Albemarle County Planning Commission
Draft Minutes Regular Meeting
November 28, 2023

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, November 28, 2023, at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Corey Clayborne, Chair; Fred Missel, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; and Lonnie Murray.

Members absent: Karen Firehock

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

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

There were no items on the Consent Agenda.

Public Hearing

ZMA202300008 High School Center II at Albemarle High School

Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Division, said that this proposal concerned a rezoning at Albemarle High School, also known as the Lambs Lane campus due to its multiple facilities. She said that the total area was 216 acres; however, they were focusing on a 9.9-acre section at the front of the property along Hydraulic Road where the rezoning was proposed. She said that this area was an already developed part of the site and was located in the rural areas but near the boundary with the development zone.

Ms. Ragsdale said that surrounding uses included residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial, such as churches and the Loaves & Fishes food pantry on Lambs Lane. She said that the entire property was zoned as rural areas, with some legacy zoning, including Georgetown Green designated R6 and some industrial zones in the rural areas and across the boundary line. She said that in the development area, there was a mix of residential and commercial zoning districts.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the proposal aimed to rezone from a rural area to R10. She said that the land use plan was encompassed by the rural area without any specific land use designations. She said that it was adjacent to the Route 29 development area, which featured residential designations and a neighborhood center designation. She said that focusing on the front of the

site, the proposal intended to provide flexibility for setbacks and building height for the new high school center as well. She said that it was anticipated that this area may also be developed, resulting in a significant amount of work ahead.

Ms. Ragsdale said that areas where there existed an existing parking lot had been discussed extensively with schools. She said that there were no other special exceptions or modifications or alternative avenues to achieve the desired flexibility in building design. She said that R10 allowed a maximum height of 65 feet. She said that they had established the envelope where the property would be rezoned within the red area. She said that the proposal anticipated the preferred alignment for the Lamb's Lane Loop Road to connect over to Hydraulic Road.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the proposal was located 35 feet from Hydraulic Road. She said that there had been significant discussion and input from the Georgetown Green residents, and their proposal was 50 feet from the property line with Georgetown Green. She said that these setbacks were appropriate, as they aligned with some of the surrounding building patterns, which predated current zoning and land use policies. She said that this location was unique due to its school campus, which also predated existing zoning and land use policies.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the table demonstrated the setback requirements for rezoning necessary to provide flexibility for a high school center in rural areas. She said that the required setback from Hydraulic roads and public roads not designated as internal was 75 feet. She said that for residential districts, such as R10, the minimum setback was five feet, with a maximum of 25 feet. She said that this rezoning would allow for a 35-foot setback, which still required a special exception due to encouraging buildings more oriented toward the street in residential districts.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the height flexibility needed was up to 40 feet, which was a five-foot increase from rural areas to accommodate this flexibility. She said that the concept plan provided a 50-foot setback for Georgetown Green residents. She said that the narrative and staff report suggested that the intention was for proffers to be submitted, committing to this concept plan and limiting site uses to public purposes or similar, without including residential density or more intensive development than R10 allowed.

Ms. Ragsdale said that they had recommended approval of the rezoning based on the narrow scope of the request. She said that although it was atypical for them to recommend rezonings to a more intensive district in rural areas, this was an existing and developed school facility. She said that the proposal, including reduced setbacks and a five-foot height increase, would not negatively impact adjacent properties. She said that the comprehensive plan and community facilities chapter supported these elements.

Mr. Missel asked for clarification regarding parking and the relocated parking.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there was planning ahead for replacement parking on an area of the site in the back where existing tennis courts were located.

Mr. Missel said that he was curious about the amount of extra parking required due to this addition. He asked if they had an estimate.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the school's parking capacity was determined by a study conducted to meet its specific requirements. She said that the information presented in the narrative represented the expected demand.

Mr. Clayborne read the rules for presentations from the applicant.

Kagan Squire, Project Manager for Building Services, said that he was accompanied by Building Services Director Lindsay Snoddy, Deputy Director Matt Wertman, and consultants from Quinn Evans and Timmons. He said that they wanted to provide an overview of the plan schedule and a detailed presentation of the high school center to highlight their latest community engagement efforts in assisting the planning design of the new facility. He said that they would also discuss the traffic impacts from this project and share an update on the building's design.

Mr. Squire said that the Center 2 project was nearing the end of its schematic design phase, and they planned to continue with the design of the building through the end of next summer. He said that after that, they would solicit bids for the project construction, which was projected to begin in late fall of 2024. He said that the school facility was expected to open for the 2026-2027 school year.

Mr. Squire said that for this project, they were requesting to rezone approximately 9.9 acres of the Lambs Lane campus from rural to R10. He said that the request aimed to provide flexibility in the design concerning setback and height restrictions. He said that early designs indicated that the center should be no closer than 35 feet to Hydraulic Road and 50 feet to the Georgetown Green neighborhood property line, with a maximum building height of 40 feet. He said that the new building would accommodate approximately 400 students daily and span around 60,000 square feet.

Mr. Squire said that they had limited the rezoning effort to establish a clear buffer between the zoning districts. He said that this also helped preserve the rural character of the remaining portions of the parcel. He said that replacement tennis courts and additional parking to accommodate the needs would be built. He said that future routing of the loop road included in the Lambs Lane Master Plan was outlined.

Mr. Squire said that ACPS had held several community engagement opportunities for diverse stakeholder groups to seek feedback on planning, programming, and design of the project. He said that opportunities dated back to spring of 2020 before the project was paused due to the pandemic; efforts restarted this past spring. He said that these groups included students, families, teachers, ACPS staff, local agencies, business leaders, and community groups.

Mr. Squire said that a traffic impact study was conducted in partnership with local government to assess the current and future levels of service at six intersections surrounding the Lambs Lane campus and the entire stretch of Hydraulic Road. He said that the study also investigated the impact of completing the future loop road and analyzed three different scenarios for the best road placement and terminus point for the proposed road.

Mr. Squire said that the TIA assumed that the development of the Lambs Lane campus would generate an increase of 25% in the existing total traffic entering the school complex, with an annual growth rate of 2.2% over the next 10 years. He said that for the two main intersections affected by this project, the projected levels of service during peak hours did not exceed a C level of service post-development. He said that the TIA ultimately recommended the best location and terminus for the future loop road.

Mr. Squire said that the Center 2 project aimed to construct a small portion of the loop road, which

was to reconfigure the existing internal connector road in front of Albemarle High School. He said that the remaining portion of the future loop road, as well as other improvements recommended in the TIA, still required future funding by the Board of Supervisors. He said that 127 additional parking spaces were needed for Center 2.

