Street. He said that they were expanding production, distributing across the mid-Atlantic and even further west and were doing extremely well. He said that it was another example of a company that was at risk of leaving their community without support.

Mr. Newberry said that the other company, AgroSpheres, was an example of a commercialized intellectual property spurring out of the University of Virginia. He said that they had an environmentally friendly pesticide that had the potential to change the world. He said that they had received significant investment from companies like Bayer, which was helping them execute their plans.

Mr. Newberry said that another objective within this goal he wanted to mention was a big part of Project Enable, and that was getting tools in the toolbox. He said that before Project Enable was adopted, there were no economic development policies at all. He said that Potter's Craft, AgroSpheres, and many others had benefited from them developing policy, providing certainty to businesses facing tough business decisions around where they wanted to invest next and whether or not the County could be a durable partner to them.

Mr. Newberry said that goal four was all about public-private partnerships. He said that two projects they may be familiar with were Barnes Lumber and Albemarle Business Campus. He said that in the case of Barnes Lumber, they were utilizing financing tools like a synthetic TIF to help offset some of the developer's investment there. He said that they were doing the same thing at Albemarle Business Campus. He said that their contributions were securing public elements requested through the comprehensive plan process and contributing to the built environment. He said that as they thought about the AC44 update and other chapters, they looked to the comprehensive plan to determine what those elements could be included in a performance agreement that they could help secure through their office's efforts.

Mr. Newberry said that goal five discussed educating the community. He said that they found through the development of Project Enable that many members of their community misunderstood the intent of economic development and what their goals were going to be. He said that a significant part of what they did was just trying to get the word out. He said that the picture in the top right-hand corner of the slide showed Ms. Hernandorena talking about their Buy Local program. He said that in the bound version of Project Enable, a Buy Local sticker was included for the Commissioners.

Mr. Newberry said that they utilized LinkedIn for much of their social media presence and printed stories through publications like Albemarle Magazine. He said that they developed a standalone economic development website. He said that site selection, as businesses were looking at expansion, could often better be described as site elimination where people who were doing research on the community and trying to figure out if they might be an appropriate place for that expansion were doing so without ever talking to anybody at all. He said that they had this website up to help market their community, not necessarily to people who were outside, but to businesses that were looking to expand right in the County.

Mr. Newberry said that goal six was the last goal that he would discuss, which was about partnerships. He said that their County Executive often talked about partnerships because they were an essential part of what they did. He said that every organization listed on the current slide was one with which they had a financial relationship to achieve a goal or strategy in Project Enable. He said that they could not accomplish a quarter of what they were trying to do without their help. He said that partnerships required compromise and a lot of time and input, but he would argue that it had been worth it in each of these instances. He said that if anyone had questions about any of these, they could discuss them further.

Emily Kilroy, Assistant to the County Executive, said that she would discuss goal seven. She explained that JT asked her to do this because she served on behalf of the County as one of the staff appointments to the Convention and Visitors Bureau, which is the main way Albemarle County works in the tourism sector through their participation on the CACVB. She said that goal seven focused on partnering to expand efforts to build the County's tourism sector. She said that the data came from the Virginia Tourism Corporation, which provided statewide and local data, and the most recent data available was for 2022.

Ms. Kilroy said that there were a couple of things to note, the first being that the pandemic had happened, causing the 2020 bar to drop significantly. She said that secondly, in 2021 there was a recovery greater than what people had projected due to changing travel preferences during that period when things did not feel quite open, but it was no longer unsafe to travel. She said that Albemarle County filled a niche as a really great place to spend a couple of nights located within

a short drive of many major metropolitan areas. She said that as a result, there was an increase in tourism and a strong recovery from the 2020 low.

Ms. Kilroy said that in fact, they exceeded their pre-pandemic tourism numbers in 2022, which was exciting to see as staffing had stabilized at many service providers in the sector. She said that it been a great time to visit Albemarle County and Charlottesville. She said that visitor spending amounted to over \$500M, and that made it one of the major sectors driving the Albemarle County economy. She said that the tourism sector sustained 9% of all County jobs, including direct service at lodging and tourist destinations as well as indirect and induced effects such as visitors eating lunch and shopping while in town. She said that visitors generated almost \$40 million in state and local taxes.

Ms. Kilroy said that recent accolades were great and included that Wine Enthusiast magazine had the Charlottesville, Virginia area as one of the top five wine regions for 2023. She said that they were a finalist and expected to hear back in just a couple of weeks. She said that this recognition was really exciting, as it placed them alongside Lambrusco, Italy, Provence, France, Australia, and South Africa on the top five list. She said that it was a huge honor just to be on a list with some strong wine-producing regions. She said that they were also named one of the top happiest towns by *Outside* magazine, which is both web and print publication, as well as one of the seven best US cities and towns to see fall foliage. She said that many of those referred to Charlottesville; however, they actually discussed the amenities and opportunities available in Albemarle.

Ms. Kilroy said that she mentioned the CACVB, which was the agency responsible for promoting tourism in their region. She said that it was a destination marketing and management organization, an industry term that described its work. She said that the organization was funded through a portion of the lodging tax generated by overnight stays in the community. She said that its primary focus was on marketing their region, providing visitor resources before and during travel, and increasing visibility for underrepresented tourism segments. She said that over the past several years, some initiatives had been implemented to showcase their community as welcoming to all visitors.

Ms. Kilroy said that one such initiative was Tourism for All, which highlighted their community's inclusiveness. She said that another sub-brand that CVB worked on was "Discover Black Cville" to emphasize Black business owners and Black restaurant tours, and to demonstrate that this community was a welcoming place for various types of visitors. She said that another example of that work was a partnership with the Wheel the World, which directly engaged some of their tourism destinations in evaluating how accessible their facilities, tours, and other amenities were for people who navigated in a wheelchair. She said that this was some really great focused work that CACVB had been leading, which had significant impacts on the tourism sector overall.

Ms. Kilroy said that the CACVB Management Board had 15 members, and she was the staff person for Albemarle County. She said that there was one staff person, one elected official from Albemarle and Charlottesville, and 14 industry representatives. She said that since Project Enable was created, there had been a new Executive Director at the CACVB, and the board composition had shifted slightly, leading to the launch of the current brand logo for Charlottesville and Albemarle County, Virginia. She mentioned that there was a really exciting project that had just launched to develop the first long-term strategic tourism marketing plan. She said that this would provide a roadmap for the organization, guiding their efforts moving forward.

Ms. Kilroy said that the marketing pillars included farm-to-table food and beverage, encompassing excellent restaurants, wineries, breweries, cideries, and distilleries as a major draw for visitors. She said that additionally, there was culture and history, world-class amenities with small-town charm, outdoor recreation, and a vibrant art, live entertainment, and festival sector. She said that Monticello remained a significant attraction, along with the University of Virginia bringing many people to their community. She said that there were numerous great aspects that attracted visitors and encouraged them to stay after making an investment in singular destinations.

Mr. Moore said that he was interested in learning more about public-private partnerships and how they have been progressing over the last few years. He asked if staff could provide any examples or further information.

Mr. Newberry said that he was not sure how many performance agreements they had exactly, but they were currently administering 19 different ones. He said that he estimated that there were seven or eight public-private partnerships in place and a number of others in development. He said that in terms of how to determine if they presented an opportunity for them to partner with someone on a particular project, these projects could take years to develop, as he discovered when he was previously in the Community Development Department before joining the Economic Development Office.

Mr. Newberry said that Willow Tree was a good example. He said that in 2017, discussions began and were completed in 2018. He said that they would continue to administer that for another couple of years. He said that these were long-term projects that remained exciting despite the pandemic, and they were making amendments as needed. He said that this tool was an essential part of their toolbox and distinguished them from other communities considering investment.

Mr. Moore asked what the state was of sites that were considered shovel-ready in the County and what challenges they faced on that front.

Mr. Newberry said that site readiness being one of the biggest challenges to business investment in their community. He said that the state had a five-tier system to categorize the readiness of a site, with tier five being ready for construction to begin and permits already in hand, while tier one was raw land outside of the growth area not even contemplated for development. He said that a major goal of most communities was to have a diversity of products at a tier four level.

Mr. Newberry said that they currently had one site in the County that was tier four, which was North Fork, with 253 acres characterized by the Virginia Economic Development Partnership as tier four. He said that it would be beneficial if they had multiple tier four sites within their various development areas at different sizes and price points to accommodate people who have been successful there and can grow, contributing career ladder jobs to their community.

Mr. Murray said that he was glad to see outdoor recreation mentioned as one of the marketing pillars for tourism. He said that he would like to see an objective related to preserving and promoting Albemarle's recreation economy, which among other things included running, cycling, hiking, kayaking, fishing, camping, botany, and birdwatching. He said that as someone who spent a lot of time outdoors himself and had spent thousands of his own dollars visiting other communities and participating in activities, he believed that it was not something they were really doing enough to recognize the financial impact of that.

Mr. Murray said that if they just looked at one thing like the Charlottesville Ten Miler race, for example, considering all the people who traveled here to participate in that event, who went and stayed in a hotel, ate at a restaurant, maybe did some shopping, there was a big impact when they considered all the running races, all the cycling races, all the people who came here to fish or bird watch or do any of that, and he would like to see some recognition of that. He said that he appreciated the example of Willow Tree, which was an excellent illustration of sustainable redevelopment. He said that anything that could enhance the objectives related to redevelopment and promoting redevelopment was crucial. He said that he would like to see more examples of redevelopment projects the County had supported.

Mr. Murray said that he had a minor point about job education. He said that as someone who had worked within environmental circles, he believed there was substantial funding from the state for initiatives such as stormwater and native plants. He said that it would be fantastic to provide training for individuals in these areas. He said that they must search extensively for qualified professionals to manage stormwater or install rain gardens or biofilters, which were excellent job opportunities. He said that he would like to see partnerships perhaps with Western Albemarle or PVCC.

Ms. Firehock said that she agreed with Mr. Murray's remark about promoting the natural beauty of the area. She said that for example, birders spent more than almost all other types of tourists. She said that they were very lucrative types of tourists to attract. She said that she also wanted to explore the possibility of placing more emphasis on supporting and growing small businesses in their community. She said that while she had been a professor at the University of Virginia, she had started her own small business with just one employee and had since grown it to 18 employees. She said that small businesses made up 99.5% of all businesses in the area. She said that 5% of all businesses were small businesses, with over 766,000 in Virginia.

Ms. Firehock said that the majority of new startups were established as small businesses. She said that in her opinion, they did not do enough to support entrepreneurial startups in their area. She said that these startups could become a significant part of their economy once they grew. She said that she would like to see more emphasis on startup services as part of their economic development strategies. She said that it was essential not only to focus on larger companies and breweries but also on various tech firms, intellectual-based small businesses, and mom-and-pop shops.

Mr. Missel expressed his gratitude toward staff for the incredible strides they had made in this work over the last few years, and he looked forward to continuing to work with everyone. He asked how the Commission could be most helpful to staff. He said that they mentioned components that could be integrated into a performance agreement or comprehensive plan. He said that they did not have to answer now, but he would request information on how the Planning Commission might be most helpful for the County in terms of economic development currently and into the future.