Mr. Squire said that it was estimated there would be 40 student drop-offs and pickups, four to five buses, and 20 bikers or walkers at the Lambs Lane campus. He said that bike and pedestrian facilities would be incorporated into the proposed facility's final site plan. He said that building services would be relocated off-campus to another location, and the existing building would be demolished, resulting in a reduction of traffic generated by that facility.

Kylan Shirley, Quinn Evans Architects, said that they had been working with ACPS for several months to develop a schematic design for the High School Center 2 building on this site. He said that the current building services site would become the location for the high school center after an extensive planning process. He said that this involved studying various ways to navigate the challenges posed by vehicular and pedestrian traffic while considering the Lambs Lane Master Plan campus, sports integration, bus drop-offs, parent drop-offs, and student walking routes.

Mr. Shirley said that all these factors were taken into account, and they aimed to place this building on a busy campus with the goal of improving overall campus operations as well. He said that this plan included creating a new entry drive into the site. He said that the conceptual site plan being presented had not been approved by the School Board. He said that the information presented was still considered a concept and would require approval from the School Board in January.

Mr. Shirley said that the building plan could be seen at the center of the diagram, with Albemarle High School located toward the top, indicated by the white outline. He said that the road would follow the pathway around the bottom side of the building, where the current driveway was now. He said that the project had identified a clear and distinct pedestrian and bike pathway into the site, separating it from vehicular traffic. He said that cars moving into the site had been relocated to the outside of the site, and driveways along the front of Albemarle High School had been reoriented toward the stadium for clearer, more direct circulation and improved intersections.

Mr. Shirley said that this would also accommodate parent-student drop-offs better than the current system, separating cars from queuing in parking lots during drop-off times at both the high school. He said that the building was an L-shaped design that created a courtyard space. He said that as they regained some of the asphalt for green space, the area between the entrances of Albemarle High School and High School Center 2 would be developed into an entry plaza and campus green space.

Mr. Squire said that Center 2 featured several sustainable aspects, including accommodating solar panels, utilizing geothermal wells for mechanical systems, improving stormwater management, enhancing the building envelope, and using native plantings. He said that the building would achieve at least a LEED Silver certification, with a stretch goal of net-zero readiness. He said that these strategies aligned with the comprehensive plan's community facilities objectives and indicators of progress.

Mr. Bivins said that this was his district, his neighborhood, and his street. He said he had been supportive of the project since its inception. He said that throughout the various iterations of the Georgetown Green project, the team had made a strong effort to engage with the community on issues not only related to the project but also concerning life near a high school. He said they

should recall their own experiences in high school and the communities they passed by daily, as some of those same issues were facing the Georgetown Green.

Mr. Bivins said that as they consider education campuses, they should think about how they can promote their intended purposes on the campuses. He said that they needed to adjust their approach just to achieve changes in the requirements of 5 feet. He asked for clarification about parent pickup and drop-off being relocated to the tennis court area. He asked if this decision had been finalized.

Mr. Shirley said that the current plan involved expanding the parking lot near the tennis courts from its existing capacity of 200 spots to accommodate students and staff from both schools, creating additional parking spaces for after-school events. He said that the tennis courts would be relocated behind the stadium, and the parent drop-off area would be repositioned. He said that the stretch of road will be widened to serve as the parent drop-off area. He said that the new parking lot will also provide multiple options for parents to exit the site efficiently.

Mr. Carrazana said that it appeared to be well-designed architecturally, as it aligned with his professional expectations. He said that the land seemed valuable due to the surrounding development, and it appeared that the site may be underutilized. He said that if they were considering the future growth in this area, they should consider future needs, such as a three-story building. He said that the current massing suggested no reason not to build taller; perhaps even considering a 10-story structure could be beneficial. He said that shelling space was significantly cheaper to build now compared to 10 or 15 years later.

Mr. Missel clarified that the proposed building would be net-zero.

Mr. Squire said that it would just be net-zero ready.

Mr. Missel said that he was curious about how net-zero ready and if they were for pursuing sustainability.

Mr. Shirley said that the project would achieve at least LEED Silver certification, as the process had just begun. He said that currently, they were targeting LEED Gold standards. He said that to determine their readiness, they must progress beyond schematics. He said that their energy use intensity goal was low enough that installing solar panels on the building would almost meet the requirement. He said that they were pursuing a geothermal heating and cooling system based on well-filled technology, which they believed would help them achieve their target. He said that the school division had been working on determining how to acquire solar power.

Mr. Murray said that he strongly encouraged them to focus on regionally native plants rather than just American or Virginia native plants. He said that LEED was a building standard, and there were points available for landscaping. He said that there was the Sustainable Sites Initiative that applied to the rest of the landscape, which they should consider. He said that he hoped they would look into options such as permeable paving or other methods for capturing stormwater in parking lots and directing it into parking islands. He noted that the campus was close to a water supply.

Mr. Moore said that he agreed with Mr. Carrazana's comments about underbuilding, and what was really needed was another full high school on the northern side of the County. He said that in terms of traffic impacts, there would be a significant influx of cars within a 20-minute period. He asked if the proposal would see a reduction in parking spots for students and staff.

Mr. Shirley said that there was a boomerang shaped lot by the stadium that would be reduced by half. He said they would lose about 45 spaces. He believed that most of these spaces were currently occupied by students. He said that the proposed 200-space lot would make up for the loss.

Mr. Moore said that currently, Lambs Lane was the only access point for the parking, which was already a narrow road shared by two other schools. He asked when Center Two might be operational compared to when the road improvements would be completed.

Mr. Shirley said that the construction sequencing for this project had not been fully determined yet. He said that the building services building would be demolished first to create space for the roadwork. He said that the intention was to have the site work progress in one direction while the building work occurred in the other direction, with the goal of completing the road as soon as possible. He said that this was important because they needed to ensure access to the site.

Mr. Moore asked if the loop road would be completed by the time the center opens.

Mr. Squire said that the full loop road was not part of their project, and its completion date remained uncertain. He said that funding from the Board of Supervisors was required. He said that he was unaware of the precise timeline for the project.

Mr. Moore said that he appreciated the additional parking spaces, but he noted that they would all be using one side road. He asked for clarification about "C-level service" when discussing traffic services.

Matt Wurman, Deputy Director of Building Services, said that when performing a traffic impact analysis, all roads and intersections received a grade ranging from A (good) to F (failing). He said that the two main intersections relevant to this project's development were the Hydraulic and Georgetown Green intersection and the Hydraulic and Lambs Road intersection. He said that under existing conditions, Hydraulic and Georgetown Green intersection operated at a Level of Service B or A during peak hours. He said that the other intersection operated at a C level of service. He said that post-development of this project, both intersections were projected to operate at a Level of Service C.

Mr. Bivins said that it should also be noted that part of what this situation involved, particularly on Lamb's Lane, was that various buses, police officers, and first responders relied on Lamb's Road for fueling their vehicles and servicing. He said that the County had a plan, in collaboration with the school, to relocate this function elsewhere. He said that it may not occur within his lifetime, but it would happen during the lifetimes of some members on the panel that there would be no buses being repaired or police officers refueling at Lamb's Road. He said that this would result in a modest reduction in activity. He said that the traffic flow through the area would improve as this was where buses and first responders currently went to have numerous tasks completed for them.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the building would be served by backup power.

Mr. Shirley said yes.

Mr. Clayborne said he asked because he was considering climate resiliency. He said that the idea was that this building could serve a dual purpose after a natural disaster by housing people within

the community if necessary.

Mr. Shirley said that there was a separate building designation with the building code for emergency shelter. He said that this type of structure was the most resilient and met very stringent code requirements to fulfill this purpose. He said that currently, it was not planned that this building would serve as an emergency shelter; however, it would have backup power to preserve essential functions such as maintaining IT systems and kitchen equipment and ensuring building safety in case of electrical loss.

Mr. Clayborne said that it may be worthwhile to consider given the increase in natural disasters and hot summers causing difficulties for those without air conditioning.

Mr. Clayborne opened the hearing for comments from the public. There was no one wishing to speak, so he closed the hearing to the public and brought the matter back before the Commission.

Mr. Murray said that there should be a better process for this type of request.

Mr. Missel said that considering the applicant's presentation of sustainability goals, such as solar panels, there were numerous opportunities to transform the construction process into a learning laboratory. He said that this could involve incorporating students in the design and construction phases, which may already be happening but had potential for further development. He said that such an approach would be particularly beneficial given the current weak state of the vocational workforce and the need for improvement in this area.

Mr. Missel said that under the umbrella of sustainability and resiliency, he suggested having an actual plan in place to implement net-zero ready, with measurable milestones along the way. He said that this approach would be highly beneficial for securing capital funding and planning for the future. He said that the City, County, and UVA were collaborating on a resiliency plan, and schools could serve as an excellent location to integrate these efforts and identify opportunities.

Mr. Bivins said that if the staff could engage in a serious conversation while considering the potential uses of the campus, this may present an opportunity to incorporate additional capacity. He said that if the School Board was leaning toward the idea of expanding the space, it would be beneficial to discuss this matter. He said that they should consider sustainability measures when developing and maintaining natural spaces.

Mr. Moore said that funding the Lamb's Lane Loop would be important for future traffic impacts.

Mr. Bivins motioned to recommend approval of ZMA-202300008 High School Center II at Albemarle High School for the reasons stated in the staff report and as discussed at the meeting. Mr. Missel seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7–0).

ZMA202200004 1906 Avon Street Extended

Mr. Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner, said that the proposal was originally considered by the Commission on February 14, 2023. He said that the Commission deferred the application at the applicant's request to make revisions based on comments and concerns expressed at the meeting. He said that the property included three parcels along Avon Street. He said that the zoning of these three parcels was currently R1 residential, which permitted one residential unit per acre. He said that on this property, which spanned over three acres, it would legally allow

three residential units.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the overlay zoning districts encompassed managed steep slopes and the entrance corridor, as Avon Street was designated an entrance corridor. He said that the surrounding zoning of neighboring parcels included Mill Creek in planned residential development (PRD). He said Avon Park was zoned R6 residential, while the Faith Temple Church comprised two R1 residential parcels. He said that across the street, Spring Hill Village was a neighborhood model development.

Mr. Reitelbach said that in the comprehensive plan, the property fell under the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan, where it was designated for neighborhood density residential. He said that it recommended three to six residential units per acre, along with some supporting uses and a maximum height of three stories. He said that the surrounding properties on the west side of Avon Street were predominantly neighborhood residential. He said that they had a high density of residences and green spaces, including Biscuit Run Park.

Mr. Reitelbach said that across Avon Street to the east, there was a range of recommended uses such as urban density, residential, community mixed-use, office R&D, and light industrial flex. He said that the proposal concerned a revised application for three parcels currently zoned R1, which together totaled approximately 3.6 acres. He said that the existing use consisted of two single-family detached houses along with accessory structures. He said that the applicant sought to rezone the property to R10 residential, subject to proffers. He said that despite requesting a rezoning to R10, they were proposing a maximum density of approximately six units per acre, which would allow for a maximum of 21 units on the site.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the applicant was proposing a mix of single-family detached, single-family attached, and multifamily residential units. He said that the revisions made from the initial application in February included the applicant changing the requested zoning district from R15 to R10 with proffers. He said that the applicant had reduced the maximum number of dwelling units proposed from 38 to 21. He said that they had also decreased the proposed density from 11 units per acre to six units per acre. He said that a maximum building height of 40 feet for block one, which was the western half of the property adjacent to the Mill Creek subdivision, and 35 feet for block two, which was the eastern half of the property along Avon Street, had been included.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the applicant had altered the layout of the proposed development. He said that in their proffer statement, they had added a proffer restricting the construction entrance for the proposed development from connecting with Hathaway Street through the existing Avon Park. He said that as a result, the construction entrance would come directly off of Avon Street. He said that the concept plan for the new proposal showed Hathaway Street emerging from the existing Avon Park subdivision and terminating in a cul-de-sac. He said that there were several parking areas to provide parking for the building envelope at the top of the property, which was the west side of the property.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the small square building envelope adjacent to Avon Park was proposed to be townhouses. He said that the 1920 house that could be seen identified was one of the existing houses that was proposed to remain on the property. He said that the larger building envelope in the bottom right of the concept plan was proposed to be a row of single-family detached houses with an alleyway providing access to the rear of those houses. He said that the fronts of these houses would face Avon Street.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the specifics of the proposal were that the applicant was proffering the concept plan since this was a conventional rezoning to R10 rather than a planned district such as PRD or NMD. He said that in the proffer statement, the applicant had identified major elements required for site planning if the rezoning application was approved by the Board of Supervisors. He said that the listed major elements included the internal street network and pedestrian connections, building envelopes, setbacks as per the concept plan, a maximum building height of 40 feet, and a total number of residential units not exceeding 21.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the applicant sought to rezone to R10 rather than R6, despite maintaining six units per acre, was due to the increased building height allowance. He said that R10 permitted a maximum building height of 40 feet, while R6 did not. He said that the proffer statement consisted of three parts. He said that the applicant had proffered a concept plan, which was included in this application. He said that they had identified the major elements and determined that a maximum of 21 residential units could be constructed on the property. He said that the second part of the proffer statement concerned affordable housing, with the applicant proposing that at least 15% of the total residential units constructed should be affordable. He said that the third part of the proffer stated that the construction entrance for this new development would not connect to the existing Hathaway Street in the Avon Park development.