Mr. Newberry said that the broadest answer to address the question was to ensure their active participation in the conversation. He said that maintaining an open dialogue was a two-way street, and he personally acknowledged his need to improve his communication skills by sharing more information about their initiatives and ongoing projects. He said that as the Planning Commission deliberated on various factors in the comprehensive plan and offered commentary, it was essential to consider the lens of economic development as well.

Mr. Missel said that the specific section of the written report discussed targeted industries. He said that perhaps this got too close to what his colleagues had mentioned, but considering agribusiness, given the volume of rural areas in the County, he would like to know if there had been any initiatives to partner with agriculture that may not be what they typically thought of as light industry. He asked if there were specifics on this topic or thoughts for how to move beyond the central development core.

Mr. Newberry said that at the state level, there was significant interest in controlled environmental agriculture, which included vertical grow houses, aquaculture, and various other practices. He said that this was currently a priority for the Governor's administration. He said that when considering the utilities required for these types of uses, the County's current policies presented some challenges. He said that when examining any business or company looking at Albemarle County, they first began with the comprehensive plan. He said that with this update, they could provide more thought and support for viable uses of rural area property while ensuring that it could be maintained in a way consistent with the rural area goal.

Mr. Missel said that the CACVB provided some remarkable statistics, particularly the one that showed the decline during COVID-19 followed by an increase and another increase, resulting in growth from \$400M to \$500M. He asked if there was any data that showed that would continue or otherwise.

Ms. Kilroy said that it was somewhat still to be seen. She said that some of the things that made that difficult to predict were that coming out of the pandemic, there was an industry term called revenge travel, which was referring to those who had to put off a big trip during 2020 or 2021. She said that they had to analyze if and when the phenomenon would end. She said that Albemarle was a good destination from Washington, D.C. and the Research Triangle area in North Carolina. She said that they were watching for data very closely. She said that the CACVB received monthly reports on hotel occupancy data, and they continued to see strong occupancy data in light of fairly high average room rates, and even despite these rates. She said that the University had a significant impact on this trend.

Ms. Kilroy said that it was shown by the economic impact report for the defense sector that the increase in overnight visitations driven by Rivanna Station. She said that it was hard to know exactly why, but the CACVB was closely monitoring and focusing on this issue. She said that to Ms. Firehock's point, they made wine in this region partially because their grapes produced really great wines and their vintners created excellent wines from them, but it also was different than drinking wine in a city at a wine shop due to the sense of place and visuals that they experienced when visiting a winery in Albemarle. She said that they would be examining this closely and were excited to see how the sector had bounced back strongly from the pandemic.

Mr. Missel said that regarding the zoning modernization, it would be beneficial to explore the potential advantages of integrating various uses into the zoning designations that promote sustainability, economic development, mixed-use, 24/7, live, work, play, and other development goals. He said that this was an essential aspect of their collaboration.

Mr. Carrazana said that he found the report very helpful and enlightening in many ways. He asked if information could be provided about the affordability of commercial property and its viability. He said that during the last year, they had received a number of resubmissions reducing the amount of commercial property and development in Albemarle County. He said that it was because of affordability and demand.

Mr. Carrazana asked if they could talk a little bit about that, and he wanted to know some mitigating factors that they felt were out there that they could begin to look at. He asked if there were things that the Commission could perhaps help with. He said that it was a challenge that they were seeing, as it involved a reduction of commercial property and the potential for new development of commercial property. He said that there were certainly some vacancies out there, and the way the work environment was changing also needed to be considered.

Mr. Newberry said that he wished he had a great answer for them. He said that he was not an expert on the commercial real estate sector but could share what he had heard from commercial property owners. He said that they were seeing lower demand than previously, and macroeconomic shifts of shoppers moving online, away from brick and mortar, had contributed to this trend. He said that challenges with rising costs and inflation made it difficult for small business owners to invest in renovating a space for a new use. He said that it seemed that there were more and more challenges to commercial property while the demand for residential properties remained strong due to everyone needing a place to live but did not necessarily need to own a business.

Mr. Newberry said that banks financing these projects felt more comfortable with residential ones than commercial ones. He said that there were many complicating factors, but he could probably leave it there. He said that this answer might not address all their questions, but communicating for anyone who might listen or watch later, his office appreciated engaging with the private sector to understand their challenges and what they were seeing so they could be in a position to respond effectively to meet the community's needs.

Mr. Carrazana said that the second part of his question was regarding adaptive reuse. He said that he with Mr. Newberry's assessment that there would likely be challenges for a few years, and the amount of commercial new property coming online may be reduced. He said that the question and comment he had was how this now provided an opportunity for adaptive reuse. He asked what they should do with the current inventory they had, which was built at a lower price point. He said that perhaps there was an opportunity to bring in businesses at an affordable rate. He asked if they should incentivize adaptive reuse, partnering with companies to encourage it. He asked for examples of projects like the Willow Tree project and how they were partnering with companies to incentivize adaptive reuse, and if they now had a greater opportunity due to the climate just discussed.

Mr. Newberry said that he believed they had a greater opportunity today and were moving forward than they had previously. He said that one of the tools in their toolbox that had not been used by their community yet was something called a building reuse grant. He said that it was specifically geared toward a target industry company that was expanding in the area. He said that the exact example he gave where perhaps there was some sort of capital investment that would make it cost prohibitive for them to be there. He said that just to give some really quick regional examples, they talked with businesses, particularly in industrial areas, that would say they could locate the business in the east or to the west, Louisa, Fluvanna, or Waynesboro, not for half price, but even less than half price of what it would be to locate in Albemarle.

Mr. Newberry said that it became increasingly difficult for business owners to choose to invest there when there was that dynamic at play. He said that he thought even with their grant, they were still asking businesses to do more than they could manage. He said that there were other state grants that supported those kinds of costs. He said that there was also the adoption of the Virginia Building Code, which made it a little bit easier to go into existing buildings than new construction. He said that they had some tailwinds that would help. He said that he believed

creating the opportunity for the private sector to test that out would be a great opportunity for them to deeply consider.

Mr. Bivins said that part of what they discussed when they talked about economic development was about how well they were at future casting. He said that it was about how, at this point in time in 2023, they could look somewhere down the line and say, these are the kinds of businesses, and these are the kinds of individuals they would like to have in their community. He said that part of what he was asking was, seeing the target industries, he thought there was an acknowledgment, at least there was an acceptance and acknowledgment that these were sort of rarefied business functions that could actually be anywhere in the world. He said that if he was in a bioscience or a medical device industry, he did not have to be located there.

Mr. Bivins said that if they looked at sort of business and financial services, he would be cautious about that industry because that industry was in such dynamic flux right now that it was not certain what it was going to look like even in just two years. He said that depending on the administrations in Washington, there was no telling what might happen in the financial services area. He said that the information technology and defense and security sectors were well-known for their importance to the Rivanna Station project, located there due to the proximity to Washington. He said that depending on where they placed the buildings that would replace those leaving Washington, the Rivanna Station project could become an anchor for this community.

Mr. Bivins said the goal was to identify what could be anchored in this community to establish it as a special place. He said that if he were an autocrat for a moment, he would like to call them Albemarle and find a way to stop being Charlottesville. He said that this could help strengthen their brand identity. He said that for example, some of his friends may know that he had lived in various places around the world. He said that anything that went on, his friends said, was it safe to be in Charlottesville. He said that in 2017, he had friends from around the world contacted him via WhatsApp and direct messaging, asking if he was safe and if his spouse and he were safe there. He said that everything, whether it was The Guardian or Le Monde, whatever what was happening in America, they always gave an example of Charlottesville, which was nice but not helpful.

Mr. Bivins said that it was not helpful when people looked to bring businesses to town and when they mentioned Charlottesville, they saw crime, dysfunctional governing in their sister City, and saw things which they were not used to, as someone who grew up in the Northeast, distinguishing between a County and a City. He said that they did not understand the separate jurisdictions there. He said that most business owners, unless they came from Massachusetts or Kentucky or someplace like that, did not understand the separateness between jurisdictions of counties and cities. He said that in order to overcome that, they should brand themselves in some way. He said that to brand themselves, it would be Albemarle County and it was not the City of Charlottesville. He said that there was a deficit there.

Mr. Bivins said that he would like to hear from staff at the next comprehensive plan work session about the things which they heard from their business partners that kept them from coming or making a different decision. He said that Mr. Newberry talked about what it took to get things through Economic Development, and he was still waiting on some projects to be built from 12 years ago. He said that people could say it was because of the economy of the project, but sometimes it was because the ROI on the project did not have a natural light to how they could sustain this in the future. He said that the drawing of the nexus between this investment allowed both having this type of ROI and allowing them to have an investment was a piece here.

Mr. Bivins asked if information could be provided about what they were doing with Albemarle School System. He said that the reason he said that was because they had Center 1, which was in the old Comdial Building. He said that Center 2, which they had just talked about, would likely be on the Lambs Lane Campus. He said that his perspective was that there were two distinct places trying to provide young people with an avenue for life after high school so they could stay in the area. He said that one of the things he would like to see, as they discussed Economic Development, was to determine what they lost every year when people graduated from various locations, but not necessarily the University.

Mr. Bivins said that then, they were talking about new economic development for those they attracted in the area. He said that as Ms. Firehock said, they were not trying to build people, they were not trying to build a solution that helped them sustain and develop an ecosystem that fostered forward thinking and future casting for economic development in this area. He said that he believed it would be helpful to know what drives tourism in this region. He said that while some people may go to Mickey Tavern for fried chicken on their way from Monticello, he did not think Monticello's numbers drove the way they did now.

Mr. Bivins said that the reason he did not believe that was because he read their documents stating that their numbers were down. He said that this was because they were asking for too much money, and something appeared wrong. He said that he wanted to know what were the elements driving the tourist economy in this region. He said that at one point, they were either the number one or number two bridal destination in America. He said that from what he understood from some people who still got married, that could be a \$100,000 weekend. He said that when looking at what drove the economy, it caused them to identify the auxiliary sort of businesses they wanted to try and attract here to sustain that.

Mr. Bivins said that he wanted to know how they could advertise it in a way that informed people on a national level about the availability of such activities. He said that their airport was brilliant and allowed access to anywhere in the world with just one stop. He said that while it was not Dulles or Richmond, it was Charlottesville, which was easy to get to and use. He added that when they discussed what might be happening at North Fork later in the afternoon, they were starting to create a mass that encouraged people to visit Albemarle County. He said that he was considering what attractions Albemarle County had to offer.

Mr. Bivins said that he would inform the CACVB, several things he had come across, such as Thrillist, Axios DC, and Axios Richmond, these sources often discussed wine but rarely mentioned their area. He said that they focused on Northern Virginia locations like Loudoun County, Delaplaine, and Fauquier County. He said that Albemarle County should be included in their discussions because they had more to offer than just visiting Middleburg or the Inn in Paris, Virginia. He said that the whole idea about looking at their high schools, were they talking to them and considering potential businesses regarding how young people could obtain jobs that did not require PhDs or highly specialized skills.

Mr. Bivins said that they should aim to groom them in a way that reflected the traditional business approach where an employee would work for a while and potentially stay with the company for 10 years. He said that this was the kind of business depth they were pursuing there. He mentioned the concept of needing to stop being Charlottesville and instead emphasize Albemarle County as a desirable location. He said that they should think about what aspects of tourism they could highlight if that was their direction. He said that even if one just looked at the sister state next to them, which was West Virginia, what they were doing was promoting their tourism with pictures

and magazines and items like in stores and other places, that was not what they were doing, and perhaps they could learn something from them by choosing that approach.

Mr. Bivins said that he said that he did not know what it would be like for the County to take equity positions in firms that they felt had a tremendous upside. He said that the reason he liked this idea was because his concern with Willow Tree was that it could potentially relocate if the Canadians decided they no longer wished to be there. He said that it would be more difficult for them to do so if they owned some of the debt or had representatives on their small boards advising them, as these decisions would then need to go through another level of review before being implemented.

Mr. Bivins said that they needed to help them achieve their goals while ensuring that those decisions remained within their influence. He said that sometimes when it was outside of their influence, there was no way to keep or prevent something from happening. He said that business organizations tended to look for the easiest place with the least resistance. He said that the last thing on the last slide had been about an auditorium downtown across from the Omni. He asked if it was the CODE building.

Mr. Clayborne said no.

Mr. Moore said that he agreed with Ms. Firehock's comments regarding small business and entrepreneurship, as well as services and resources for that kind of development. He said that it was implied in many of these but should be more explicit. He said that regarding what Mr. Bivins just said, when they had a private owner who can sell it off and just pick up the move anytime, he grew up in West Virginia and watched that happening with an auto parts manufacturer that received great tax credit for 20 years and then left. He said that one of the things he might add to what Ms. Firehock was saying, and he liked this politically as well, would be to consider being a pioneer in services and resources for cooperative businesses that were worker-owned, which benefited the members of those enterprises.

Mr. Moore said that this would be somewhat extending their political democracy to an economic democracy. He said that they were in a community where a solidarity economy would likely succeed well. He said that there was much about entrepreneurship but very little about support for cooperative enterprises, where people were intelligent and wanted to do good business work, but often they could not find financing because it was not typical. He said that this was something to consider when discussing economic matters. He said that also, those in co-ops were less likely to relocate.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had a few questions. He asked what the biggest issues were in the unsuccessful pursuits that might inform their future planning. He asked if they were related to utilities and site readiness or affordable housing.

Mr. Newberry said that the biggest pain point was talent and the barriers to talent being there. He said that more than ever before, economic development was talking about housing, childcare, and access to services that had not been discussed in any meaningful way from an economic development perspective. He said that even some local governments were investing in this kind of infrastructure now as a way to ensure their residents could work there as well as live there.

Mr. Clayborne said that regarding regional partnerships, they were partnering with their surrounding counties and the City of Charlottesville, there would be a point in time when they

would be looking at their borders for a comprehensive plan. He said that there would be a time when they met with the Charlottesville City Planning Commission. He said that if staff could provide any insights to inform that thinking as they looked at the borders and expanded the partnerships, it would be appreciated.

Mr. Newberry said that their region was exceptional, and they truly worked together to retain business. He said that this benefited them tremendously from having a strong relationship with the City. He said that as people were thinking about leaving their community, they got an early knock on the door, with Willow Tree being one example of that. He said that a different example would be MITRE located in North Fork needing additional space to fly drones. He said that they could not fly near the airport near North Fork and so they obtained space in Orange County. He said that they worked throughout the region to keep that economic impact there because they knew the dollars from City businesses were going to be spent in the County, and vice versa, as well as throughout the region. He said that maintaining strong relationships and partnerships would be the best way for them to continue keeping investment in the region.

Mr. Clayborne said that anything from a planning perspective as they analyzed the borders and land use would be helpful. He said that within the comprehensive plan, he would imagine there would be some push and pull between goals. He asked if Mr. Newberry could provide further information.

Mr. Newberry said that it was correct that there was a natural push and pull, and he thought that they looked for opportunities where they could enhance. He said that in the development, they would research if they could have natural native plants, greater natural areas with native plant biofilters, where there may have been something less effective in its place that could still meet requirements. He said that they were looking for win-wins all the time but accepted that the natural conflict would exist.

Ms. Firehock asked about the assistance provided to businesses when they need to retrofit a space for availability, as was mentioned earlier. She said that in her experience of working on two businesses in Albemarle County where she had to rewire the entire place, which was very expensive and cost thousands of dollars in both cases. She asked if this type of retrofitting was also available through small business loans and similar services. She said that that was retrofitting a space so that a modern company could work in it, and she would like to know if they supported that.

Mr. Newberry said that the best place to obtain information about SBA loans was through their Small Business Development Center. He said that it served as the most effective resource for small business owners seeking access to capital.

Ms. Firehock said that she had three quick comments. She said that first, affordable housing was a significant issue. She said that in the last month, she created two new positions and allowed both employees to relocate closer to Richmond because they could not afford the exorbitant rental costs, even though she was paying them a good wage. She said that this highlighted the need to consider ways of linking providing housing affordability as part of their essential strategy for attracting businesses there.

Ms. Firehock said that secondly, she wanted to revisit something Mr. Bivins said that she found insightful, which was the point that there were companies like hers and others that did not have to be in this County but chose to be here because of the beautiful natural environment and

recreational opportunities, and there was a lot of data showing that businesses placed a strong importance on the green of the local environment, and they should promote this more. She said that it was blindness because they were all there and took it for granted, but for others, it was amazing to be able to just go out the door and go kayaking or hiking or whatever.

Ms. Firehock said that her last comment was that in other communities, they had things called small business incubators, and for small businesses starting up, other cities and communities had like a building where it had a shared receptionist and there was an accountant, maybe services available, but nobody needed an accountant five days a week, and a conference room, but they don't need it to sit empty five hours a day when they were not using it. She said that those kinds of things would make their area really attractive to startups. She said that other cities have these facilities, and they did not have them there. She said that although they were not a city, they possessed many features that larger urban areas lacked.

Ms. Firehock said that Mr. Bivins was contrasting their location with Charlottesville, however, some of the advantages they offered were similar to those in larger cities, such as great outdoor spaces and excellent schools. She said that they could attract companies that had the flexibility to choose their locations based on proximity to an airport. She said that finally the Charlottesville Airport was well-suited for this purpose because it allowed her to travel anywhere without spending excessive time at the airport in the first place.

Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, said that he appreciated being there today to talk a little bit about the Rivanna Futures project. He said that when Mr. Newberry first asked to come and do kind of an update on Project Enable, they thought it might be a good opportunity to get in front of the Planning Commission to talk a little bit about the work that had been going on in earnest over the past couple of years but a lot of work by the staff over the past five or six months related to an acquisition that the County was in the process of making. He said that his background was that he had been with the County since 2009, and the last time he was in front of the Planning Commission was when he was involved with capital projects. He said that he did a lot of capital project management, so that was his entry into the County.

Mr. Henry said that he was former Navy, and when he moved into the Executive Office, he became involved with their Defense Affairs Committee, which was very active in their defense and DOD community partnership with the state. He said that this has led to some of the work by the County that he would talk about. He said that he had each slide of content and would move through them pretty quickly, but really just hoping to talk a little bit about the what and the why and then ask for any questions that he could answer.

Mr. Henry said that Mr. Newberry had walked through the goals of Project Enable, and the work of Rivanna Station fell squarely under their Board's strategic plan goal two and Project Enable's goal one and goal three, specifically related to retention and expansion. He said that there was a specific callout to their defense industry and supporting it in their region. He said that he would like some background and context. He said that when he first moved to the County, he had heard of NGIC, and many people referred to Rivanna Station as NGIC. He said that from the map, they could see that Rivanna Station was right off Route 29, located in the northern part of the County. He said that it was somewhat hidden away.

Mr. Henry said that technically, it was a sub-installation of Fort Belvoir, which was situated near the Alexandria area. He said that he there yesterday, meeting with the command staff and Mr. Richardson, the County Executive. He said that Rivanna Station was considered a sub-

installation, and were very specific about it. He said that it was not a base as it did not have all the amenities as Fort Belvoir. He said that there were 10,000 people living on it and having base housing, public works, security, and emergency management. He said that Rivanna Station did not have that, and it was currently a 75-acre facility with a secured perimeter fence line and secured access.

Mr. Henry said that there were tenants there who did the work for the intelligence community, but they did not have all the amenities that a normal base or installation would have. He said that the first part of Rivanna Station was built and started in 1997 when the Department of Defense purchased about 25 acres, where they then built a National Ground Intelligence Center, which was the first component there. He said that when 9/11 happened, along with some BRAC activities, other entities were also built out, including the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGIA). He said that the government had invested approximately \$312 million into Rivanna Station. He said that heading up toward Boulders Road, to the east they could see a large crane.

Mr. Henry said that there was an additional \$90 million project happening at the station. He said that the great thing about the location was that it was outside of both Washington, D.C. and the blast zone, providing a critical national security function. He said that the origins of this site in this location had ties to their community, UVA, and some elements within the ecosystem. He said that additionally, it served as a tactical location due to its accessibility and distance from potential concerns. He said that according to Secretary Crenshaw's office, Rivanna Station was the only facility in the state with land available around it that had not been built out, so it was not encroached upon. He said that Rivanna Station today had three entities that supported all intelligence community work.

Mr. Henry said that these entities provided battlefield intelligence and had been very active over the past 20 years in the war with Afghanistan. He said that they were currently active in what was happening in the Middle East. He said that it was a critical aspect of their daily defense and national security. He said that there were approximately 2,200 civilian and military personnel working on the 75-acre site. He said that their latest meeting with NGIC suggested that the number may be closer to 3,000, reflecting an increase in mission and workload. He said that this served as an anchor function for their community. He said that they funded a study through the Chamber, conducted by the Cooper Center on economic analysis of defense in their region.

Mr. Henry said that for Albemarle County, Charlottesville, and Greene, approximately \$1.2 billion was tied to defense annually. He said that it was the number two economic engine behind UVA. He said that UVA was significantly above that, but still, that number exceeded by about 100% what they had from the state. He said that that was why they wanted to do a little more of a deep dive. He said that nearly 3,000 employees all made on average about \$100,000 annually. He said that this was a good-paying job. He said that Rivanna Station generated about 52% of the \$1.2 billion, so it was a key engine. He said that he should note that they talked about visitors and tourism.

Mr. Henry said that prior to the pandemic, Rivanna Station would report about 12,000 visitors a year. He said that these visitors probably stayed in their hotels, took advantage of their restaurants, hit some of the vineyards and breweries, but they were here for classified visits to the station. He said that certainly there was an economic element to that. He said that the Secretary of Veterans and Defense Affairs over the past 15 years or so, about every four or five years, had done a listening session across the state and all bases and installations, where they

meet with representatives, they called it a non-attributional meeting with representatives from the facility, along with area stakeholders.

Mr. Henry said that they most recently had an update of this work at the end of May. He said that the image in front of the Commission depicted a SWOT analysis. He said that there had been some consistency in what they had heard from Rivanna Station over the past decade. He said that the image on the right was what came out of an effort a few years ago in the 2017 timeframe, to look at potential mission growth and an expansion of the facility. He said that it was often referred to as part of the possibility. He said that it was not a design but was more of a master plan of how it might work if they were to do an expansion and there were additional missions or other functions that could support the mission.