Mr. Reitelbach said that according to the school system's data, approximately two students would be generated for Mountain View Elementary School, which was currently over capacity and would remain so with this development. He said that one student each was expected to be generated for Walton Middle School and Monticello High School, both of which were currently under capacity and would continue to be so after this development.

Mr. Reitelbach said that in their review and analysis of this proposal, staff identified several positive aspects, including that the request was consistent with the recommended primary land use of housing identified in the master plan. He said that the request aligned with the density recommended by the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan at six units per acre. He said that the request was consistent or mostly consistent with the applicable neighborhood model principles, and the proposal provided at least 15% affordable housing as recommended in the comprehensive plan policy currently being enacted.

Mr. Reitelbach said that staff identified one concern: the lack of interparcel connections in the proposed layout of the development. He said that the only vehicular interparcel connection was Hathaway Street through the existing Avon Park neighborhood, but the applicant was proposing a pedestrian connection from Avon Street up to the cul-de-sac area where Hathaway Street would terminate in this development. He said that based on these positive aspects and concerns, staff recommended approval of ZMA202200004 at 1906 Avon Street Ext.

Ms. Firehock said that typically, with new subdivisions, they preferred two entrances and exits for easy access, but this project only had one. She asked if this was what was referred to as a lack of interparcel connections.

Mr. Reitelbach said that was correct.

Ms. Firehock asked if the Fire Marshal had indicated any concerns about access.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the fire department did not express any concerns regarding fire safety in relation to the proposed layout.

Mr. Murray asked for clarification about the open space proposed for the project.

Mr. Reitelbach said that open space was not included in the major elements of the proffers. He said that they would examine this further during the site plan review process, ensuring that all site plan requirements for open space were met.

Mr. Missel said that regarding the interconnecting street issue, it appeared that the alley had been designed for a potential future interconnecting street. He said that he recalled from their previous conversation that there was an implication that they were relying on adjacent properties to possibly connect to it in the future. He asked if this was still the intended plan.

Mr. Reitelbach said that his understanding was that they would not connect any further with the adjacent properties. He said that the applicant may be able to provide more information on this matter, but he believed that the stub-out was primarily for turnarounds, fire access, and turnarounds for fire trucks and similar purposes.

Mr. Missel said that the illustrative exhibit showed two buildings in block one separated by a significant open space. He asked if they would be required to build a building similar to those two structures or if they could potentially construct a larger mass of a building that fits within the building envelope represented in concept one.

Mr. Reitelbach said that was correct. He said that theoretically, they could construct a single, larger building rather than the two depicted in the illustrative exhibit. He said that to do so, they would need to adhere to the building envelope presented.

Mr. Missel asked if they would be required to meet the 20% open space requirements.

Mr. Reitelbach said that they would not be required to allocate 20% for open space. He said that as this was a conventional rezoning, they would adhere to Section 4.16 of the zoning ordinance. He said that if they opted for a cluster division, then they would have more specific open space requirements.

Mr. Clayborne invited the applicant to provide a presentation.

Kelsey Schlein, Shimp Engineering, said that Jenny Smith, the property owner, was also present and was the applicant for the request. She said that previously, they were double the density the last time the project was before the Commission and largely relied on justifying how the Avon Street corridor as a whole had developed far lower than the maximum density recommendations for the comprehensive plan. She said that in response to feedback received from the Planning Commission, the community, and continued follow-up conversations with the Avon Park HOA, they had amended the application before them tonight.

Ms. Schlein said that in 2021, they began concept planning with their client and held a pre-application meeting with the County in March. She said that during the meeting, they presented a concept that demonstrated a connection from Hathaway Street to Avon. She said that as they developed their concept further, they conducted conceptual grading and ran preliminary profiles on the entrance while coordinating with VDOT. She said that they soon discovered that they could not construct the entrance to Avon through property solely owned by Ms. Smith and still adhere

to VDOT's vertical curve requirements because the grade was too steep.

Ms. Schlein said that considering this factor, they temporarily halted the project for approximately a year to explore potential solutions. She said that they engaged in conversations with the pastor of the neighboring church, seeking opportunities for a possible easement, property acquisition, or even a property swap involving other land owned by Ms. Smith on Avon Street. She said that they pursued several alternatives; however, none of them came to fruition. She said that the church wished to retain its property and prioritize maintaining their westernmost parking area, which was crucial to them.

Ms. Schlein said that their extended pause did not yield an alternative entrance point. She said that in May 2022, they submitted the ZMA for R15 and 38 units. She said that this was very similar to the concept that everyone had seen back in February, which had a connection from Hathaway all the way to the adjacent property of the church to the east and did not show a connection to Avon Street. She said that they made a few revisions, held a public hearing in February, and then, in response to that, resubmitted a few times for further coordination with VDOT and the County for R10 and 21 units.

Ms. Schlein said that in the February version, the Hathaway extension was originally shown connecting to the church property so that, in the future, if that property were to ever redevelop, that connection or an entrance could ultimately connect to Avon Street. She said that the revised proposal had extended Hathaway Street and stubbed it out into a cul-de-sac turnaround. She said that the overall concept was revised to a maximum of 60 units per acre, which was consistent with the density recommendations in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Schlein explained that the reason for rezoning to R10 was specifically for the proposed multifamily units in block one. She said that they had been working with Ms. Smith for several years, and she had a unique design vision as a landscape architect. She said that one unit type that had been particularly important to her was a condominium-style unit along Avon Street. She said that that portion of the property featured a stunning ridge with incredible views, making it an ideal location for a housing unit type not commonly seen on Avon Street. She said that the request for R10 was exclusively for a maximum height of 40 feet, and they proposed three stories as a maximum with a 40-foot height limit for taller ceilings.

Ms. Schlein said that she believed that the R10 justification was further justified because, when comparing the intent of R6 and R10, they were identical with the exception of an outdated comprehensive plan reference. She said that the reference called for community and urban area locations for medium-density residential use. She said that apart from this discrepancy, the intent of both districts was the same. She said that they felt that they were developing at a density consistent with the R10 guidelines while still upholding the intent of the zoning district at R10. She said that this approach remained in line with the comprehensive plan designation at 6 DUI.