Mr. Henry said that Rivanna Station through the Army Corps of Engineers had done its own master plan. He said that this was a requirement for all bases and installations. He said that there was no stakeholder involvement outside, and it really focused within the fence line. He said that there were some expansion ideas created in that. He said that ultimately, this led to the expansion happening there today. He said that expanding on site was expensive, about \$90 million due to the terrain. He said that they had to bring in some parking, structured parking, as the site is built out on 75 acres. He said that currently, they were at the station tomorrow, which had prompted action by the County. He said that the current slide represented business retention and expansion work that was underway.

Mr. Henry said that the County had been in discussion with their friends at the state Veterans Affairs Office since 2018, looking to help solve some of the concerns related to Rivanna Station's current expansion and future expansions. He said that it was worth noting that the DOD had a strong preference generally to have a large buffer from its neighbors, as practical as possible to enhance security and also mitigate intelligence collection. He said that this was as important there as anywhere, with concerns over encroachment and purchase of the land being an emerging problem across the nation. He said that turning on any news broadcast on the weekend often featured discussions about encroachment around military bases, particularly in California and Texas. He said that the concern was foreign nationals purchasing property to influence what occurred on those bases.

Mr. Henry said that the issue was being addressed at both federal and DOD levels and had also been communicated at Rivanna Station. He said that as a result, a strategy was developed a few years ago, working with state contacts to examine the land around Rivanna Station and determine how the County could help mitigate these concerns while also providing potential for economic development and enhancing existing functions. He said that one point they had heard consistently from the DOD was that Boulders Road terminated right where there was a commercial building. He said that the commercial building, owned by an LLC from Chicago, housed support staff, contractors, and consultants who worked with Rivanna Station.

Mr. Henry said that the army was very interested in the extension of Boulders Road back to Route 29. He said that this was part of their comprehensive plan, and he believed that one of the aspects of the acquisition work would enable them to help move it forward. He said that the next slide showed the acquisition. He said that the County, working through a strategy, approached the seller through an anonymous LLC and worked on this process over the past year. He said that in mid-May, they assigned a contract to the Board, which the Board accepted. He said that the contract was for 462 acres, which was all of the white-hatched property in the image in front of them. He said that it was 462 acres at \$58 million.

Mr. Henry said that the yellow highlight showed what was in the current development area, so about just over half of that, 232 acres and change was in the current development area. He said that everything else was in the rural area. He said that through their due diligence, once they got under contract, they had to do their phase one testing and assessing the existing conditions. He said that they wanted to make sure the property was buildable as they believed it was in order to move forward with it. He said that they had completed the work and overlaid the initial concept plan, which was just a concept.

Mr. Henry said there would be a lot of work to further this project, but they could cite the initial vision of a campus extension. He said that they could easily double the footprint or more, and that was some of the future work after closing. He said that regarding the acreage and how the comprehensive plan laid out, the intention on the buildout would focus on Route 29, which crossed the top of the screen on the west side and was where the future development would be focused. He said that the areas to the east, the lakes seen on the screen, were aimed to be maintained as standoff distance, and there was significant interest in transforming these areas into quality-of-life trails and amenities for staff.

Mr. Henry said that the next slide showed a 3D image depicting what the potential development might look like. He said that it was estimated to cover approximately 50 acres. He said that the concept they were working on with state and federal partners would connect into the intelligence community's national security network. He said that this initiative aimed to anchor this corridor as a technology corridor that could support their intelligence and national security work for both government and defense purposes.

Mr. Henry said that they saw potential for development from North Fork all the way up to Green County, approximately eight miles, with the possibility of realizing a level of potential similar to Silicon Valley at its onset. He said that they believed the Rivanna Station Futures projects would help anchor that work. He said there was an ecosystem in their community that supported it. He said that Mr. Newberry gave an example of ideas that started at UVA that turned into a business that was now expanding. He said that they saw a lot of pipeline opportunities for this function, and K-16 opportunities as well.

Mr. Henry said that these were some of the areas they would move forward with in their concept as they worked with state, federal, and military partners. He said this was just an artist rendering of what that concept plan was, and there was much work to do to affirm its use and needs. He said that the final slide was about site control and having control over the property, which they considered critical for this work to happen. He said that they had been briefing at the state level with secretariats and expected to be in front of the Governor that fall. He said that they also planned to brief their congressional delegation, as they believed there was a lot of interest and opportunities.

Mr. Henry said that this was a long-game project, with a 10- to 15-year buildout. He said that once they got to closing, which would happen by the beginning of next year, then they would start pivoting to doing other things like master planning and broader engagement. He said that they were really excited about this project, as they thought it would help retain that existing function critical for defense and their economy. He said that there was a tremendous amount of upside for development that would support the function. He said that part of their ask to the state was funding to help get them to site readiness level of a tier four so it was prepared for future buildout.

Mr. Clayborne said that he appreciated the presentation, as he was unaware of the project before tonight. He asked if the Commission had any question for Mr. Henry.

Mr. Murray said that Albemarle County would be the owner of this land once it was signed. He asked if there would be opportunities for the County to work with the defense community to build this in a sustainable and sensitive way.

Mr. Henry said that was the expectation. He said that especially with new military facilities, resilience was key. He said that for example, Fort Belvoir was upgrading their fleet to EV and investing in EV chargers and infrastructure. He said that this was not exactly what the question was about but saw an opportunity for sustainable development. He said that if they had academic partners or private industry there, they would want to follow that level of design.

Mr. Clayborne adjourned the work session. He then called for a recess.

Public Hearings

CCP202300002 New Southern Feeder Pattern Elementary School

Mr. Clayborne said that as a reminder, the Commission's only action tonight was related to the consistency of the proposal and not a recommendation regarding whether the project should be built.

David Benish, Development Process Manager, said that they were reviewing a proposal to locate a southern feeder pattern elementary school in the Avon Street corridor. He said that the proposal was for a school with grades K through 5 or some combination of those. He said that it was a 72,500 square foot building with a capacity of 500. He said that those were general concept numbers, as the building was still under design. He said that it was on property owned by the County School Board, and previously by the County, in the amount of 15.8 acres. He said that it was located at the end of Founders Place off of Mill Creek Drive.

Mr. Benish said that he wanted to touch briefly on what a CCP review was. He said that it was a little bit different than some of the other reviews. He said that this proposed activity was considered a public use, and public uses were permitted by right in all of their zoning districts. He said that public uses not specifically identified in their comprehensive plan or land use plan required per state code determination of whether they were in substantial accord with their comprehensive plan. He said that the CCP considered the location, character, and extent of the facility to determine substantial accord. He said that community meetings by County Board policy were held for all public facilities of this nature. He said that one was held with the 5th and Avon Street CAC in September of this year.

Mr. Benish said that the Planning Commission acted on CCPs and made that finding of substantial accord. He said that as Mr. Clayborne indicated, this was about whether it was going to be consistent with the comprehensive plan and was not whether to build the project or not, and it was not at the level of as fine a grain of review as they might see in a rezoning or a special use permit. He said that no action was required of the Board of Supervisors, but the Commission's finding was forwarded then for information. He said that they did have the option to appeal or call up that decision, but that was not a normal practice.

Mr. Benish said that the Commission was charged with this final call. He said that the site was located on Founders' Place, or at the end of what was now the end of Founders' Place, south of Monticello Fire Rescue Squad. He said that the Commission may recall that the site had been subject to a prior compliance with the comprehensive plan review for the High School Center 2 as well. He said that the proposal was found in compliance or in substantial accord with the comprehensive plan review that took place back in June of 2020. He said that the previous PC action was specific to the High School Center 2. He said that it was determined that this proposal, being a different type of elementary school, required a CCP.

Mr. Benish said that they may recall having reviewed this sort of action before, it was determined that they needed to run this through the Commission again as an elementary school. He said that he provided in the staff report and in the table displayed the differences between those two schools and highlighted some of the differences. He said that the building square footage was roughly 12,500 feet larger, about 100 more students potentially, more staff, more outdoor fields than initially intended for the high school center, although he believed that was an option to put fields there. He said that they could see the hours of operation and the number of buses as provided by the applicant.

Mr. Benish said that in terms of the land use and related recommendations in the comprehensive plan, the comprehensive plan called for institutional uses on this site. He said that the master plan noted that this could be a center location, which was more of a mixed-use, more intensive area as per the current master plan. He said that it proposed an extension of Founder's Place that would connect to Route 20. He said that the master plan had anticipated civic uses for this site. He said that it recommended a collaborative process and a community meeting and process to determine what uses were most appropriate for this area.

Mr. Benish said that he would quickly refer to the table from the map from the master plan. He said that where Galaxy Farm Drive was noted was the property in question. He said that they could see that it was designated for institutional uses. He said that briefly regarding that center designation, what the narrative in the master plan did say was that civic uses on County property were expected. He said that it stated that a collaborative community process should be undertaken before the County decided on what uses should be made of the property. He said that however, there had been a finding that a prior public school was appropriate on the site.

Mr. Benish said that it had always been noted that schools were a potential location within the site and within the center. He said that staff did not believe that the continued use or potential use of this 15-acre site precluded the possibility of doing that collaborative process in the future for the remaining area that was designated as the center, which was about 46 acres. He said that, in summary, what they found was that the proposal was consistent with the growth management policy to locate facilities in the development area so that the areas they proposed most of their development to take place were adequately served by public facilities. He said that it was consistent with the land use plan and the land use recommendation as institutional use, and it was overall consistent with the community facilities objective strategies and neighborhood model principles.

Mr. Benish said that they did raise two concerns about the site. He said that they felt that this school proposal concentrated schools and related public uses that were derived from those schools into one area of the development area and had left other areas a little less served by these services. He said that they also felt like the traffic impacts on Avon Street, due to the development of this area, would advance the need for more road improvements in this area

sooner, particularly given some of the patterns of traffic they had been seeing at elementary schools with the current usage of school buses and such. He said that they felt that on balance, the comprehensive plan did not specify spatial distribution in any specific way.

Mr. Benish said that there were other communities and development area neighborhoods that did not have school services, such as Pantops. He said that when looking at all the issues outlined in the comprehensive plan, it was within substantial accord. He said that listed on the current slide were the factors favorable from the staff report in case that was needed for a motion. He said that staff recommended that the Commission find the location, character, and extent of the proposed elementary school and public use in substantial accord with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Missel said that he understood more than one site had been considered for this building. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Benish said that it was best for the applicant to answer that. He said that he knew that they had conducted a thorough search for sites, and due to availability and timing, they chose this specific site.

Mr. Carrazana asked if a traffic study had been conducted as a part of this.

Mr. Benish said no, there was no traffic study.

Mr. Carrazana asked if it was not required.

Mr. Benish said that it was not necessarily required. He said that they utilized the information provided in terms of the general vehicle counts and buses, as well as experience with other schools' traffic.

Mr. McDermott said that they typically used the 1000 trip per day threshold to require a traffic analysis for a project, and this did not reach that number.

Mr. Bivins asked if he understood correctly in the staff report that there would be a connection to Route 20 or Scottsville Road. He asked whether this connection would go through Galaxy Farm Lane

Mr. Benish said yes.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was an expectation that there would be a connection up to Mountain View.

Mr. Benish said that the applicant could speak best to that. He said that it had come up in the CAC meeting, and there were some topographic issues with connecting to it. He said that they were looking for opportunities for at least a pedestrian connection.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had one question around transportation, specifically regarding master planning and mapping out transportation projects. He said that there were concerns about infrastructure, particularly the road network, as mentioned in the staff report. He said that they also used Smart Scale but pointed out that it took six to 10 years from cradle to grave. He said that he was curious if this part of upgrading project workflows and upgrading the stretch of road in question was already underway or if it was currently on the radar for consideration.

Mr. McDermott said that there were some recommendations for transportation improvements in the area primarily up along Avon Street. He said that they had conducted an Avon Corridor Study several years ago and looked at a series of different improvements. He said that one of the areas of concern was the intersection of Mill Creek and Avon, which was currently a signalized intersection experiencing congestion during peak hours, especially with the Mountain View School located nearby. He said that there were some difficulties at this intersection. He said that there was a recommendation to put a roundabout there, however they did not have any specific transportation recommendations other than curb and gutter and pedestrian infrastructure improvements on Avon Street Ext.

Mr. Missel said that regarding ongoing studies, under factors unfavorable, they mentioned the collaborative community process had not been undertaken as recommended in the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan. He asked if there were plans in place to do that process.

Mr. Benish said that priority-wise, no. He said that the applicant stated in their application that they intended to work with the public on this site in the design of that building. He said that they felt that the center area, which amounted to the County-owned properties and some others besides the ones all abutting in this area, provided an opportunity for further development. He said that however, there had not been a determination for any other uses within their work program at this time.

Mr. Clayborne said that the Commission would now hear from the applicant.

Lindsay Snoddy, Director of Building Services, said that regarding the building overview, the site was initially proposed for a high school center. She said that they had gone through this process before for that school use of the site, which was now being proposed for the new southern feeder pattern. She explained that they needed this school due to capacity issues at Mountain View. She said that this would not bring in kids from another area but rather split the Mountain View community into two separate schools. She said that the new school would be approximately 72,000 square feet and accommodate 500 elementary students when fully enrolled.

Ms. Snoddy said that interior spaces would include classrooms, a cafeteria, media center, gym, administrative spaces, breakout rooms, and support spaces. She said that exterior features that differed from the high school center were playground spaces and field spaces, which were not part of the center model. She said that they would be looking to obtain compliance with the Virginia High Performance Buildings Act and had a goal for the project of being net-zero ready.

Ms. Snoddy said that for the spaces, they would be looking at bright colors and sustainability features. She said that Bluestone Elementary had recently been completed, and their design team had taken a field trip there last week.

Ms. Snoddy said that the civil engineers were performing a traffic study of the area to determine existing and projected traffic volume on nearby roads with and without the projected road notated by a dashed-yellow line on the displayed map. She said that they were currently planning to design the connector road and bid it as an alternative to the project bidding. She said that during the CAC meeting, some members questioned whether the road connection was needed. She said that if it were determined that the road was not necessary, it would open up more land for other community facilities such as another field in that area.

Ms. Snoddy said that the County owned adjacent parcels. She said that they would ensure that access to those two County-owned parcels was not prohibited as part of the project. She said that the building design was not dependent on the connection to Founders Place or Galaxy Farm Road. She said that it was a 15.8-acre site at 133 Galaxy Farm Lane. She said that, as they are early in the design process, they were likely to have a two or three-story building on the site due to the size of the site and rock impacts. She said that they would be maximizing daylighting and views. She said that they were carefully considering the queuing space. She said that due to learning from the COVID-19 pandemic, they aimed not to add any traffic that would queue off the site.

Ms. Snoddy said that sports fields, a basketball court, and outdoor play spaces would be part of the project. She said that the conceptual plan had been shown at the CAC meeting, demonstrating configurations when coming off Founders Place with the parking and bus drop-off loop and the parent drop-off and parking in front. She said that the plan showed a plot for the school building. She said that they had moved the bus drop-off area to the lower part of the school.

Ms. Snoddy said that in another conceptual plan, they had developed the site further and were getting closer to what they thought might be on the site. She said that it was a three-story building in some locations, and the two classroom wings had three stories going on. She said that they were really working with the site to take advantage of the views of the mountains without obstructing them with the design.

Ms. Snoddy said that they anticipated five large buses and two small buses coming to the site. She said that they actually reduced this slightly based on the number of carpool parents dropping off their kids and what they expected. She said that they increased parent drop-off, expecting about 80 vehicles from parents dropping kids off at school in the morning, with more in the morning than the afternoon due to extended day enrichment programs at the school.

Ms. Snoddy said that they would discuss the number of cars coming to the site for staff and visitors. She said that this was a new discussion since the CAC meeting, as they had just engaged with the school PTO to ask how they would like to see the school operated. She said that it would ultimately be a school Board decision, but they were doing active community engagement because the sites were so close and they had not considered the Southwood proffer as an option. She said it was a very small proffer, and the timing did not work out for them at all, even if they could deal with the space. She said that they needed the school now due to capacity issues.

Ms. Snoddy said that looking at a traditional Pre-K through 5 model, each facility would operate as independent Pre-K through 5 schools, which would lead to a redistricting study. She said that they had a lot of people at the PTO meeting who gave feedback, and they would be issuing a survey to the community for those who could not attend that meeting. She said that a primary intermediate model would place Pre-K through second grade at the existing Mountain View School and then have an upper campus at the almost adjacent new school with grades 3 through 5. She said that they did this split because the Mountain View building had larger classrooms, and it already accommodated Pre-K, kindergarten, and first-grade students.

Ms. Snoddy said that the buildings would operate on a staggered schedule to help manage traffic flow, which might also happen in a traditional peak Pre-K through 5th grade. She said that one potential benefit of this approach was having one campus 15 minutes earlier than the other. She said that for example, buses would pick up all students in the neighborhood and drop off Pre-K

through second-grade students at the first campus before going to the second campus to drop off older children.

Ms. Snoddy said that the design and placement of the buildings would not impede the future and interconnected street plans that were part of the comprehensive plan. She said that there were questions about pedestrian connectivity to the site. She said that they would look at maintaining the existing connections and improving everything to the site, as well as exploring other connections, possibly to the Galaxy Farm neighborhood. She said that they were investigating with their civil engineers how they could connect to the Mountain View existing campus with a pedestrian one.

Ms. Snoddy said that as part of the neighborhood model design, this project looked to incorporate outdoor learning spaces, community usage amenities, fields, and playgrounds. She said that the school Board had an active communities program with a policy in place. She said that there was high demand for buildings in urban areas, which were used day, night, weekends, as much as people could get in them. She said they had numerous sports programs, and the fields outside were heavily scheduled by Parks and Rec. She said that adding more fields in this area would be appreciated by the community.

Ms. Snoddy said that over the past five years, Mountain View School had facilitated over 6,000 events with 55 user groups. She said that they were experiencing an increasing demand for community usage. She said that their next steps were to continue their community engagement through extensive communication using surveys and meeting people in their neighborhoods, including attending PTO meetings. She said that all of their main materials were available in both Spanish and English, ensuring that they reached everyone.

Ms. Snoddy said that the next step for their presentation to the school Board was a schematic design presentation on December 14. She said that for the project schedule, they were looking at programming from September through December, with schematic design going through December and development designs from December through May 2024. She said that bidding, and construction would take place from September 2024 to July 2026, with the facility being open for the August 2026 school year.

Mr. Bivins said that this location was appropriate for a school. He said that in his district, they had several schools on a campus, which helped him understand the process and model well. He said that it might be interesting to consider placing the middle school at the proposed location, allowing children to attend Walton School as an elementary school. He said that this would create a similar model to Western, where schools like Western and Brown were located across the street from each other. He said that they were part of Lamb's Lane Campus, which already offered a full suite of schools plus additional educational opportunities.

Mr. Bivins said he was disappointed that there had not been a way to establish a walkable school in the Southwood community. He said that the community did many things to facilitate that particular development. He said that it was a perfect opportunity for the community or the developer to do something for the community. He said that he remained disappointed there was not a way to facilitate a school in a community with close to 1,000 households when fully built.

Mr. Carrazana said that a traffic study would be very helpful, whether it was required or not. He said that traffic impacts were a cumulative effect. He said that the development should look at a

traffic study, as it would provide more information to work with and demonstrate attention to the impact on roads and connections.

Mr. Missel asked what the applicant planned to do with the findings from the TIA analysis.

Ms. Snoddy said that it was within their scope for civil engineers to conduct the traffic study. She said that although the connector road was included in the comprehensive plan, if it demonstrated that the connector would not improve anything, they would prefer to place a field there instead.

Mr. Missel said that typically one would conduct a TIA first, then decide on the development program and the capacity of the site based on that. He said that it seemed like they had the capacity, goals, and needs but were not quite sure about what was happening on the adjoining roads yet. He asked if they would reconsider their project schedule and incorporate some of those improvements into the scope if they found that with Commissioners' concerns regarding background traffic and cumulative impacts, they might be at a tipping point.

Ms. Snoddy said that they would be examining whether the traffic study demonstrated that the connector road genuinely improved flow. She said that if they faced a flow issue, they needed to address it. She said that the first priority was the building and site. She said that then, they would need to consider how to set up the additives in the bidding process. She said that they would certainly take that pathway if it proved to be a productive use of funds.

Mr. Matt Wertman, Deputy Director of Building Services, said that he could provide additional information regarding the inquiry about the road. He said that the proposed road would connect to two existing roads: Founders Place Road and Galaxy Farm Road. He said that from their project's perspective, those would be the termini. He said that they were working with Timmons Group, a civil engineering firm, who was present today if anyone had any specific questions. He said that Timmons Group had already conducted traffic counts on surrounding roads in the area but were still awaiting initial data analysis to determine their next steps.

Mr. Wertman said that an aspect of their traffic impact analysis would be studying the possibility of installing a roundabout at Mill Creek and Founders Place. He said that they had Monticello High School right across the street, and they knew that the southern parking lot at Monticello experienced traffic issues during football games. He said that a solution such as this would provide another ingress or egress out of Monticello, benefiting the community as a whole. He said that those were all things they had asked Timmons Group to study. He said that this was budget-related since the project was funded for a school rather than a transportation project. He said that was why they were bidding it as an additive and hoped that they could construct it if the budget allowed. He said that the Board of Supervisors only funded the school portion.

Mr. Missel said that the impacts that were caused by the project were not funded, but the project could go forward without those impacts being mitigated. He asked if there was a fire station at the location or if they were all included in the discussions in terms of impact.

Ms. Snoddy replied that they would consider the fire engine and not block access.

Ms. Firehock said that the use was suitable in that location. She said that as they reviewed designs for the site, they should consider examining another VMDO project, the Bellemeade School in Richmond, Virginia. She said that this project involved creating an outdoor learning

center using vacant property adjacent to the school, which resulted in a more effective use of the outdoor space around the school rather than the traditional landscape design.

Mr. Murray said that he believed the site was suitable. He said that if they were considering an outdoor learning center, it was worth mentioning that the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries had frequently funded such projects. He said that they had funded the rain garden at Crozet Elementary under the condition that it was part of an educational curriculum.

Mr. Moore asked a question regarding the proposal of a high school center. He said that he wanted to know if a traffic study had been conducted prior to its establishment.

Ms. Snoddy said that they did not have a traffic site at that time.

Mr. Moore said that the proposed staggered schedule likely helped with both district lines and traffic situations. He said he suggested considering this approach for Woodbrook and Agnor-Hurt as well.