Ms. Schlein said that moving on to public street design, she would examine Hathaway Street in relation to the approved site plan for Avon Park 1. She said that Hathaway Street was a public road connecting to Avon and had been stubbed out to adjacent properties. She said that Avon Park 2 developed over there, and she indicated the subject property they were looking at tonight, located at 1906 Avon. She said that Hathaway Street was clearly designed for interparcel connection and future expansion. She said that it was designed to accommodate up to 2,000 vehicle trips per day. She said that the current vehicle trips on that road, if this project were to be fully built out, would be around 750. She said it was well below what it was originally designed for,

and included both Avon Park, Avon Park 1, Avon Park 2, and 1906 in the 750 calculation for daily trips.

Ms. Schlein said that to revisit why they could not make an entrance point onto Avon Street extended, Hathaway Street had an increasing vertical curve toward their property line, and they needed to level that out by creating a landing before coming back down toward Avon Street. She said that the elevation of Hathaway Street was 684 feet, and the elevation needed to be reduced to 640 feet, which required a 44-foot drop. She said that this may be achievable if the road were constructed with a decreasing curve or at a landing. She said that however, it was built as an increasing curve to meet VDOT requirements, so they had to level it out before descending further.

Ms. Schlein said that if they were to create an entrance, this would necessitate a waiver, including a site distance waiver from VDOT. She said that they had gone through numerous revisions with VDOT to address their concerns. She indicated the image on the slide, a profile illustrating where the entrance should connect to meet VDOT requirements. She said that after further revisions in February, they presented Hathaway Street extending all the way to the adjacent property line and had more discussions with VDOT.

Ms. Schlein said that they recognized that due to the grade and the existing developed nature of the adjacent properties to the north, which was Mill Creek's open space, and to the east, which was the church, not providing the full connection through the stub-out to the adjacent property did not meet the waiver of VDOT interconnectivity requirements. She said that in discussions with VDOT, both of these criteria were met given the existing grade challenges on the property, as well as the developed nature of the adjacent properties.

Ms. Schlein said that one favorable aspect in discussing this with them was that stubbing out the street would create a fire access turnaround, whereas one did not exist in the public right-of-way today. She said that she had a few more slides but she had covered much of the detailed information. She said that she understood that the entrance and the road were the major concerns and that there were questions as to why they did not extend Hathaway Street in their proposal.

Mr. Bivins thanked the applicant for providing plans that were easy to read and did not require the use of a magnifying glass. He said that it was that he recalled there would be a construction entrance which would not utilize Hathaway Street.

Ms. Schlein said that was correct.

Mr. Bivins said that vehicles using construction entrances tended to be larger than minivans and Tundra pickup trucks, although a Tundra pickup truck was quite large. He said that his question was why the said construction road could not be converted into an entrance onto Avon Street. He said that although this may require some adjustments in the layout, if it could be done for that, why not incorporate it into the community. He said that he believed this could benefit the community and potentially eliminate the need for the odd cul-de-sac. He said that they would be moving the same amount of people through the cul-de-sac, it would just be a narrow gate as opposed to a wide road.

Ms. Schlein said that if they were to place it there, it would be near an existing driveway that accesses the site. She said that they could not use this location because the construction entrance

must meet VDOT requirements. She said that they needed to ensure that the landing met the vertical curve requirements when vehicles approached it.

Mr. Bivins said that all that needed to be said was that they were getting a free ride because it was a construction entrance and VDOT did not require them to have the same standards as they would if it were a permanent road.

Ms. Schlein said that they did not have to have the same standards for radii, landings, or anything else.

Mr. Bivins said that people should be careful of trucks entering and exiting the site. He said that they were managing a flow of people through a seemingly smaller and narrower entrance, which accommodated 10 fewer dwellings than before.

Ms. Schlein said that overall, if they considered the six units in one area and five units in another, they were looking at approximately 10 units. She said that traffic was expected to be relatively low. She said that because this was a VDOT right-of-way, the connection would be considered a commercial entrance rather than an alley, but it would be designed to feel like an alley with slow driving speeds as a traffic calming measure. She said that they may need to show larger radiuses on the entrance design, as VDOT would evaluate and approve this entrance.

Mr. Bivins asked if Hathaway was a public road.

Ms. Schlein said yes.

Mr. Carrazana asked if Ms. Schlein had further information to present about the concept of higher roofs in the dwellings.

Ms. Schlein said that she did not prepare a specific section in this presentation but did have more details about the layout.

Mr. Carrazana said that he wanted to know the floor-to-floor height in the proposal.

Ms. Schlein said that they would likely consider a 10-foot ceiling, taking into account the duct work and electrical requirements. She said that this would involve examining how everything would fit together. She said that ideally, they had discussed having high ceilings on the first floor, but they may only be able to accommodate up to 12 feet at most.

Mr. Carrazana asked if they were looking at 10 feet for floor-to-floor.

Ms. Schlein said that if they did more than 10 feet, their floor-to-floor measurement might be around 13 feet. She said that they might reach a 36-foot height with a 12-foot floor-to-floor distance, and that was why they set the maximum limit at 40 feet. She said that if they had a 10- or 11-foot ceiling, but maintained a consistent gap between floors, they aimed for 35 feet with any type of roof pitch. She said that they were looking at that five extra feet for cushion.

Mr. Carrazana asked what the dimensions of the alley would be.

Ms. Schlein said that ultimately, the minimum distance required for fire access purposes would be 20 feet.

Mr. Carrazana asked if it would be two-way.

Ms. Schlein said yes, it would have to be due to traffic flows.

Mr. Missel asked if the dwelling units pictured on the bottom of the slide, with five that went across, had pull-in parking or off-street parking.

Ms. Schlein said that there was driveway access.

Mr. Missel asked if there would be garages.

Ms. Schlein said most likely.

Ms. Firehock said that she was looking at the drawing that was previously shown, which included the prior plan and this one. She said that there was a stormwater pond located at the bottom left corner in the previous version, but in examining the new version, she could not locate it. She asked if the stormwater pond was still intended for the same location.

Ms. Schlein said that it was not shown in the slides, but in the application, it was shown that ultimately the water would go to that point of the property.

Ms. Firehock said that it was in the narrative but was not shown on the plan.

Ms. Schlein said that the proposed BMP was located in a similar area to what had been mentioned earlier. She said that it was included in their conceptual plan. She said that they had indicated two other potential locations for BMP installation as well.

Ms. Firehock asked if Ms. Schlein could speak to the pedestrian access. She asked what the pathway was that people walked along Avon Street. She said that she also wanted to know more about the recreational activities occurring on this site. She said that there was an increased amount of preserved green space, and she would like to know about plans for both programmed and passive recreation.

Ms. Schlein said that there had been a question regarding green space between the two buildings. She said that they were open to modifying their plan to include a green space in that location. She said that one block could accommodate townhomes or multifamily units, but there would not be a continuous line of 14 townhomes, and there would be a break. She said that they had considered creating a central courtyard as a focal point, which could be situated between two multifamily buildings or groups of townhomes. She said that they recognized the importance of dog parks in their design. She said that it was almost mandatory in subdivisions nowadays to have these types of amenities.

Ms. Schlein said that they had had productive conversations with the Avon Park Homeowners Association regarding their agreements with Avon Park 2 for any type of amenity payment sharing or anything similar. She said that they had discussed a few ideas to make the place attractive, including a dog park, gardens, and a central courtyard. She said that ultimately, whatever they decided to include would further the conversation with Avon Park regarding beneficial amenities on both properties and how the neighborhood could work cohesively with open space, green space, and future connectivity to Biscuit Run.

Ms. Schlein said that regarding the second question about the pathway to Avon Street, they had discussed this with staff and acknowledged its critical importance, which they also emphasized in their official statement. She said that during the site plan phase, they must determine whether it would be a public or privately maintained pathway. She said that this would influence the final design details, possibly including stairs.

Ms. Firehock said that it looked like they were going across quite a bit of topography at the very bottom. She said that she did not know if they needed a foot bridge or something so people did not need to hike down a ravine and back up.

Ms. Schlein said that as they had it displayed there, it was directly pulled from the public right-of-way. She said that this considered the possibility that this may ultimately become a public connection. She said that they needed proper coordination with staff to determine what requirements must be met for a public connection and whether stairs or an asphalt path were permissible.

Ms. Firehock said that it would need to work with the contours.

Ms. Schlein said that it would not be a slide straight down.

Mr. Murray said that he agreed with Ms. Firehock's comments. He said that he also wanted to mention that they had stormwater facilities. He said that if designed as biofilters in the appropriate manner, these facilities could providing public space and incorporating attractive native plants into their open space plan. He said that this approach resulted in a much stronger presentation.

Mr. Moore said that he had not been on the Commission in February but had reviewed the changes and comments from then and now. He said that it was evident that this proposal had been significantly improved. He said that he concurred with Ms. Firehock's observations that the elevation, steep slope, and abundance of trees presented a challenging development scenario. He said that he understood it would be addressed at the site plan stage. He said that he believed many of his fellow Commissioners' questions had already been addressed. He said that his only remaining query concerned the 15% allocation for affordable housing. He asked if there was a plan in place to distribute it evenly throughout the dwellings or concentrate it within the townhouses.

Ms. Schlein said that in February, they revisited their plans and considered the long-term tenants of Jenny's, which was rented at an incredibly affordable rate, around 60% AMI. She said that it was likely that this situation would continue. She said that the availability of affordable units would depend on the builders who joined the project and whether the units were for sale or rental.

Mr. Moore asked if there was any indication yet of how it might unfold in terms of rentals versus owned homes.

Ms. Schlein said that there was not at this point. She said that there was flexibility in the proffer statement that allowed for both rental and sales options.

Mr. Moore asked if 15% off 21 affordable units would be three units.

Mr. Reitelbach said that he would have to defer to the Housing Manager to answer that question. He clarified that it would be rounded up.

Mr. Moore said that in that case, it would be four units.

Mr. Bivins said that they had discussed sidewalks, and there was significant concern about the sidewalk on Hathaway Street. He said that he observed that a similar sidewalk was being constructed in block two. He asked how they could ensure that people from both the western and eastern sides could safely reach the cul-de-sac without having to compete with vehicles in the middle of the punitive alley.

Ms. Schlein said that they were likely to incorporate some type of pedestrian connection there, as it was required by the County.

Mr. Clayborne asked which side of block one was the front, and which was the back.

Ms. Schlein indicated on the map which direction was the front of the building and the location of the additional stairway.

Mr. Clayborne said that the topography of the site included a high ridge. He asked if the ridge had an effect on the view from the neighborhood to the left.

Ms. Schlein said that the viewshed was primarily oriented toward a certain direction and would likely provide a similar perspective for any viewer. She said that currently, there were woods in the vicinity, but she was uncertain about the specifics. She said that perhaps one of the neighbors could offer insight tonight. She said that if there were any obstructions, they might be more apparent from the second story.

Mr. Clayborne asked if residents were responsible for maintaining those streets.

Ms. Schlein said that in the private portion of the project, once it reached the stage where attorneys were working on the HOA documents, she believed they may have a more creative HOA due to the unique situation of these units not benefiting from the private road. She said that consequently, there might be some distribution and designation among lot owners regarding who was responsible for maintaining the road.

Mr. Clayborne opened the public hearing.

Robbie Savage said that she was president and board chair for the Avon Park Homeowner's Association. She said that on Tuesday, February 14, their residents came en masse to discuss their concerns about the development at 1906 Avon with them. She said that on September 12, her vice-chair and she met with Ms. Schlein and Jenny and Don Smith to discuss the proposal. She said that the meeting was cordial, and they reached several agreements that pleased them.

Ms. Savage said that there were still two major issues remaining for their community. She said that first, the density of the development was a concern. She said that although it was now proposed at R10, she believed it should be an R6. She asked why they should not grant a variance for that height for the ceilings instead of increasing the entire area's zoning to R10. She said that many of their homeowners had experienced approvals at higher levels with the expectation that they would not be built out to that level, then someone else bought the property, it was rezoned

or whatever, and there they were back at the higher level. She said that there was a lot of concern about that.

Ms. Savage said that Justin Shimp had requested for a special desk designation, R10. She said that they would like to see it designated as R6 with a variance for the cathedral ceilings. She said that this was not in the growth area and could sometimes be confused. She said that people thought that because it was all in Avon Park, on Avon Street, it was high density. She said that it was not, and she hoped that they could go with an R6 designation. She said that the second issue was access. She mentioned that Commissioner Bivins asked a very good question, which was if there would be a construction road, which they appreciated being incorporated into the new plan, why could there not be a separate entrance.

Ms. Savage said that the development of Avon 2 had recently been completed. She said that her community had experienced an influx of traffic, trucks, and dust as various materials were delivered throughout the night. She said that the residents did not wish to endure this disruption again. She said that it had been quite some time since their community could simply function as a neighborhood without ongoing construction projects. She said that she had compiled a list of questions that the community required to be addressed by the Commission, which she believed she had already forwarded to them.

Ms. Savage said that her last question, before concluding her remarks, pertained to the Fire and Rescue Department's assessment of the property on Avon, through Arden, and onto Hathaway. She said that they had not yet seen this analysis. She said that with cars parked on both sides of the street, they wanted to know what the fire and rescue evaluation looked like. She asked if they genuinely satisfied with the safety of the area. She said that if so, she would appreciate having access to that information. She said that they were more than willing to collaborate with the Commission, developers, and property owners in order to find a mutually beneficial solution.