Ms. Snoddy said that she would forward the information along.

Mr. Clayborne asked how long they anticipated the structure remain in place.

Ms. Snoddy said that if one examined their current building stock, the average was approximately 50 years for existing buildings. She said that the figure included renovations calculated into it. She said that they had some very old schools and aimed to keep them standing as long as possible.

Mr. Clayborne said that he was asking that question just to kind of illustrate a couple of points. He said that one point would double down on some of the comments about transportation, which would be magnified. He said that the other point related to the comprehensive plan, with equity and climate action as anchor pieces. He said that as they were using this site, they could make it an example of what it meant to have a great learning facility.

Mr. Clayborne said that he wanted to make one comment about the community engagement piece and something that they were still grappling with in terms of AC44. He said that there was room for improvement and opportunity to grow.

Mr. Bivins said that if the other access road was going to be Galaxy Lane Farm, it was positioned as a higher and more modest footprint. He said that the idea that there would be lots of traffic flowing through that community was not what he thought they were anticipating when they came before them. He said that balancing this, since he lived on a road with only one way in and out, and having to navigate school traffic twice a day, the community probably was not expecting that to happen at a \$400,000 plus price tag for those cottages when they were built. He said that the County should consider installing a road to be a good neighbor. He said that he did not believe that the community was constructed or envisioned to be a pathway to a school. He asked when the enrollment and capacity predictions were drafted.

Ms. Snoddy said the projections were done in October 2023.

Mr. Clayborne opened the public hearing for comments from the public. He read the rules for public comment.

David Frazier said that his parents lived at 107 Galaxy Farm Lane. He said that they were right in the middle of all that was happening between the new development, the schools, and the Albemarle rehab center. He said that one of his concerns was the issue that had been mentioned several times: the lack of a collaborative community process. He said that he did not know why it had been neglected but wanted to see it rectified, with more community involvement in the process. He said that there was a meeting on September 21, but his parents, who were 88 and 85 years old, were unable to attend. He said that he was also their representative and could not attend.

Mr. Frazier said that some of his other concerns included the impact on the quality of life for his parents and whoever would own the property after them, as well as how property values would be affected. He said that they currently had beautiful views of the mountains to the south, and they were discussing placing a three-story building directly in front of their property. He said that the traffic estimates provided by the applicant were significantly low, considering the amount of traffic they already saw. He said that the amount of traffic coming out of Mill Creek Drive and from Mountain View Elementary at peak times was substantial.

Mr. Frazier said that going forward, the traffic study must be conducted as there were numerous factors and additional elements to consider. He said that for instance, they were adding a community located downhill from his parents' residence, which consisted of approximately 57 or 59 units. He said that they were incorporating other developments in the area, one at a time. He said that while the individual additions may not meet the threshold for a traffic study, the cumulative effect should be examined thoroughly.

Mr. Clayborne closed the hearing to the public.

Mr. Missel asked if there was a way to add conditions to the proposal.

Mr. Herrick said that there was not. He said the matter was simply to determine if it was in compliance with the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Firehock said that she understood they could not impose conditions, and they could only determine if the use was appropriate or not. She said that they could find the use appropriate but still strongly encourage the applicant to undergo the community process. She said there were several aspects that could be improved at the site planning stage, such as the positioning of buildings and their height. She said that even if they agreed that this was a suitable location for a school, there may be more work needed to ensure the site blended harmoniously with the neighborhood.

Mr. Clayborne said that the staff report from this, which included factors that are unfavorable, would be listed. He said that it would go onto the Board and they would also receive a record of the key points of the Commission's discussion as well.

Mr. Herrick said that if the Commission wanted to sustain a motion like that, it would be a motion to determine whether the plan was in compliance with the comprehensive plan or not. He said that the motion would also recommend any other actions the Commission wished to take.

Mr. Clayborne said that there was overwhelming consensus from a comprehensive plan standpoint that it was viable. He said that some concerns raised during their deliberation included community engagement and traffic.

Mr. Bivins said that this would get reported back to the school board. He said that there would be other individuals within the school's hierarchy who would hear the comments from the Commission.

Mr. Missel moved that the Commission recommend that the location, character, and extent of the proposed elementary school and its public use was in substantial accord with the comprehensive plan for the reasons identified as favorable factors in the staff report. He said that he would like to recommend and emphasize the discussion concerning transportation impact analysis and community engagement, and advocate for advancing the two processes. Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7–0).

ZMA202100016 North Fork UVA Discovery Park

Mr. Missel said that he had a personal interest in a business that may realize a reasonable and foreseeable benefit as a result of the transaction identified as North Fork UVA Discovery Park ZMA 2021-16. He declared that he was disqualifying himself from participating in this transaction and requested that this fact be recorded in the appropriate public records for a period of five years. He said that he would leave the meeting.

Mr. Carrazana said that in the interest of full disclosure, he was an employee of the University of Virginia. He said that the pending application was for the UVA Foundation, which was a separate entity. He said that he was able to consider the pending application fairly, objectively, and in the public interest; however, he wanted to disclose his employment for the record.

Mr. Murray said that he was employed by the University of Virginia. He said that the pending application was by the UVA Foundation, which was a separate entity, and he believed that he could consider the pending application fairly and impartially in the public interest. He said that he wanted to disclose his employment for the record.

Mr. Moore said that he was employed by the University of Virginia. He said that the pending application was by the UVA Foundation, which was a separate entity. He said that he could consider the pending application fairly, objectively, and in the public interest. He said he wanted to disclose his employment for the record.

Mr. Firehock disclosed that she was an employee of the University of Virginia. She said that she was not employed by the University of Virginia Foundation, but she believed she would be able to render a fair and balanced judgment on this matter, regardless of her employment status.

Bill Fritz, Community Development Department, said that the property was located between Airport Road and Route 29 near the airport. He said that it was a large piece of land running from Airport Road all the way to the North Fork Rivanna River. He said that one of the areas had single-family attached units proposed. He said another area had multifamily, single-family detached, and single-family attached units. He said that another area also had commercial and office spaces. He said that the remaining area was industrial, with an entrance on Airport Road that would be upgraded to a roundabout.

Mr. Fritz said that the applicant had proffered significant improvements for the enhancements and a substantial amount of cash associated with them. He said that there was another entrance directly on Route 29, which also had proffers based on the level of development. He said that improvements would occur as development progressed. He said that an existing entrance was

located on Quail Run, which served as a secondary access point. There was also a potential connection to the east. He said that the adjacent property to the east could potentially allow access to the property and potentially to Route 29.

Mr. Fritz said that the applicant had proffered and incorporated improvements to the greenway and trail system that ran along the northern portion of the property, including along the North Fork Rivanna. He said that there was also a recreational facility, Dabney Park, located fairly centrally on the property. He said that included in the application was the proposed grading, which was important because it would allow the grading to occur prior to the submission of site plans. He said that this was encouraged for planned industrial parks. He said that the proposed grading impacted steep slopes in several locations. He said that Area B5, located on Route 29, had already had its slopes approved by the Board of Supervisors for critical slope disturbance.

Mr. Fritz said that if the development was approved, the disturbance of the slopes would then be approved by virtue of being shown on the approved application plan, so a separate action was not required. He said that there were significant proffers. He said that the industrial portion of the property remained largely unchanged. He said that the prior rezoning on the property had a number of proffers, all which were being retained or enhanced in some way.

Mr. Carrazana asked whether there were triggers for the level of proffers and when they took place. He said that he wanted to know more about the triggers, specifically what was associated with the next level of proffers.

Mr. Fritz said that there were different triggers for a variety of things, such as traffic reaching certain points on Route 29. He explained that when a certain number of residential units were constructed within the residential portion, intersection improvements would be made. He said that other proffers were triggered in terms of construction improvements in Dabney Park or trail systems. He said that there were proffers for the right-of-way for the roundabout, and yearly payments were associated. He said that when Greenway trails were built, it triggered either dedication of land construction of other trails within the development.

Mr. Carrazana said that for the traffic issues mentioned, particularly concerning the concept of increased development leading to more congestion, proffers were required in order to achieve the development.

Mr. Fritz said that because the triggers were going to occur at some point in the future, and they did not necessarily know what the most appropriate things would be to improve traffic when that occurred because there was other development occurring in the area. He said that the cash proffers triggered at certain levels of development allowed the County to employ a certain flexibility to most appropriately address the transportation needs at the time the need was generated.

Mr. Carrazana asked how they could apply it to other developments causing similar challenges throughout the County. He said that this measure was appropriate, and since they possessed the necessary resources and means, they should consider implementing it in other locations as well.

Mr. Bivins said that when they discussed phased proffers for transportation, one of the reasons this worked in their case was because they had a vast and open green space with probably decades of development ahead. He said that while it may take decades to develop some things, they usually wanted to get it done in one instance. He asked how it would work for kinds of

proposals where there was a hard cutoff for opening. He said that the process fit very nicely in this instance because they were really talking about a flow of development as opposed to an end point.

Mr. Carrazana said that there was a simplified approach because there was one owner. He said that it was how they considered applying it in a situation where there were multiple developments and one green area being developed over time and how to begin to apply the triggers.

Mr. Bivins said that he agreed because the last big piece was that if they had done that when they first did the development out there, the entire community would have had to bear the sort of complicating issues of how they were going to deal with incremental traffic. He said that he had always struggled with why they put that on the last to the table, when in fact it was a cumulative effect of 2,000 or 3,000 houses there that were adding it, not the 120 that were coming at the last bit. He said they should consider the blending.

Tim Rose, Chief Executive Officer of the University of Virginia Foundation, said that with him tonight were two of his colleagues, Frank Hancock and Deborah Van Ersel, who were the leaders on the project. He said that they also had their engineers and legal team present as well. He said that the University of Virginia Foundation provided real estate and other services to the University of Virginia, and as part of that, they were the owner of the North Fork Research Park. He said that he had stood in front of this group about 30 years ago down the hall to get the original piece of land approved, and they hoped that everyone had been pleased with the development that they had helped lead there.

Mr. Rose said that their goal was for the park to support the University's vision for fostering research and also to provide an economic development engine of sorts for the community. He said that university-affiliated research parks across the country had transitioned from being just a research park to becoming a 24/7 live, work, play community, and their request was to allow that to happen at the park. He said that they hoped that the housing would serve both the park and the employment center, which had experienced significant growth in that area.

Mr. Rose said that it would benefit the City and the County if they obtained this rezoning. He said that their first step would be to communicate with potential housing developers, both market and affordable housing. He said that the affordable housing process would be similar to the one they were currently going through closer to the City. He said that they needed them on their team to help them assist with this proposal.

Valerie Long, representing the applicant, said that it had been a challenging process, particularly given the large scale of the research park. She said that part of the challenge had been the detailed traffic study and analysis, as well as collaborating with County staff and VDOT to identify appropriate proffers to address transportation challenges, especially considering the existing congestion in the area. She said that even without any changes at North Fork, that congestion would continue.

Ms. Long said that the main goal was to create a 24/7 live-work-play community with constant activity. She said that this would enhance the economic development potential at North Fork and throughout the entire County. She said that the development would offer a variety of housing options with different price points in a strategic location near a large employment center. She said that it served as an amenity for economic development prospects. She said that potential tenants and their employees desired to live close to where they worked, reducing commute times

compared to their current living situations. She said that the project supported the new microCAT service, which would serve this area.

Ms. Long said that by leveraging existing parks, natural assets, and trail systems, it enhanced the amenities available, including a cafe, gym, and numerous miles of trails and walking paths. She said that it introduced a 24/7 mix of uses helping enliven and activate the park. She said that residents living and working in the area would enjoy playgrounds, recreational fields, paths, trails, and future restaurants, among other attractions. She said that in essence, the infrastructure was already in place for the residents, though this was not always the case, particularly with residential rezoning.

Ms. Long said that they had included a quote from the existing Places 29 master plan in their comprehensive plan that actually contemplated having residential units in North Fork in the future. She said that the original plan was approved back in 1996. She said that their plan set for the application was much longer and more detailed. She said that they wanted to be able to show how similar the core elements were within the park. She said that they had the same road network and the same development blocks. She said a land addition to North Fork was approved in 2010.

Ms. Long said that a portion of the park would be rezoned as a neighborhood model district, and the remaining area would continue to be zoned as planned development, industrial park. She said that the sole reason for changing to the neighborhood model district was to allow residential use, which was the only district that permitted both residential and nonresidential uses. She said that there were two parcels along Route 29 that had been owned by the Foundation for a long time but were not actually part of North Fork. She said that they felt it was appropriate to officially add them to it.

Ms. Long said that they were amending the proffers to address the impacts, modernize the terminology, make numerous other changes, and build on the historical proffers that had been in place for so long. She said that all of the uses allowed at North Fork would continue to be allowed everywhere in the park. She said that the blocks they were proposing to change to neighborhood model district would not preclude planned development industrial park uses; it was just an additive. She said that the existing approvals permitted up to 3.7 million square feet of nonresidential and PDIP uses that would continue.

Ms. Long said that since 1996, the Foundation had committed to retaining at least 200 acres of open space. She said that there would also be affordable housing. She said that they were proposing to rezone the two parcels not part of North Fork to PDIP. She said that one parcel was currently zoned highway commercial, while the others were zoned either R1 or R2. She said that future development of the park must align with the proposed application plan and the numerous details found throughout the application plan. She said that this served as a general framework for the park's development. She said that all types of housing units were permitted in the neighborhood model districts. She said that there was also a specific green space plan.

Mr. Clayborne asked Ms. Long to discuss the proffers for the application.

Ms. Long said that she would begin with the Parks and Recreation proffers. She said that the existing proffers discussed trails, but they were confusing and ambiguous. She said that the new proffers were clearer about what was required and when. She said that the first proffer involved constructing a recreational field and recreation area with a field, parking lot, restaurants, restrooms, and picnic area at a specific location. She said that the second proffer was for building

a trail from the Dabney Park parcel to the future Greenway Trail along the river. She said that there were three options, but the Foundation had not yet determined which one to choose. She said that the proposals committed to building at least one connector trail in one of those three locations.

Ms. Long said that a new commitment not part of the original was constructing a trail along Jacobs Run, which would create a nice connection once the County built the Greenway Trail alongside the river. She said that it would connect to Chris Green Lake eventually. She said that there was an existing easement previously dedicated by the Foundation to the County for the County to build a Greenway Trail along the river. She said that the current Parks and Rec planning staff identified some areas that would require the trail to disturb more land and sensitive areas than was appropriate and would be much more expensive to construct.

Ms. Long said County staff had requested the Foundation to agree to some flexibility and consider or commit to expanding the greenway easement dedication in the future. She said that this would enable Parks and Rec staff to build the trail in a more environmentally sensitive and cost-efficient manner. She said that a study considered a shared use path along Route 29 frontage. She said that if this ever occurred, the proffers committed to dedicating an easement for that path in the future. She said that there was a commitment to set aside a small area for a trailhead parking lot for public use at any time. She said that the exact location had not yet been determined and would be addressed during the site plan stage.

Ms. Long said that for transportation proffers, the first was to construct two additional turn lanes when required based on a trip threshold event. She said that if at any point during the site plan stage the associated trip generation estimates indicated 150 trips during the peak hour, it would trigger the need to upgrade and construct those turn lanes. She said that they were tied to the trips and the impacts that would be created by the proposed use, whatever that was contemplated by the site plan.

Ms. Long said that the second was a commitment to provide cash to the County to help close a funding gap in the Airport Road/Berkmar Extended roundabout. She said that there was a project to extend Berkmar to Airport Road and then have a roundabout constructed at that intersection. She said that there were many benefits of that project both to North Fork as well as to the larger community and traffic generally. She said that it will enable Berkmar Extended and Lewis and Clark Drive to function as a parallel road network to Route 29, as envisioned by the original Places 29 master plan. She said that the Foundation constructed the extension of Lewis and Clark Drive, and the segment was completed in 2020. She said that they finished that connection, and now one could go from Airport Road, north on Lewis and Clark Drive, all the way to Route 29, which already functioned as a connector road.

Ms. Long said that the completion of the Berkmar Extended segment would make that segment complete. She said that the roundabout would help substantially with keeping traffic moving and provide safety. She said that in addition to committing to contribute \$2.5 million to close a recent funding gap, they had proffered to dedicate land and easements needed for the project in the area. She said that this would help keep the cost down. She said that part of the cost was VDOT factoring in buying land and easements from the Foundation, but this was no longer part of the equation.

Ms. Long said that there was a commitment to provide up to \$1.5 million over time for future transportation improvements once they had been identified by the County and VDOT. She said

there were many studies going on right now and many other projects in the pipeline in this area. She said that the new Rivanna Station project would complement North Fork. She said that the idea was to commit a certain amount of money from the Foundation toward future improvements, rather than trying to predict or commit to a particular improvement that may not be what VDOT and the County ultimately decided was the most appropriate.

Ms. Long said that this amount would be payable in three increments when certain trip generation thresholds had been reached. She said that it was noted it was not limited to road projects; the funds could be used toward transit improvements, bike and pedestrian improvements or the like. She said that they tried to make that as flexible for the County and VDOT as possible.

Mr. Bivins said that he was relieved to hear that the locations and types of dwellings were simply illustrative. He said that he had been planning to ask or suggest that in considering those, they think about putting multifamily dwellings closer to the green space. He said that out of all the dwelling types, those would be the most densely developed, and they would be the people who have the least amount of green around them. He said that he assumed the single-family dwellings would likely have some sort of green patch around their properties. He said that the whole idea was to give families or individuals with the least opportunity to have green to put them closer to the green space.

Mr. Bivins said this was one of those places in the County that he was very fond of. He said that he was particularly fond of it now that the secondary road had been put there. He said that he believed it worked and seemed to be fulfilling what was expected of it when Mr. Rose presented the vision in the 1990s. He said that at that time, he had been an employee at the University of Virginia had hoped to lease some of the space. He said that he was somewhat conflicted about the trails and their distance from where people would be living. He said that Dabney Grove was not close to where the people were going to live. He said that another point of contention was the fact that, given who would be moving in there, the area where office buildings were likely to be probably did not want people wandering around them.

Ms. Long said that this was part of the hesitation or inability to commit to a precise location. She said that they wanted to be able to assess that as they proceed.

Mr. Bivins said that he would encourage everyone to consider making the residential part of the community full of opportunities so that there would not be any tension between some of the units in the park and the people living in the area. He said that the result should be a livable, workable place that worked for everyone, particularly given what they heard earlier this afternoon from staff about the envisioned area across the road.

Mr. Bivins said that he challenged the Foundation to ensure that the design truly became an innovation corridor. He said that he saw a bunch of projects that were not very interesting and just the same old stuff. He said that the Foundation had the opportunity for it to be something smart and forward-looking as opposed to another suburban development, which they did not need.

Ms. Long said that she agreed with the statement and added that it was precisely why they were there. She said that the neighborhood model area application plan showed trails and other amenity areas.

Mr. Bivins said that he saw them and could see them, but when they started doing all of the proffering on the north side of the property, it would be hard to get over there, especially for older people who might need a walker. He said that it would be somewhat annoying, particularly when there was a rich field available for wonderful activities. He said that this was for multi-generational green spaces and having multi-generational people living in the places.

Deborah van Ersel, UVA Foundation, said that some of their tenants in North Fork were related to the folks across the street, and that was a more restrictive user group with certain sensibilities and sensitivities to those around them. She said that their employees wanted walkability, amenities, outdoor spaces, and meeting spaces. She said that they did provide the facilities. She said that on another diagram, one would see trails around their water retention pond. She said that they wanted to connect those to the newer trails that had been proffered in the future. She said that their original master plan, the one redone in 2017, showed all kinds of connections to trailways and walking ways. She said that this was an effort to create a “live, work, learn, play” kind of community. She said that they absolutely wanted this to be a place of great innovation.

Mr. Murray said that he wished everything they received was full of much green space. He said that there were impacts to isolated wetlands. He said that he knew they had no regulatory power over isolated wetlands but mentioned that there were vernal pools nearby along Route 29. He said that those were an important ecological community in the County. He said that the Foundation did an excellent job using native plants. He said that several people wished the Foundation would progress further and use regionally native plants.

Mr. Moore said that he would like to echo Commissioner Bivins' comments and ask about the placement of park space or third spaces for residents to come together in active ways during this phase. He said that based on where the parks were located, they were referred to as a kind of town center. He said that with the current tenants being a biotech firm and a security firm, it may not feel like a traditional downtown area.

Ms. Long said that they had indicated the location of the multi-use path and primitive trail, taking advantage of streams and green space throughout. She said that there was an intent and commitment to have them go all through the area. She said that in addition to the existing trails, this was building on that in all areas. She said that throughout the neighborhood model district, there would be pockets of open space.

Ms. Long said that the last page of their plan set was the code of development, which governed how the neighborhood model district blocks would develop. She said that it made it similar to any other neighborhood model district application received as a rezoning. She said that there were requirements in the code of development, including the amount of open space each block must have, amenities, and setbacks that regulated. She said that all rules were intentionally flexible to accommodate various types of buildings such as multifamily or townhouses while still requiring essential components that made it an attractive town center.

Mr. Moore asked for more information about the not-insignificant improvements that would be needed in water and sewer to make this work.

Ms. Long said that she understood that the Foundation had been collaborating closely with their civil engineers. She said that she had not participated in those discussions because her firm represented the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority, so she wanted to avoid involvement in that matter. She said that she was aware of their collaboration and planning efforts. She said that at

this stage, they were sharing information and plans. She said that there was a proffer in place since at least 1996, which stipulated that if there was a large water user planned, the Authorities must confirm that there was sufficient capacity before site plan approval.

Ms. Long said that both the Rivanna Authority and the ACSA were currently planning and initiating significant improvements to the community's infrastructure and water supply plan. She said that they were getting ready to build the pipeline that would connect the South Rivanna reservoir to the Ragged Mountain. She said that the Foundation had been working very closely with them and recently conveyed easements for the pipeline and land for a pump station.

Ms. Long said that they were about to start projects to, among other things, build a second water pipeline across the Rivanna so if the existing one were to fail, they had a redundant supply water system in place as well as expanded capacity. She said that those were big, expensive projects and they took time, but she knew that they had been working together to coordinate those things.

Mr. Moore that he was rereading some news stories about President Ryan's commitment to being great, good, and building 1,000 to 1,500 affordable units, and it looked like they might get around 200 for the proposal. He asked how, when coming in at 15% affordable, that fit in.

Ms. Long said that they hoped that 200 was the absolute minimum. She said that the range was from 200 to 1,400.

Mr. Moore said that he meant 200 affordable units.

Ms. Long said that at maximum buildout, he was correct. She said that the plan was that once the zoning was in place, they would initiate a process very similar to what they had been engaging in with the development and nonprofit housing community in two other projects at Piedmont and Wortland Street. She said that they hoped to determine what worked best and where. She said that they hoped there would be far more than 200 affordable units, especially because meeting the goal likely required more than that number unless a fourth location was identified.

Ms. Long said that the challenge was trying to commit to a certain number of units at this point when they had not yet started the process. She said that they did not feel it was appropriate to ask the nonprofit affordable housing developer to conduct market studies and design plans to help them determine how many affordable units they could build when they did not yet have the zoning in place.

Ms. Long said that they certainly expected that would be a challenge for them to commit to it, as the Foundation was a developer. She said that they would need to rely on the expertise of other builders. She said that based on the amount of interest they received for their first two RFPs at other sites, they were encouraged that there would continue to be a lot of interest in both for-profit and nonprofit housing such that, hopefully, there would be more than 200 units built. She said that it was challenging to commit to it.

Mr. Moore said that when he read the proposal, he realized that the Foundation was qualitatively and quantitatively very different from an average developer. He asked why they were just doing the minimum 15% at 88% AMI here, and it stood out to him. He asked if they could get more at this stage, but he acknowledged it would be better added at the site plan stage.

Ms. Firehock said she was supportive of residential being added to North Fork. She asked for more elaboration on the transportation aspect, specifically regarding multimodal options. She asked how accessible pedestrian and bicycle travel would be. She asked for more information about the type of commercial use that was envisioned and whether residents would be able to meet their needs within North Fork.

Ms. Long said that if someone wanted to commute from their townhouse in a specific location, there would be a sidewalk at least. She said that there would perhaps be another paved trail to connect to the shared use path and allow one to ride their bike to the town center or to a future employer located in one of the other blocks. She said that there would be sidewalks throughout the area, even if there were not already sidewalks. She said that the concept was for all the reasons indicated that it would be bikeable, walkable, and support that type of a community.

Ms. Long said that as they moved through the site plan process, each site plan would identify the sidewalks and other trails and amenities that would support multimodal use. She said that there were existing transit stops on the site. She said that the Foundation had a lot of experience; they ran up until the pandemic a shuttle bus. She said that it was also within the area of the future microCAT transit program, which should support both residents and employees at the park.

Ms. Long said that with regard to the second question, they had tried to be very flexible in terms of commercial uses permitted in order to provide the types of conveniences that future residents would have an interest in, like a coffee shop, restaurants with outdoor cafe seating, or perhaps a small drugstore, grocery store, or childcare center. She said that there were visions for neighborhoods supporting commercial uses at appropriate scales to provide neighborhood services.

Ms. Firehock said that they should consider a bikeshare program. She said that when she worked full time at UVA, they had bikes that they just kept as an informal share. She said that they needed to have something like that so that if one worked in one of those research facilities, they could hop on a bike and ride over to the store.

Ms. Long noted that it would be an ideal location for an e-bike hub or scooters.

Mr. Clayborne opened the hearing for comments from the public.

Valentin Theodore "VT" Cruz said that he was a resident of Airport Acres. He said that his concern was with the development and infrastructure in the area. He said that his house was built in the late 50s on well and septic. He asked if they would have to disconnect from the well and septic due to this development. He asked whether a second lane would be added to Airport Road and if it would take out the woods behind his house. He said that regarding the proposed traffic circle on Airport Road, he inquired about the height restriction for any structure. He said that his home was almost directly behind the fire station.

Mr. Cruz said that his concern was that this was a great idea for many reasons, but it was also an 800-pound gorilla behind them. He said that he had retired and did not want to have to move again or deal with another mini-megalopolis in his backyard. He said that he wanted to ensure that the woods were kept and the roads were maintained at an absolute minimum level. He said that this would benefit the people living there by preventing them from having to contend with two lanes of traffic. He said that his concern was that he did not want to get stuck with this situation

and wonder what they should do. He said that he could not afford to connect to the sewer and water system.

Ms. Long said that regarding the first question about whether they would be forced to connect to water and sewer, she was not aware of if there would be a requirement for them, nor was she able to speak to that. She said the residents would be able to do their own thing, and the Foundation and development would be connected to the water and sewer system. She said that with regard to the future widening of Lewis and Clark Drive, it was part of an eventual option for the Foundation or the County or VDOT to widen it. She said that when it was extended, there was already the necessary land and right-of-way. She said that the road had been graded already to accommodate two additional lanes, one on each side, so there would not be any more tree clearing needed for that area or more significant grading work required.

Ms. Long said that although it was fairly difficult to see, there was a buffer required on the application plan between Lewis and Clark Drive and the backyards of the Airport Acres residents. She said the buffer would continue. She said that there should not be any reason to need to grade into that area. She said the buffer was a commitment on the application plan that would be binding. She said that the building was limited to a maximum of six floors, and the hotel room limit was 200.

Mr. Herrick said that he was not aware of any changes proposed for water and sewer services in the neighboring subdivisions due to this application.

Mr. Clayborne closed the hearing to the public.

Mr. Bivins said that with the extension of Berkmar Drive and assuming that the circle at Lewis and Clark Drive came together, an individual would be able to go across to the shopping center and have access to a Harris Teeter and the full suite of things which were over there. He said that they would also have the ability to come all the way into town on a multi-use path, as Berkmar Drive Extended would go all the way up to the circle. He said an individual could commute from there and come all the way into town if they decided to. He said that one would have the ability to use an alternate means of coming into town from North Fork on that one road. He said that he suggested that this would be a significant win for many people who want to use an alternative method to come into town but do not wish to travel on Route 29.

Mr. Clayborne said that he wanted to ensure that the affordable housing was distributed throughout the development.

Mr. Moore moved that the Commission recommend approval of ZMA 2021-16, incorporating the proffers contained in Attachment 2 and the application plan featured in Attachment 3. Mr. Bivins seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6–0, Commissioner Missel recused himself).

Committee Reports

Mr. Bivins said that they held the combined CAC meeting on Tuesday. He said that he had come to understand that many people did not comprehend how roads were built, who was responsible for their construction, and how long it took to build a road. He said that those individuals sat on the CAC, yet they lacked understanding of the aspects. He said that he was pleased with the topic of the joint CAC meeting, although some parts were overly micro-focused. He said that people

had to take in an enormous amount of information that was likely new for many of them due to the complexities involved in building roads in the County.

Mr. Bivins said that he believed they walked away with a different level of appreciation of road construction. He said that he thought there was an opportunity to have exposure to the micro transit option that was coming through. He said that to the extent that they could get that in front of people, it would be very helpful because there was a lot of conversation about that afterwards. He said that it did not get discussed during the meeting, but it was discussed outside in the lobby, and people seemed to have many questions around that possibility.

Mr. Clayborne asked how frequently all the CACs gathered for joint meetings.

Mr. McDermott said it was typically once a year.

Mr. Carrazana asked what was happening on October 30.

Mr. McDermott said that October 30 was regarding micro transit. He said that it was separate and not all CAC, but it was related to Commissioner Bivins' comment about micro transit. He said that October 30 was their official kickoff celebration for micro transit. He said that he had sent an invitation to that event by email, and members of the Commission could attend because there would be no discussion of business. He said that the kickoff would be happening at Martha Jefferson Hospital, and it marked the start of their two-year service.

Mr. McDermott said that they could already start downloading the app. He said that this was a micro transit service that acted similarly to Uber. He said that they would be conducting a significant outreach effort, and their public engagement offices were working on radio spots, social media spots, and providing information on how to do this. He said that to use the app, one simply downloaded the app, ordered a ride, and the areas covered included the entire Places 29 development area and the entire Pantops development area, including the ability to travel between those two locations. He said that Martha Jefferson was also accessible via this service. He said that the service was fare-free for the two years of the demonstration project. He said that this represented a significant new transit opportunity for the County.

Ms. Firehock said that unfortunately, the Historic Preservation Committee did not meet quorum, even though they believed they would. She said that she sat there for half an hour for no reason.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: October 17, 2023

Mr. McDermott said that the October 17 meeting was actually a joint meeting listed on the agenda, while the October 18 meeting was the actual Board meeting. He said there were no land use items on the agenda that evening, so he did not have to sit through the entire meeting. He said that during the Board meeting, they discussed legislative priorities and had other discussions but nothing related to land use or decisions made by the PC.

AC44 Update

Mr. McDermott said that regarding the AC44 update, staff was preparing to come back in front of them on November 14 with goals and objectives for housing and economic development. He said that there was now a survey available online for those two items similar to the last one; they had opened it and would keep it open through the rest of this year. He said that their focus was on

preparing goals and objectives and scoping out what they would do for phase three, which was the development of action steps.

Mr. McDermott said that an online public engagement opportunity would be held on November 4. He said that they would have an online open house where anyone could join, with breakout rooms for different topics and questions. He said this event would be coming up and would be advertised, with invites sent to those who wanted to join the online meeting. He said that the correct date was November 6, a Monday night, from 6 to 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Karina-Plun said that he would provide a review of the MPO meeting. He said that they did not have a quorum for that particular meeting. He said that he had acted as chair for the meeting since the chair was not present. He said that they discussed a presentation from the consultants regarding the long-range travel plan and their prioritization measures for various aspects of the plan, and they provided comments and feedback on it.

Mr. Karina-Plun said that they had a presentation from the MPO about SmartScale Round 6, and some of the changes that the Commonwealth Transportation Board was making for those. He said that they went over some of those changes and gave feedback and thoughts and some of their concerns about the changes that might be happening. He said that they had a presentation about transportation analysis zones. He said that they eventually gave roundtable updates and concluded without any official decisions being made.

New Business

Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors Joint Work Session – Affordable Housing and Development Incentives

Mr. McDermott said that they had settled on the date for the joint PC and Board meeting on developer incentives. He said that this would occur on Monday, December 4 at 1:00 PM to 4:00 p.m. He said that they were working on scheduling the speakers as well as determining the location. He said that they would not hold it at Lane; instead, they were looking to hold it at an off-site location. He said that the idea was they would hear from housing professionals and learn more about how they could utilize developer incentives to increase affordable housing development.

Albemarle Planning Commission/Charlottesville Planning Commission Joint Meeting

Mr. McDermott said that he had met with the City planning department, along with neighborhood development services and the secretary of the City Planning Commission. He said that they were looking to try and hold a meeting early in 2024. He said that he planned to reach out to the chair and vice chair for the City Commission to sit down with them to plan what topics they wanted to cover. He said that he hoped to hold an inner community meeting in November to prepare for a joint meeting between both planning commissions in the January-February timeframe.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

Ms. Shaffer said that she wanted to let them know that she would be attending the November meeting. She said that she was eagerly anticipating it and could not wait to see each of them there.

Adjournment

At 8:11 p.m. the Commission adjourned to November 14, 2023, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m.



Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning

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

| |
|------------------------------------|
| Approved by Planning Commission |
| Date: 11/14/2023 |
| Initials: CSS |