Shelly Smith said that she was one of the ministers at Faith Temple Church. She said they were trying to understand the planning and various aspects of it. She said their concern was whether the rezoning implementation would lead to any changes regarding Faith Temple’s property rights. She said that from what she understood, their property directly attached to the development that was going to be constructed. She said that she wanted to know if there would be anything affecting any expansion they might want to do in the future, including things such as water lines or sewage systems. She said they were unsure of all the different things that may arise, but they wanted to know if this would infringe on their ability to do anything on their property.

Ms. Smith said that another question she had was regarding a section in the middle of the plan in which there seemed to be some trees between the first of the five blocks and then one in the corner. She asked how many feet there were from the roadway on the right side to the first unit on Hathaway, and how close was the back of the church from the closest building. She said that she wanted to know how it would appear with their church. She asked if there would be trees, if the space would be open, or if there would be fencing. She said that they had a lot of people cutting through the church property already, and she assumed it was coming from the current units that existed.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there were any other members of the public who wished to speak. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had any final remarks.

Ms. Schlein said that she would clarify a few details about the church location. She said that in 2021, they met with Pastor Wright, but she would gladly meet with other church members to discuss the situation further. She indicated on the slide the existing access point to the church, and the church itself was located off-screen to the right. She said that Avon Street could be seen coming down from the top of the image, and Mill Creek's entrance was situated to the east of the church. She said that there was an existing tree line in this area. She said that all proposed impacts on property were contained within the site. She said that any stormwater management measures would ensure no adverse effects on adjacent properties or anything similar.

Mr. Clayborne said that the matter now rested with the Commission.

Ms. Firehock said that she would briefly address the question raised by the first public commenter regarding their concern about the R10 compared to the R6. She said that she understood that the proffer to keep it at R6 would run with the land and prevent anyone from coming back to make it R10. She said that it was legally binding and could not be changed.

Mr. Herrick said that it was possible to modify it; however, this alteration was contingent upon obtaining additional zoning approval. He said that the existing proposal would remain tied to the land and could not be adjusted without undergoing the rezoning process once more to revise that particular proffer.

Ms. Firehock said that any land could come forward to request that at any time.

Mr. Herrick said that was correct.

Mr. Moore said that it was basically R6 with higher ceilings.

Mr. Herrick said that it was R10 limited to 21 units on the subject property.

Mr. Moore asked what the setbacks were for R10.

Mr. Reitelbach said that R10 would have setbacks of a five-foot minimum from the right-of-way for the exterior edge of the sidewalk, a maximum of 25 feet for the right-of-way of the exterior edge of the sidewalk if the sidewalk was outside of the right-of-way, and five feet minimum for a side setback. He said that there was no maximum for a side setback, and there was a 20-foot minimum rear setback with no maximum rear setback.

Mr. Moore asked if the last single-family home in the row nearest to the church could be positioned only five feet from the property edge where the tree line currently existed.

Mr. Reitelbach said that was correct.

Mr. Clayborne said that density and access had been raised as issues. He said that they had touched upon it a little bit but could delve deeper into the subject. He said that he would propose discussing those two matters to be considered, starting with density. He asked if there were thoughts and reactions to what had been discussed, particularly regarding R10 versus R6.

Ms. Firehock said that the new density had much less impact and she observed a significant increase in infiltrative open space, which suggested that the overall site development would have less road mileage. She said another aspect to consider, which was the alley's width, measured

at approximately 25 feet. She said that this width was similar to the neighborhood streets in Charlottesville where cars were parked on both sides. She said that one could think of it as an urban street. She said that if they exited the building and proceeded outside, they would encounter numerous such streets. She said that she had driven down many of them to reach this meeting, often getting stuck behind people driving at a slow pace due to the narrow widths.

Mr. Missel said that he had one follow-up question regarding the setback issue. He asked about the general advantages of having an R10 zoning, specifically what specific benefits it offered and enabled that were not currently being utilized by the applicant. He said that alternatively, it could be asked what additional benefits the applicant could take advantage of in addition to building height.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the only other design requirement that would be different was minimum lot size, which related to density. He said that regarding setbacks, those for R6 and R10 were the same.

Mr. Missel said that the density seemed comfortable to him, and he believed that the mitigation for the building height approach and the understanding that the proffer runs with the land satisfied his concerns regarding density.

Mr. Moore said that the density in units per acre was approximately six units in Avon Park and the density was similar in this proposal.

Mr. Missel said that he had a brief comment about the height. He said that since this was located on the entrance corridor, it would be reviewed by the ARB. He said that without any sections, he found it challenging to determine the extent of the looming presence. He said that it could be highly visible or significantly reduced by block two. He said that he was confident that the height difference would be mitigated through the ARB's consideration of materials and colors, among other factors. He said that he ultimately believed it would be visible from the entrance corridor.

Mr. Bivins said that he was mostly accepting of the density, but still had some issues he would alter address. He said that when individuals visited and expressed their enthusiasm for enhancing the aesthetics of the location, they should receive additional recognition for their efforts. He said that he hoped that, given the owner's background as a landscape architect, this space would be characterized by joy and not merely used to persuade the County to approve the project.

Mr. Bivins said that he had continued to express his concerns about one-way streets with only one entrance and exit. He said that he remained distressed by the fact that they had such streets, and he could make a sarcastic comment about people managing to climb Pikes Peak in just seconds. He said that he understood that rearranging dirt was an expensive process. He said that nevertheless, he believed it was healthier for communities to have multiple entry and exit points, so he would continue to advocate for this change whenever possible.

Mr. Clayborne said that there was a general consensus that they all agreed with Mr. Bivins' sentiment. He asked what other concerns needed to be addressed before they moved on. He said that he wanted to make a comment regarding property rights. He said that they must not negatively impact someone else's property by allowing something to happen to a specific property. He said that all impacts to surrounding areas were reviewed and analyzed, as stated in the staff report available online.

Mr. Missel said that looking at the southern property boundary, which is the long property boundary that adjoined the parking area that is part of block one. He said that the parking area setback appeared to be at least at its minimum setback on the illustrative exhibit and seemed quite tight to that property boundary. He said that if he were living in one of those homes along Tudor Court, he might appreciate the ability to have a buffer against that space. He said that he realized this was a circulation issue, but it was part of the parking envelope. He said that if there were a way to shift that block slightly to the north to allow for a wider buffer between the homes on Tudor Court and the parking associated with block one.

Mr. Missel moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZMA202200004 1906 Avon Street Extended for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Carrazana seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Committee Reports

Ms. Firehock said that she attended the Historic Preservation Committee meeting. She said that they primarily focused on editing the language for the comprehensive plan. She said that she empathized with the staff, as they had put in a significant amount of effort and recommendations to condense objectives and collapse them. She said that for example, there were initially five objectives they reduced to three. She said that during the meeting with the committee, it was suggested that these objectives be pulled back out and separated, and staff acquiesced. She said that at the end of the day, she believed the language would be clearer.

Ms. Firehock said that they attempted to refine specific wording, such as one instance where the text seemed to recommend that all residents would have access to all historic sites. She said that it seemed as though they were planning to open up everyone's land for visitors to explore wherever they wanted. She said that they fixed this issue and hopefully prevented any unnecessary alarm. She said that there was still strong support among committee members for an action item to create a historic preservation ordinance.

Ms. Firehock said that the purpose of this ordinance would be to prevent the demolition of historic properties without obtaining a permit first. She said that currently, they required permits for demolitions; however, since there was no penalty for tearing down a property without a permit, the ordinance lacked enforcement. She said that she looked forward to seeing the redrafted goals before appearing before the Commission.

Mr. Missel asked if it was required to document a property.

Ms. Firehock said that currently, there was nothing that made anyone have to let the County document the property, and instead they had to request property owners to document it.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: November 15, 2023

Mr. McDermott said that at the Board of Supervisors meeting on November 15, they had several public hearings. He said that the first one was regarding the Walnut Creek Personal Wireless Service Facility Tower, which sought a Tier 3 Tower Special Use Permit. He said that this permit was approved with five votes in favor and one vote against, so it was not unanimous.

Ms. Firehock asked who was the nay vote.

Mr. McDermott said that it was Supervisor Mallek. He said that there was a hearing on the Briary Creek or Rebenton Farm boarding camp, a large facility with cabins located on the Fluvanna County line. He said that it received unanimous approval from the Board, who appreciated its potential benefits for the community. He said that the zoning text amendment related to bonus factors for residential density was discussed in detail by the Board due to concerns expressed in public comment. He said that despite these concerns, the Board ultimately approved it with five votes in favor and one against from Chair Price, who expressed concerns about its impact on affordable housing.

AC44 Update

Mr. McDermott said that for AC44, they were getting into the land use and transportation element. He said that they were starting to visit all the CACs to present some of those things. He said that over the next two weeks, starting again next week and the week following, they would finish off all the CACs. He said that at the presentations, they would discuss what activity centers mean, how they relate to transportation, and also some minor changes to land use designations in the comprehensive plan that they were considering.

Mr. McDermott said that they were preparing to present this information to the Commission meeting at December 19. He said that initially, they planned to discuss the goals and objectives for transportation and land use at this meeting, but they recognized that there was background information related to land use and transportation that needed to be presented first. He said that they would hold a work session on December 19 to address these issues, such as how density should be calculated and minor changes in land uses.

Mr. McDermott said that after the work session, they would present the goals and objectives for land use and transportation at a meeting in January. He said that once this was completed, they would move forward to the Board regarding these items, concluding phase two of the process. He said that in the new year, they would focus on action steps for phase three.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the December 19 work session would begin at 6 p.m.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct. He said that there was only a work session scheduled. He said that there were no public hearings planned for that evening. He said that the agenda included solely a work session on this item, he would not be able to attend as he would be departing for the holidays at that time. He said that David Benish, who had extensive knowledge of both this topic and the operations of the Planning Commission, would be substituting for him.

Mr. Murray asked when the Riparian Buffer Overlay District would return to the Commission.

Mr. McDermott said that he would need to check on that. He said that they had a work session regarding it. He said that the riparian buffer ordinance was not scheduled to return to the Commission until after January. He said that he would contact Scott Clark and Frank Pohl to inquire about an estimated date.

Mr. Murray said that he suggested releasing the new draft of the language as soon as possible. He said that this was important due to its extensive nature, allowing them sufficient time for review.

Mr. McDermott said that the upcoming meeting for the housing development initiatives was scheduled for next Monday, and Stacy Pethia had sent the materials last week. He said that he

had a tentative general agenda. He said that they were meeting on December 4.

Mr. Missel asked if there was a Zoom link for the meeting.

Ms. Firehock asked where it would be located in Northfork.

Mr. McDermott said that it would be in the Town Center IV. He said that the meeting would be publicly available for access. He said that yes, there would be a Zoom link. He said that the information should be accessible on the Board of Supervisors' web page.

New Business

There was none.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

Mr. Bivins said that when they received future projections of students joining the school system from developments, they had to consider that the impacts would not be realized for several years. He said that the concern over limited seating today was not relevant as it did not impact the long-term plan. He said that often, when people spoke about the issue, they mentioned that there was no room at Mountain View or Albemarle High School. He said that he was unsure if there was a way to alleviate the community's concerns regarding overloading the schools.

Ms. Firehock said that they might have a plan to expand the school, which could coincide with development.

Mr. Bivins said that he had become more aware of setting the tone and expectations for those who listened to County business.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the enrollment projections considered the future capacity projections.

Mr. McDermott said that the projections for the number of students generated were for a full build-out per year; these were the expected numbers for each grade level. He said that the available seats at schools assumed no changes in existing facilities. He said that when there was a plan for new schools, as was recently approved with funding for two new schools and a high school center, they ensured that this information was well noted in the staff report and presentation.

Mr. Carrazana said that in the past, they would receive a report from the School Board which included projections for each school, however, it had been several years since they last received such a report. He asked if it was possible to regularly receive this report again.

Ms. Firehock said that they also received a copy as part of the CIP Advisory Committee.

Mr. Carrazana said the report was beneficial as it provided him with an understanding of the plans for these schools. He said that there were numerous developments, and they all needed to share their impact on the school. He said that this information would be passed on to the School Board

and incorporated into their planning process. He said that having awareness of such projects, informed by growth in specific areas, would be helpful.

Mr. McDermott said that he would contact the schools, as they were currently developing a redistricting plan for schools. He said that he knew they had considered future projections for all the schools in that redistricting plan. He said that he believed the report would contain such information. He said that he would reach out to them and determine what might be most appropriate to share with the Commission.

Mr. McDermott said that it was announced that Michael Barnes would be joining their team as the Planning Director. He said that Mr. Barnes was a UVA graduate and had previously worked as the planning director in Waynesboro for several years. He said that over the past four years, he had been with VDOT in the Charlottesville area, where they had collaborated extensively. He said that Mr. Barnes was scheduled to commence his role in January.

Adjournment

At 8:05 p.m., the Commission adjourned to December 4, 2023, the Joint Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Meeting on Monday, December 4, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. at North Fork (994 Research Park, Charlottesville, VA 22911)

_____

Kevin McDermott, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date:
Initials: