Albemarle County Planning Commission
DRAFT Minutes November 14, 2023

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, November 14, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.

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

Members absent: none

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

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Mr. Clayborne stated that Ms. Firehock was requesting to participate remotely.

Ms. Firehock stated that she was located in Howardsville, Virginia, and she was requesting to participate remotely due to an illness.

Mr. Murray motioned that the Commission allow Ms. Firehock to participate remotely. Mr. Moore second the motion, which carried unanimously (6 – 0).

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Clayborne opened the hearing for public comment.

Tom Olivier, Samuel Miller District, said he was there to discuss economic development proposals with the new comprehensive plan. He said that according to the World Bank, global GDP grew from $1.4 trillion in 1960 to over $100 trillion in 2022. He said that the rapid expansion of the global economy lifted many residents of developing nations out of poverty and elevated the standard of living in developed nations. He said that this prosperity came with a significant cost: the extensive destruction of natural systems that led to the extinction of many species and threatened the survival of human societies due to ecological crises.

Mr. Olivier said that the IPCC warned that they must transform their societies soon to limit more severe disruptions from climate change. He said that they had known for some time that such an event was coming. He said that the Club of Rome's 1972 report, "The Limits to Growth," concluded that they must learn to live without endless economic and population growth. He said that if they failed to do so, the club warned, they faced a collapse of global systems, likely in the 21st century.

Mr. Olivier said that mainstream economists continued to promote ongoing growth as a positive development, seemingly unaware of its biophysical impossibility or detrimental consequences. He said that fortunately, green economists in the steady state and degrowth schools had been

developing economic paradigms for rewarding sustainable societies. He said that the policy proposals for today's discussion did not acknowledge the need to transform their economy into an ecologically sustainable form. He said that to address this issue, first, he suggested shelving Project Enable.

Mr. Olivier said that their new comprehensive plan should call for the creation of a new County economic development plan, one based on green economic principles. He said that more specifically, he suggested that their new comprehensive plan require wide-ranging environmental impact assessments of large development proposals before approvals were considered. He said that if the County was genuinely committed to environmental protection, it should assess greenhouse gas emissions, water resource usage, biodiversity impacts, and so forth, prior to submitting or considering any proposals for decisions.

Neil Williamson, the Free Enterprise Forum, said that the Club of Rome quote reminded him of the population bomb that proved to be inert. He said that Albemarle County needed economic vitality and jobs for future generations. He said that the Commission should consider balancing environmental impacts with the positive effects of business development. He asked if they had reached out to the Albemarle County Economic Development Authority for their formal opinion on the economic development goals and objectives being discussed. He said that he hoped that the advisory board would collaborate with another advisory board to get diverse perspectives.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Clayborne said that there were no items to pull from the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Missel motioned for the Commission to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7 – 0). (Ms. Firehock was remote)

Work Session

CCP202300002 AC44 Comp Plan Update: AC44 Goals and Objectives for Housing and Economic Development

Tori Kanellopoulos, Principal Planner for the Community Development Department, said she would be presenting with Ben Holt, Senior Planner II. She said that they were joined by Dr. Stacy Pethia, Housing Policy Manager, and J.T. Newberry, Interim Director of Economic Development, who would be available as topic experts during the presentation. She said they would discuss draft goals and objectives for housing and economic development as part of the AC44 Comprehensive Plan update.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they would start with a quick recap of where they were and what the current focus was in Phase Two. She said that they would share the draft goals and objectives for housing and economic development. She said that they would pause after discussing housing for the Commissioners' discussion and then again after discussing economic development for further discussion. She said they would wrap up with next steps.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained that the purpose of this work session, similar to the October 10 work session, was to obtain the Commission's feedback on draft goals and objectives, specifically for housing and economic development. She said that they wanted to ensure they were on track before diving into action steps and identify any potential gaps in their current plans. She said that

drafting goals and objectives was informed by community input, and to create effective recommendations, it was essential to understand the priorities of the community and respond to the challenges and opportunities they presented.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said the AC-44 framework, developed with significant community input, provided overall guidance for the plan. She said that recommendations were drafted using technical expertise from County staff, partner agencies, County committees, the Planning Commission, and researching best practices. She said the Board gave direction to the AC 44 team and made the final decisions.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that each chapter in the comprehensive plan would include goals, objectives, and action steps, and in Phase Two, they were drafting goals and objectives, while phase three focused on developing action steps. She said that goals represented the vision for where they wanted their community to be in the future, with outcomes and objectives serving as targets to guide them toward that vision. She said that action steps outlined how they would implement the plan effectively.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they had now reached the third and final step of AC44, Phase Two. She said they had utilized the input gathered during the initial discovery process, which identified challenges and opportunities for their community, and Phase Two, developing planning toolkits to inform the drafting of goals and objectives. She said they would continue to incorporate the feedback received in phase three to refine the draft recommendations. She said that there were currently questionnaires open for the October 10 Planning Commission work session topics.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said the discussion would summarize what they had heard so far on housing and economic development. She said that since the October 10 work session, the AC44 team had held a virtual open house on all topics with open questionnaires, a housing-focused discussion with JABA members and staff, and presented to the Central Virginia Regional Housing Partnership. She said that they would continue to meet with County committees for their input. She said that they were likely to check in with the ARB later this month.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that as they moved into the final round of sharing goals and objectives, they would continue to hold CAC meetings focused on land use and transportation planning, including the multimodal plan, and schedule rural area meetings on land use and transportation planning. She said that when discussing housing in the context of the comprehensive plan, they were referring to housing for all community members, which included both designated affordable housing units and market-rate housing.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that having a variety of housing choices available in their community was an essential aspect of the comprehensive plan, and this referred to offering different types of housing at various price points. She said that such options catered to preferences, life stages, household size, and income levels. She said that housing was considered affordable when a household spent no more than 30% of its gross monthly income on housing costs. She said that alongside housing choice, recommendations for preventing households from becoming homeless and working toward ensuring that homelessness remained rare, brief, and one-time were another set of crucial policies in this chapter.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the chapter intersected with numerous other plan sections, including land use, transportation, and economic development. She said that the overlap was partially demonstrated by the data on the right side of the slide from the Housing and Transportation

Affordability Index, which estimated an annual transportation cost per household at $14,756 in the County. She said that as the AC-44 team drafted housing goals, objectives, and other chapter recommendations, they had been taking into consideration the major themes emerging from community input.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that many of these themes were strongly interrelated. She said they had heard that there was a significant need for affordable housing to cater to current and future community members, including those employed in Albemarle County who could not afford to live there. She said that having a variety of housing options at various price points enhanced affordability, along with energy-efficient housing units and programs to upgrade efficiency and weatherization of existing units. She said that they had learned that multimodal transportation options connected to housing were necessary, which affected affordability as they saw in the previous slide and the opportunities for aging in place.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the six draft goals had organized the housing chapter into the following major sections, which she would review in more detail. She said that since they had received the draft goals and objectives, she would cover them at a high level and leave time for discussion. She said that to increase the overall housing supply and choice, draft recommendations included promoting a variety of housing types, particularly in locations accessible to activity centers, jobs, transit, and amenities; increasing the number of mixed-income developments; and prioritizing energy-efficient design.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that to increase the supply of affordable and workforce housing options, draft recommendations included removing barriers to housing development in both policies and ordinances, and utilizing community engagement and involvement to support and track this development. She said that to preserve and maintain the County's aging housing stock and existing units, draft recommendations included increasing the capacity for low- and moderate-income homeowners to repair and maintain their homes; encouraging the preservation and maintenance of affordable rental units; and focusing housing programs in communities at risk of displacement.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that additional recommendations included ensuring safe living conditions for tenants, reducing involuntary displacement of community members during redevelopment, and addressing unhealthy housing issues. She said that to promote fair housing, draft recommendations suggested amending County policies and ordinances to avoid negatively impacting the supply or equitable access to affordable housing. She said that existing programs and projects should be evaluated based on their effectiveness in serving different demographic groups.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that working toward ensuring homelessness was rare, brief, and one-time involved expanding permanent housing opportunities for chronically homeless households, utilizing the housing first approach as a best practice, preventing homelessness when possible, addressing unmet needs for unsheltered individuals, and assisting households experiencing homelessness to quickly return to and remain stably housed.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that enabling community members to age in place involved draft recommendations proposing increasing the supply of affordable and accessible housing units for low-income senior and disabled households, supporting diverse housing options, locations, and designs that are accessible, enhancing multimodal transportation access, increasing access to assisted living and supportive housing, and reducing housing costs for low-income seniors,

homeowners with a total and permanent disability, and those with disabilities.
Ms. Kanellopoulos said that since the 2015 comprehensive plan was adopted, the housing chapter had been updated in 2021 with Housing Albemarle, which was the County's housing policy. She said that as a result, the housing chapter was now the most recently updated chapter within the current plan. She said that many of the recommendations from Housing Albemarle would be carried forward with updates and additions as necessary. She said that this included ensuring consistency between other plan chapters for the format of goals, objectives, and action steps.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that there would also be new recommendations based on updated plan content connected to other chapters and community input, such as an additional emphasis on energy efficiency and coordinated land use and transportation planning as it related to housing, including aging in the community and connecting to activity centers. She said that they had online questionnaires for each plan topic as they shared draft goals and objectives. She said that they anticipated keeping the questionnaires open throughout the calendar year and potentially early next year to allow for continued opportunities for input.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they had heard various comments through the housing questionnaire. She said that they anticipated keeping the questionnaires open to allow more opportunities for input. She said that feedback included infrastructure, regional coordination on housing, additional requirements and incentives for affordable units in new developments, more market-rate units, lower property taxes for affordability, and methods to measure success. She said that during the November 6 virtual open house, there were two breakout rooms: one focused on environmental stewardship, parks and recreation, and historic resources; the other concentrated on housing and economic development.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they provided an overview of each topic, discussed changes from the 2015 plan, reviewed draft goals and objectives, and then invited participants to share whether they felt their top priorities were addressed and if there was anything they would add or modify. She said that at the November 7 JABA discussion, they posed questions related to housing needs and preferences, transportation, and spaces for future community gathering and accessing resources and programs. She said that it was essential to note that while they summarized feedback for engagement summaries and presentations, they also shared more detailed notes and input with relevant staff across the County and partner agencies.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they shared the comprehensive notes from JABA with staff in the Office of Equity and Inclusion, Fire Rescue, Climate Protection, and the Health Department. She said that the input from both events included having concerns about the limited supply of land in development areas, exploring affordable housing options in rural areas, considering community land trusts and County-owned land for affordable housing. She said that addressing the need for senior-specific affordable housing with accessibility, walkability, transit, and safe gathering spaces onsite was also expressed.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that JABA staff expressed significant concern about the increasing number of seniors experiencing homelessness, such as living in vehicles or struggling to afford rent due to rising housing costs on fixed incomes. She said that the transportation was another high priority for seniors, particularly when family members were unable to drive them to appointments, classes, or community centers.

Mr. Bivins said that he had looked at the work done by the regional housing study. He said that

the analysis presented was quite smart but it was unfortunate because the data used was from 2018 and spanned from 2018 to 2040. He said that using a baseline of 2018 overlooked significant changes that had occurred in this community and the broader economy. He said that he suggested considering updating or refreshing the data for a more accurate analysis. He said that as they discussed whether these were the right questions to ask, it was essential to ensure that the data supported those questions, even if the data was from 2018. He said that the current data provided harsh answers based on what could be seen in the available information.

Mr. Moore said that the County had developed a housing policy back in 2021, and some of these were similar to and others seemed to be missing from the current recommendations. He said he was curious about how much weight the existing policy was given.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they used Housing Albemarle as the baseline for their work. She said that it was possible that some elements may not currently be included due to falling into the action stop level of detail. She said that the organization of Housing Albemarle was slightly different from how the updated plan would be organized, as it did not follow the same goal, objective, action step format.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that some adjustments were necessary to ensure consistency in language and adherence to the same format. She said that it could be that some level of detail present in Housing Albemarle was more appropriate for an appendix or separate plan, but many of those recommendations would still be carried forward as they remained relevant.

Mr. Moore said that he recognized that the goals presented were not what he initially expected. He said that they seemed more like vision statements than actual goals. He said that the objectives left him feeling unsure about their clarity and specificity. He said that some of them were so broad that they lacked clear meaning, such as "prevent homelessness where possible through homelessness prevention." He said that he desired more tangible objectives to work with. He said that he believed it was possible to achieve the presented goals.

Mr. Moore said that he suggested considering applying the SMART goal framework from nonprofit planning. He said that in objective 1.1, they aimed to incentivize various housing types, while in 1.3, they planned to He said that was specific and actionable. that point 2.1 was the same: build 10,000 new affordable units by 2040. He said that the goal was specific, actionable, and probably required an interim objective. He said that others felt very vague, and it was more like they would continue doing what they were currently doing but with a slight increase in efforts.

Mr. Moore said that regarding the positive aspects, he believed there was a good community concept that included being walkable, bikeable, and environmentally friendly. He said that if their baristas, CNAs, teachers, and firefighters had to commute from Green or Waynesboro or Fluvanna, it became more of a theme park than a community. He said that having their workforce live in the County where they worked was crucial.

Mr. Moore said that he greatly appreciated objective 1.1, which allowed and encouraged various housing types such as four-plexes, ADUs, tiny houses, and so on. He said that he liked the specific goal of objective 2.1 to build 10,000 more affordable and workforce-friendly units. He said that regarding the vagueness in the objectives, he believed they could be more specific.

Mr. Moore said that he would like to explore the concept of blanket upzoning, which had been implemented in cities like Minneapolis and had shown decent impacts on controlling rapid housing

cost inflation. He said that it was unclear how much this topic had been addressed or considered within the objectives. He said that while it may not be realistic, he thought it was a useful strategy worth considering as part of their approach to addressing housing issues.

Mr. Moore said that he observed certain aspects that were not mentioned in the goals and objectives but might appear later in the action plans. He said that these observations were based on the 2021 report, which he found to be very comprehensive. He said that the report reminded him of a housing policy similar to the Affordable Care Act, addressing various real issues without implementing a public option.

Mr. Moore said that the first goal mentioned developing permanently affordable housing communities on County-owned land, which he would like to see emphasized further. He said that land trusts and shared equity systems were part of the plan as well. He said that they are obliquely referenced but could be a very useful way to bring affordability much further down on the AMI scale. He said that a sustainable housing trust fund, which was perhaps obliquely referenced here, was another tool that they could explicitly reference.

Mr. Moore said that there were other things to consider in order to address what might be missing. He said that upzoning in general could fall under 1.1, allowing and incentivizing different types of missing middle homes. He said that there should be more focus on renting, such as voucher programs and emergency rental assistance. He said that analyses have shown that voucher programs provide a high return on investment for both short-term and medium-term impacts, keeping people in their homes. He said that they should think through what this could look like and how they can achieve it.

Mr. Moore said that in the past, developers had primarily sought changes to zoning or special use permits. He said that local governments rarely proactively considered how they could develop land themselves. He said that while financing such projects would require significant resources, it was worth exploring the possibility of creating new neighborhoods and town centers with a mix of affordable housing and quality jobs. He said that by adopting a more ambitious approach to planning, they could potentially enhance their communities in meaningful ways.

Mr. Murray said that he agreed about land trusts, stating they were one of the better ways to encourage affordable housing over the long term. He said that he was not in favor of broad upzoning, as it could cause land speculation and make land and homes even less affordable while removing any incentive for affordable housing. He said that in Charlottesville, he had noticed incidental reports of speculation with properties selling for enormous amounts due to the potential for additional development under goal two. He said that various references to reducing barriers could be found in different places, but he wanted to emphasize that not all barriers were negative.

Mr. Murray said that they had barriers such as environmental safeguards or those designed to ensure public safety. He said that it was essential to differentiate between necessary barriers and unnecessary ones. He said that he suggested the use of the term "unnecessary" when discussing barriers, acknowledging that not all barriers were inherently negative. He said that he advocated for maintaining the County's aging housing stock. He said that the most affordable homes currently available in the County were those that already existed.

Mr. Murray said that numerous individuals displaced due to their homes becoming uninhabitable had reinforced this belief. He said that programs like AHIP can assist in renovating these houses, preserving their livability, and allowing residents to continue living in their communities. He said

that he supported this initiative. He said that goal three was one of the most important objectives that he strongly endorsed. He said that he was glad that the entire document differentiated between the growth area and the rural area in terms of housing types because he believed this distinction was important.

Mr. Murray said that he thought there were some discussions that could be had about the rural area since a significant portion of existing affordable housing was located there. He said that the way subdivision was done in the rural area contributed to making housing less affordable. He said that without increasing development in the rural area, there were things that could be fixed. He said that they were de facto encouraging farm estates in the rural area, which harmed housing affordability and damaged natural resources. He said that if they could find a way to change this dynamic by having smaller lot sizes in the rural area without increasing the total amount of development, it would be beneficial for both housing affordability and natural resources.

Ms. Firehock said that she agreed with what had been said so far, especially regarding community land trusts. She said that she believed that when they attempted to make housing affordable, it often became unaffordable over time due to its entry into the free market and subsequent appreciation, leading to its purchase by others. She said that she appreciated the reference in the plan to tiny houses. She said that they must thoroughly examine their zoning laws because currently, there was no feasible way to establish a tiny house community in the County.

Ms. Firehock said that not everyone desired a lawn that required mowing; many preferred shared common spaces and a community garden that all residents could maintain collectively instead of having individual lawns with associated setbacks characteristic of suburban development patterns. She said that she would like to see more emphasis on the objectives, as they currently appeared somewhat vague to her. She said that she would like to see more information on mortgage down payment assistance for public service sector employees, such as police officers, firefighters, and teachers.

Ms. Firehock said that some communities had implemented robust programs that helped subsidize the down payment, making it more likely for individuals to afford purchasing a house in the County. She said that assisted living facilities had been constructed in recent years; however, many of them were unaffordable for the average middle-class person. She said that she suggested exploring ways to incentivize subsidies or subsidized assisted living for both the middle class and lower middle class.

Mr. Missel said that he encouraged everyone to strive for a balance between ambitious goals and realistic attainment. He said that while setting high goals was not inherently negative, it was essential to remember that sometimes unattainable objectives were set, which could lead to disappointment. He said that discussing aspirational concepts such as incentives and barrier reduction was indeed valuable. He said that however, they should acknowledge the limitations of their current capabilities and focusing on what was truly achievable.

Mr. Missel said that he knew that staff had been working for almost two years to close the gap in Housing Albemarle and incentives that allowed the development community to implement the goals. He said that despite this effort, applications were still coming in at 15% for those with an annual income of 80% AMI for 10 years. He said that there was a joint work session with the Board of Supervisors on December 4, where they could discuss incentives. He said that he participated in several conversations today regarding the importance of that aspect with the development community. He said that connecting these discussions can lead to actionable items.

Mr. Missel said that the way they would accomplish these goals would be identified during the action items. He said that AHIP had a block by block program, which focused on improving entire communities rather than just individual homes. He said that partnerships with organizations of this nature were essential, as well as funding and supporting programs. He said that the importance of transportation was widely acknowledged and discussed. He said that under objective 1.1 of goal 1, targeting areas accessible to activity centers, job opportunities, public transit, community amenities, and promoting increased density in development areas was important.

Mr. Bivins said that he agreed that the December meeting would be an important dialogue for all parties involved as they moved forward on this matter. He said that despite his optimistic nature, he was not overly hopeful about the prospects for affordable housing in the area. He said that one reason for this was that if they required the development to be limited to 5% of the total land area of the county, it may be challenging to create a program that would significantly change the developer's return on investment.

Mr. Bivins said that while they could discuss potential solutions, he was unsure how effective they would be if they were only committed to 5% of county land by focusing on the development area. He said that these projects should cater to a multi-generational population, allowing individuals at different stages of their lives to reside there and potentially live out their days in such a community. He said that they had to consider what a crossroads community was. He said that to effectively keep someone in a rural area, it was essential to provide them with necessary services such as well-maintained houses, functioning septic systems, and access to healthcare facilities.

Mr. Bivins said that Esmont was an example, which had a convenience center, post office, and other amenities. He asked what the outcome would be if they intentionally developed this area with a creative thought process in mind. He said that the housing stock between Route 20 and Route 6 was an important factor to consider when planning crossroads communities in rural areas. He said that there was an abundance of housing stock over there, including grand estates; however, some areas contained less luxurious properties. He said that if they were to declare in the County that these locations would be prioritized for assisting rural residents in maintaining their homes, it would challenge their understanding of crossroads communities.

Mr. Bivins said that this was a valuable challenge if they were discussing an equitable approach. He said that in this unique situation, there existed a perfect integration of three elements: accessible housing, economic development, and job opportunities. He said that by providing employment that enabled individuals to afford their desired homes, they could avoid creating a serf class. He said that during the EDA portion, he challenged them to analyze data more thoroughly.

Mr. Bivins said that the largest employer was the Commonwealth of Virginia, and its workforce size could be affected by decisions made in Richmond. He said that depending on the General Assembly's decisions, the workforce could grow or shrink. He said that another significant factor was the Department of Defense. He said that if anyone had attempted to obtain clearance or knew someone who had tried to get clearance, it was not an easy job and it was not a quick one. He said that this also reduced the number of individuals who could easily take advantage of opportunities.

Mr. Bivins proposed that if they focused on accessible housing, they had to consider economic development and transportation. He said that if they were truly committed to achieving 5%, they must be highly inventive in connecting the 5% across the City of Charlottesville through

coordination so that they would have a much more extensive network. He said that he stopped being optimistic because it would require more funding, and residents did not like increasing taxes.

Mr. Clayborne said that he was surprised not to see any mention of tracking or data collection in the presentation. He said that this issue consistently arose, and they needed to document it to address it effectively. He said that it was financial resources or staff resources, they required data to assess their progress in these areas. He said that the lack of such information within the system was currently a significant flaw.

Mr. Clayborne said that he expected to see more emphasis on educating the community about affordable housing. He said that time and again, people expressed their support for affordable housing initiatives but requested that they not be located near them. He said that it was essential to educate the public on what affordable housing truly meant and what constituted workforce housing. He said that he suggested putting a more deliberate tie to other sections of the comprehensive plan, particularly environmental stewardship. He said that he struggled to find the difference between goal four and the law.

Mr. Clayborne said that goal five focused on homelessness, which was a significant issue requiring regional collaboration or at least partnership with the City. He said that he expected to see some kind of language addressing the concerns raised. He said that regarding the aging in place piece, it was unclear whether it involved exploring zoning options for accessible dwelling units on the same property. He said that they should consider whether a single-family homeowner could build an additional unit in their backyard to accommodate aging parents within current zoning restrictions. He said that if so, they should consider how they could incentivize such developments, and if not, what steps could be taken to enable them.

Mr. Bivins said that at some point, they wanted to be able to point to measured progress through tracking. He said that it could be a teachable moment for the community to explain the development that was occurring. He said that it was important to have a current data set.

Ms. Firehock said that she agreed that there were many ambitious and aspirational objectives in the document. She said that the devil was in the details and that these would be addressed through action steps. She said that she was not entirely convinced that these action steps would magically reveal how all of these goals could be achieved. She said that she preferred to focus on a more realistic assessment of what they could actually accomplish.

Ms. Firehock said that she did not want them to feel like the chapter was just a list of overly aspirational goals that could not be achieved. She said that she wanted them to focus on tasks that were attainable. She said that she did not have specific suggestions for removal at the moment, but it occurred to her that the chapter seemed to be based on an ideal world where all objectives were accomplished, particularly in the area of affordable housing. She said that being overly optimistic could do a disservice by setting unrealistic expectations. She said that they should critically evaluate which goals could be achieved through actionable policies and include them in the final chapter, while removing those that were not feasible.

Mr. Missel said that regarding funding, he had not found any information on this topic within the report. He said that funding should be based on substantial County strategies that built upon each other. He said that it may not be that next year there is a $50 million fund for affordable housing, but there should be a goal attached to a funding initiative that can be developed over the years.

He said that in examining Northern Virginia and other areas, it was clear that the commitment of localities was strong; however, if they did not intentionally grow and develop these strategies, they would not achieve anything beyond aspirational goals.

Mr. Moore said that while they spoke about this, he could not help but think of his experience in community radio. He said that during their pledge drives on air, they set a specific target for listeners to raise within a certain time frame, but then he would tell the host a different, more achievable goal to reach. He said that his point was that having achievable goals and stretch goals may be the way to address the issue of affordable housing, which consistently ranked as the number one concern in surveys, engagement sessions, and community discussions. He said that they had a significant amount of wealth within their community to take action on this matter; however, they may lack the political will.

Mr. Moore said that they possessed a history of investing in public goods or things deemed essential by the Board of Supervisors. He said that they recently acquired a large tract of land around Rivanna Station to support the military-industrial complex. He said that while there were valid reasons for such actions, he said that they could apply similar strategies to other areas.

Ben Holt, Long Range Planning Team, said that a strong economy was a vital component of a thriving and prosperous community. He said that the County's Economic Development Office continued to utilize Project Enable, adopted in 2019, as a guide for economic development within the County. He said that strategies included support for target industries, primary businesses, as well as recruitment and retention of businesses of all sizes. He said that strategic partnerships were utilized for business support and workforce development, and economic development overlapped with many other planned topics, such as transportation, housing, and land use.

Mr. Holt said that community input themes for economic development echoed many of the priorities within the draft goals and objectives of Project Enable. He said that these included continued support for target industries, reduced barriers for development related to economic uses, support for reuse and infill within development areas, desired commercial and business tax reduction, improved job training and workforce development, access to jobs, career growth, and livable wages, improved transit and multimodal connections to employment areas, support for employment and commercial uses within activity centers, and adaptive reuse within our crossroads communities.

Mr. Holt said that four goals for economic development focused on leading the growth of target industries and primary businesses, supporting job creation and employment opportunities, supporting small businesses and entrepreneurs, and promoting career pathways and workforce development. He said that goal one would continue its primary focus on leading growth for target industries and primary businesses by emphasizing employment uses within the development areas. He said that objectives included ensuring that available land was suitable for business and industry, maintaining a supply of appropriately zoned land, reducing barriers to growth and development, utilizing available infrastructure, and employing an efficient manager. He said that infill and redevelopment, particularly within activity centers, would be encouraged.

Mr. Holt said that goal two, focused on job creation and employment opportunities, included objectives that utilized Project Enable guidance for complementary land uses adjacent to Rivanna Station, leveraged strategic partnerships, promoted environmentally sustainable practices, expanded and retained businesses, and supported tourism that leveraged historic, scenic, and cultural resources within the County.

Mr. Holt said that goal three, supporting startups, small businesses, and entrepreneurs, included objectives for providing workspace, guiding business establishment, and assisting entrepreneurs with necessary resources. He said that goal four, focused on supporting career pathways and economic mobility, included objectives that leveraged a range of partnerships to provide career development and training, as well as promoting workforce participation through aspects such as affordable housing, transportation options, child-care, and broadband availability. He said that the connection to the existing comprehensive plan involved continued support for targeted industries in primary businesses generating revenue for the local economy.

Mr. Holt said that aspects included support for small businesses and entrepreneurs, workforce development, and effective utilization of areas for employment uses while maintaining a supply of adequately zoned land. He said that the questionnaire responses suggested enhancing infill and redevelopment by utilizing shared workspaces, partnerships between local schools and employers, leveraging non-profits for workforce support, addressing school overcrowding and performance to enhance the community profile and employment retention.

Mr. Holt said that there was a noted desire for commensurate support for both businesses and affordable housing without allowing one or the other to lag behind. He said that one individual expressed concern that emphasizing reduced restrictions and development density could be detrimental to community character. He said that the recent virtual open house feedback suggested continued support for target industries, regularly updating these targets based on market conditions, providing opportunities to live, work, and play in the County, enhanced incentives for local businesses that build community character, exploring different models for business support, and better utilization of adaptive reuse and infill.

Mr. Murray said that in their previous discussion, one topic raised was the recreation economy in the County. He said that a considerable number of visitors came here for activities such as running races and hiking, enroute to Shenandoah National Park. He said that although objective 2.6 mentioned tourism, he did not notice any reference to this recreation aspect and wondered if it could be more explicitly mentioned.

Mr. Bivins said that the data focused on economic development and measures all the relevant aspects. He said that the data set started in 2010 and ended in 2021. He said that it was unclear whether these were separate data sets or an accumulation of data over time. He said that not presenting a comprehensive data set, including pre-pandemic, post-pandemic, and current economic turmoil, did not serve the staff well.

Mr. Bivins said that instead of focusing on historical data, it would be more beneficial to have a future outlook in the data. He said that obtaining a data set that provided a richer perspective by incorporating future projections would be helpful.

Mr. Bivins said that he believed these goals were appropriate, as he had a market-driven perspective. He said that with 95% of the landmass classified as rural, they should consider whether it can be an economic driver. He said that as the County had been named one of the best wine regions, they must find a way to capitalize on this success without undermining their rural identity. He said that to achieve this, he recommended reevaluating the targeted industries and considering those that can create a multiplier effect in the region.

Mr. Bivins said that they should consider whether these were still the desired target industries,

since Project Enable had aged. He said that knowing what these industries looked like now and which ones they should focus on to support their comprehensive plan was helpful. He said that as they merged into a new comprehensive plan, he suggested refining their targeted industries to see if they complemented each other.

Mr. Missel said that having lived in the County for 35 years, it had been fascinating to observe the transformation from a focus on preventing economic development to actively seeking ways to promote it. He said that as they considered their next steps, addressing staffing and resource allocation was crucial. He said that while browsing the County's economic development website, there were two local grant opportunities. He said that exploring additional grant opportunities or partnerships could be a valuable goal for them to pursue.

Mr. Missel said that housing was important. He said that they all said that housing and transportation must go together. He said that as they examined zoning packages coming their way, they should consider what constituted a full package, particularly in terms of mixed-use development opportunities. He said that he was encouraged to see the availability of a grant for building reuse. He suggested thinking about building reuse within the area as well.

Mr. Missel said that staff mentioned a link to a grant opportunity tied to infrastructure and SMART SCALE. He said that achieving tier five status can actually provide points toward achieving at SMART SCALE. He said that economic development initiatives focused on ready sites had proven to be an effective way of leveraging grant opportunities. He said that the local tourism industry played a significant role in generating income for the County. He said that it was essential to consider partnerships with organizations such as the Charlottesville Area Tourism Industry to further develop the sector.

Ms. Firehock said that they had focused on larger firms. She said that most businesses that start up in the state were small businesses. She said that it was crucial not to overlook the collective impact of these small enterprises. She said that currently there was limited support for new startups in the County. She suggested linking affordable housing with attracting businesses. She said that for instance, she recently hired three new employees at her local firm, but none of them could afford to buy a house in their County.

Ms. Firehock said that she wanted them to recognize that many small businesses required suitable space and explore the possibility of assisting with retrofitting existing buildings, such as former gyms, recording studios, or retail spaces, which had unique configurations that could be costly to adapt for small businesses. She said that in the past, there was a lack of support for converting commercial stock into what was needed at the time. She said that more assistance from the County was required to help small businesses, startups, and similar ventures. She said it was essential to link the affordable housing chapter with this section because the ability to hire employees and attract businesses depended on whether they could afford to live in the area.

Mr. Murray said that objective 3.1 emphasized promoting support for diverse spaces suitable for businesses of all sizes to operate. He said that it was not just about providing spaces but also ensuring their affordability. He said that for instance, when discussing affordable housing, they must consider the affordability of locations for starting a business as well. He said that if a space was available but unaffordable, it did not benefit anyone. He said that affordability was a crucial factor to consider.

Mr. Murray said that the history of Crozet highlighted the importance of community development,

where people can live, work, and engage in sustainable business practices. He said that when discussing sustainable practices that promote the climate action plan and resilience planning, being able to live and work in the same place was crucial. He said that it was essential to reach a point where people in Crozet did not have to commute from Crozet to Charlottesville for work. He said that recognizing the different expectations for land use in the development area and rural areas was important, as it highlighted that sustainable uses existed in rural areas for the economy, not just open spaces. He said that more could be done, and opportunities may lie within the action items to achieve this goal.

Mr. Moore said that the ready-to-go land, rated four or five, seemed to be a significant need from their representative, as there were not many of those available. He said that it was great to see this included in sections 1.1 and 1.2, and they could even consider strengthening the language on these sections if desired. He said that concerning goal four, the County would promote opportunities for upward economic mobility, but it did not discuss unionization or workers' rights. He said that workers gain power and economic security through organized labor, and he recommended providing resources to help them understand their rights and organize effectively. He said that as someone coming from a labor-focused perspective, he believed this should be an integral part of their goals.

Mr. Clayborne said that the word "equity" did not appear in any of the goals and objectives mentioned. He said that this topic could be an opportunity to discuss whether certain groups or communities required more resources than others due to various factors. He said that the equity aspect, which focused on fairness and addressing disparities, did not appear to be addressed in these goals. He said that goal four caught his attention as it emphasized the foundation of a healthy community by promoting upward economic mobility and entrepreneurship.

Mr. Clayborne said that as they developed action plans and strategies, he believed that it was essential to remember that this was a highly educated community with a university present. He said that they should not overlook non-traditional pathways for achieving upward mobility. He said that they had a highly regarded community college and various trade schools available to students. He said that as an example, he recently attended a meeting with several CEOs from some of the largest general contracting firms in the country. He said that a way they recruited children in elementary school was by claiming that they could make $1.50 a minute by working for them. He said that the trades should not be overlooked as a viable career path.

Mr. Clayborne said that starting the education process early was important for addressing goal four, which encompassed topics such as upward mobility, safe housing, job training, and career ladders. He said that discussing these concepts at an elementary school level could help lay a strong foundation for future success. He said that it was crucial not to lose sight of these fundamental aspects as they delved deeper into discussions on economic development.

Mr. Bivins said that in various community activities he participated in, one primary focus was ensuring they had an educated populace. He said that this did not mean obtaining numerous degrees; rather, it meant providing individuals with options for lucrative careers that did not require extensive education or pursuing higher learning when they felt ready. He said that if they aimed to assist the EDA office and its clients, they must understand that they could provide employment opportunities beyond CEO positions.

Mr. Bivins said that the County needed people who can come to work on a daily basis and perform tasks that aligned with the goals for growth within the County. He said that was why they required

high schools like Center One and Center Two, which aimed to provide an alternative path for young individuals to consider their futures without leaving the City. He said that the EDA and staff should consider what would happen when Barnes Lumber Plaza became operational.

Mr. Bivins said that when North Fork came online, staff should explore opportunities to collaborate with the EDA in creating a hub of activity. He said they were working with people to bring jobs to places seeking special use permits for ZMAs. He said that this was the integration he hoped they would achieve through their efforts in updating the comprehensive plan. He said that it required a cohesive approach across multiple chapters rather than focusing on just one aspect of the community.

Mr. Missel said that he was aware of initiatives and partnerships underway with the University of Virginia and the County. He said that these involved training, education, engineering, architecture opportunities, among others. He said that UVA often focused on sending out its students; however, there were also opportunities for them to partner within. He said that regarding both initiatives, it would be interesting to include a section or sentence in the discussions that highlighted how the Planning Commission could assist them. He said that this could involve considering ways the Planning Commission could help during the implementation phase of the comprehensive plan, without focusing solely on next steps for the plan itself.

Mr. Murray said that Commissioner Bivens discussed the significance of aging in place, emphasizing its increasing importance as individuals continued their careers without retiring. He said that while it was possible to adapt to a new career path when young, transitioning to different roles became more challenging as one aged. He said that many acquaintances of his, who were once engaged in landscaping, had to change professions due to health issues such as arthritis. He said that providing opportunities for individuals to transition into various roles as they aged was crucial.

Mr. Holt said that in the final round of sharing Phase Two draft plan recommendations, land use, transportation, and community facilities would be included. He said that the upcoming work session with the Planning Commission was scheduled for December 19. He said that staff was considering splitting these topics to hold a second work session in early 2024, which would provide more time for community and Commission input. He said that discussing more detailed topic content at the first work session would include land use category updates, draft multimodal planning, and locations for activity centers and employment districts. He said that the second session would present the draft goals and objectives for these topics.

Mr. Holt said that following the Planning Commission work sessions in early 2024, the Board would hold either one or two work sessions to cover all draft goals and objectives. He said that in phase three, early next year, action steps would be drafted and shared, including prioritizing recommendations and incorporating metrics where applicable and possible for enhanced tracking of plan targets.

Mr. Missel said that one of the things that came up was the integration of various aspects, as they were not siloed. He said that as they thought through transportation, community facilities, and land use, they should be able to discuss how these elements were connected.

Mr. Holt said that refining the chapters was a significant part of the conversation. He said that they planned to use cross referencing.

Mr. Clayborne said that climate and equity should be included within the chapters. He said that the success of the document lay in its ability to incorporate all these elements collectively.

Public Hearings

AFD202300001 Evans Kinloch District Addition

Scott Clark, Conservation Program Manager, said that the item was a proposed addition to the agricultural and forestal district. He said that the agricultural and forestal districts were voluntary conservation programs in many counties across the state. He said that there were approximately 900 parcels and 68,000 acres in rural areas participating in this program.

Mr. Clark said that these districts were enabled by state code and had four primary goals: production of food and other forestal products, protection of open spaces, maintenance of a strong agricultural and forestal economy, and preservation of natural resources. He said that the goals were established by both the state ordinance and their County code for what these districts aimed to achieve.

Mr. Clark said that unlike conservation easements, these districts were not permanent, and they operated in cycles, with each district being reviewed every 10 years for its viability. He said that upon review, a district may continue or restart as necessary.

Mr. Clark said that in general, the districts functioned by preventing development to more intensive uses. He said that the ordinance, specifically chapter three, provided a comprehensive list of what qualified and did not qualify as development to more intensive use for this program. He said that primarily, they affected subdivision matters. He said that these districts established higher review standards for rural area uses permitted by special use permit. He said that additional scrutiny was provided to a special use permit situated within or adjacent to one of these districts. He said that for landowners and properties dedicated to preserving agriculture and forestry, there were limitations on the state's ability to seize such land for projects like road construction due to the commitment to maintaining the land for productive rural uses.

Mr. Clark said that the impact of these districts was on subdivisions. He said that in 1980, when this ordinance was adopted, two tiers of development were created within the rural area zoning district. He said that the minimum lot size for the district was 21 acres; however, there was an exception. He said that smaller lots, ranging from two to 21 acres, were also established as part of this one-time grant.

Mr. Clark said that each parcel that existed in December of 1980 was given five rights to smaller lots. He said that these rights must be tracked over time, as they were valuable commodities. He said that the agricultural-forestal districts affected this pattern of subdivision by prohibiting smaller lots, except for family subdivisions or transfers within the family. He said that the 21-acre lots were permitted in these districts; however, the smaller lots could only occur under specific circumstances.

Mr. Clark said that to hold land within the agricultural district, one must have already owned it for at least four years, and the family member receiving the land must maintain ownership for a minimum of four years after transfer. He said that this was the only exception to the rule. He said that the primary impact of these districts lay in this limitation on subdivision. He said that other matters, such as increased scrutiny for special uses, also contributed to the overall effect.

James Fulcher, Natural Resources Planner, said that they received an application earlier this year from Virginia Evans, which included parcel information and other details. He said that the location was indicated by the arrow, situated just north of Esmont on Turkey Sag Road. He said that staff reviewed the parcel based on its attributes. He said that one significant aspect they considered was the soil quality; they had identified important and prime soils on that property, which they believed were valuable to preserve moving forward. He said that this was nearly 26 acres.

Mr. Fulcher said that they considered the potential development without any protections on the land. He said that there were three unused development rights. He said that in October, they presented this before the Ag-Forestal Committee, who were supportive of it. He said that staff recommended approval.

Mr. Murray asked if they had conducted an analysis on the number of 21-acre subdivisions and family subdivisions that had taken place since the previous analysis was performed.

Mr. Clark said that he did not have an offhand answer. He said that the last time they conducted a family subdivision analysis was at least 10 years ago. He said that there had been a concern at the time that the program was being misused, as it was a simpler subdivision process and less expensive to go through. He said that the concern was that people were flipping the land by going through that process quickly. He said that he did not have an exact count for 21-acre lots across the County, but they could easily determine that.

Mr. Murray said that he was referring to specifically 21-acre subdivisions located in Ag-Forestal districts. He said that he was concerned since over time, the standards for family divisions had become more stringent. He said that many individuals may have shifted their focus from land use to Ag-Forestal districts. He said that it would be beneficial to determine if there had been an increase in the number of family subdivisions since the transition occurred.

Mr. Clark said that they could certainly do the research on this matter. He said that he would like to clarify a frequent point of confusion. He said that Ag-Forestal districts were a land conservation program and not a taxation program. He said that many people assumed that the primary reason for participating in this program was to qualify for the open space taxation rate; however, while many did, a significant number of individuals did not. He said that they conducted an analysis on the Batesville District and one adjacent to it, which revealed parcels in that district across various tax categories, not just the open space category.

Mr. Clark said that there was a wide variety of motivations among landowners in these districts, beyond potential tax benefits for those who qualified. He said that through his long-term conversations with them, he found that many joined these programs to reassure each other that they would not develop their lands. He said that this community aspect involved a shared desire to protect their properties and provide mutual reassurance. He said that the purpose of these programs extended beyond merely serving as a taxation qualification, encompassing a more complex and interconnected set of motivations.

Mr. Bivins clarified that if a property or parcel fell under an agricultural and forestal district with specific land use, then VDOT was unable to acquire the land for road improvements.

Mr. Clark said that he did not believe that widening the shoulder would become an issue. He said that it would become an issue if the land needed for the old Route29 bypass had been in a district. He said that according to his understanding of state laws, they would not have been able to take

that land for that purpose.

Mr. Bivins said that if they wanted to improve 600-level roads, they could not widen the roads. He said that this would become a new tamper for development.

Mr. Clark said that in the County, it appeared that this situation had never occurred, and it was unclear how frequently it had happened in other areas. He said that typically, when discussing the impact of Ag-Forestal districts on transportation projects, the focus was not on whether they could slightly widen their gravel road. He said that the question was whether construction was possible.

Mr. Bivins said that he was thinking about the 600 roads, particularly this one that led to a secret magical location. He said that no one was supposed to know about the existence of this hidden spot. He said that the road had an interesting layout; part of it was paved, then it turned into gravel as one approached the secret magical place. He said that on the other side of the location, the road became paved again.

Mr. Clark said that he believed that these districts did not significantly affect the level of roadwork.

Mr. Clayborne opened the hearing for public comment. He said that there was no one wishing to speak, so he closed the hearing to the public.

Mr. Bivins said that if they considered the 68,000 acres in comparison to the 464 acres within the County, this represented a 14% allocation for agriculture and forestal, while only 5% was designated for development. He said that they should leave it like that.

Mr. Murray motioned to recommend approval of AFD 202300001 Evans Kinloch District Addition. Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7 – 0). (Ms. Firehock was remote)

Recess

The Commission convened a 7 minute recess.

Public Hearings

ZMA202300004 Cornerstone Community Church

Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager, said that this item was a proposed rezoning involved changing the property from R1 residential to commercial use. She said that to orient them, the property was on Stony Point Road. She said that it was across from Riverside Village and adjoined commercial properties to the south. She said that residential areas with Wilton, Avemore, and Cascadian nearby were to the east, while Darden Towe and the Elks Lodge were directly to the north.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the next slide was an overview of the property's location and aerial view of the surrounding area, which had been developed with mixed-use properties like Riverside Village across the street. She said that County park land now existed along the southern edge of the property, and there was a stream buffer. She said that there were three existing structures: a garage storage building, an existing home, and a carport. She said that currently, there were two existing entrances, but only one entrance would be proposed when the property developed.

Ms. Ragsdale said that one of the other existing conditions to discuss that evening was the limits of the floodplain when the rezoning for this property was proposed in the past. She said that at that time, the floodplain line was shown in red on their official maps. She said that the parcel was outlined in a pie shape. She said that however, these were changing or anticipated to change with new FEMA mapping. She said that this property would not actually be within the floodplain, but the 100-foot stream buffer for the stream would remain in place.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the property was zoned R1, surrounded by commercial and residential areas in brown. She said that the dark green area represented the mixed-use development, Riverside Village, which had up to 36,000 square feet of commercial space that was approved and located along the road. She said that with recent history in mind, a minimum and maximum were established for this area. She said that the maximum remained unchanged, but the minimum was reduced.

Ms. Ragsdale said that this proposal involved a 3.5-acre parcel where the applicants intended to initially use the space for religious assembly seating up to 300 people, and may also consider other commercial uses in the future. She said that there were some setback issues that would be discussed and outlined in the report. She said that the next slide depicted the Pantops master plan, and indicated that the portion highlighted in orange represented urban density residential areas, which anticipated non-residential uses as well.

Ms. Ragsdale clarified that this designation was the same as Riverside Village across the way. She noted that the private open space, or green area, was not clearly visible in the legend, but followed the current limits of the floodplain. She said that the applicant likely had a number of illustrative slides and detailed information about their plans for using the site. She said that in the concept plan, a building envelope had been proposed in gray, which generally aligned with what they would develop on the property. She said that the existing buildings were visible beneath it.

Ms. Ragsdale said that along the edge of the gray area was the required 50-foot building setback line required in commercial districts. She said that currently, were several encroachments, and concurrent special exceptions had been granted to allow this structure to be as close as 28.5 feet from the property line.

Ms. Ragsdale said that another structure, at approximately 47.5 feet, also encroached on the setback area. She said that the setback for the other structure would be removed. She explained that the tan areas represented parking envelopes, while the green area was a 100-foot stream buffer with commitments for replanting and removing existing gravel.

Ms. Ragsdale mentioned that they had received considerable feedback regarding the site's potential development and uses, with concerns related to traffic and the types of establishments that may be built there. She provided a list of the types of uses that would be permitted, stating that these were consistent with the master plan and anticipated uses for non-residential areas in this location. She compared them to what was approved for Riverside Village and found them quite similar in terms of what is allowed by right.

Ms. Ragsdale stated that these proffers only applied to by-right uses and they did not limit special use permit uses. She said that potentially, this allowed not only religious assembly use but also other by-right options for the church. She said that for example, if the parcel remained R1, a

special use permit would be required specifically for religious assembly and another one for child daycare centers.
Ms. Ragsdale said that rezoning to commercial allowed those to be by right. She said that the commercial district also allowed residential uses by special use permit, providing additional options in terms of uses. She said that the initial application was reviewed, proposing 13,500 square feet of commercial uses in addition to the religious assembly use. She said that the initial trip generation data was provided, and there were no concerns regarding traffic or potential commercial uses. She said that they understood that religious assembly uses typically occurred during off-peak hours.

Ms. Ragsdale said that as indicated in the staff report, they supported the request, finding it consistent with the recommendations of the master plan and the character of the area, particularly with similar development across the street. She acknowledged the commercial development across the street and addressed the issues currently in place, such as setback encroachment. She said that the FEMA map had not officially changed, and she said that they would not support development or parking in the floodplain, which was a major issue with the prior rezoning.

Mr. Murray asked if Ms. Ragsdale had an explanation for the reasons the FEMA designation would change.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she was not an engineer, so she could not speak to the modeling behind it. She said that however, the County Engineer had reviewed this and did not anticipate any significant changes from the preliminary FEMA maps currently available. She said that an engineer representing the applicant may provide additional details on this matter.

Mr. Missel said that his question was the same. He said that he presumed that the reason must be due to the presence of the road, as it had not been updated since its construction.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there were also changes to the map, including the development of Riverside Village since the previous maps.

Mr. Missel said that he had one question that may be more appropriate for the applicant. He said that regarding the alignment mentioned as going down to one access point, he asked if it would align with the street across the way.

Ms. Ragsdale said that they anticipated that with the site plan.

Mr. Missel said that he did not notice anything in the plan that required it, but maybe that was not a rezoning issue.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she pointed out several issues where the necessary details would be included in the site plan, and she was satisfied with the current state of affairs. She said that the focus shifted from the concept plan, which required rezoning, to awaiting the site plan for further resolution.

Mr. McDermott said that typically, that was a requirement came from VDOT that they aligned those two. He said that this aspect would be assessed during the site plan stage.

Mr. Bivins said that in the narrative provided by the applicant, they mentioned using the house as a parsonage. He asked if it proceeded to C1, whether a residence would be permitted.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she turned to the Zoning Administrator because they had not yet addressed that question. She said there was a provision in the commercial districts for a dwelling if it was occupied by a caretaker or employee. She said that they would need to discuss this further.

Mr. Bivins said that if the residence operated as a parsonage, which was the home of a church employee such as a minister, then it should be acceptable in the commercial zoning district.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to gain some clarification for his own understanding. He asked if it was correct that a 20-foot buffer was acceptable for current residential use, but for commercial use, it was already included at 50 feet.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she could explain that in more detail. She said that there was a 50-foot setback for structures, and a 20-foot use buffer, also known as a screening area within the ordinance. She said that these measures would be implemented to ensure adequate distance and privacy. She said that the focus was on addressing setback encroachments.

Mr. Moore said that he understood, and that it was an existing building. He said that he remembered reading about a rezoning request for a childcare center in the area several years ago, which had been rejected. He asked what the reasoning for that ruling was.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there were several distinctions between this proposal and the previous one. She believed that there was more detail in this proposal and a greater analysis concerning the proffers and traffic analysis. She said that the floodplain was a significant factor in these matters. She noted that some items were left unaddressed when it reached the Board of Supervisors, such as the setback issue not being addressed when applying for the special exception.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had one question, which may also serve as public knowledge. He said that if he recalled correctly from the packet, there was a list of acceptable uses under C1 with some items struck out. He said that hypothetically speaking, if they assumed that the church receives a new building elsewhere and vacates it. He asked if Ms. Ragsdale could discuss the checks and balances in place if one of those uses, which were not stricken from the packet, becomes available. He asked what measures would be taken to address community displeasure with such a use.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the failure to eliminate the use could potentially allow it in the future if not checked out. She said that the proposal left some aspects undefined, particularly regarding a 300-seat church's specificity. She said that the concept plan had less detail than expected, providing flexibility for various uses. She said that since the community meeting and review of this rezoning, they had carefully considered the remaining items on the list and received feedback. She said that if there was uncertainty about other uses on the list, that would be the time for the public to express their concerns. She said that staff would then revisit the list with the applicant regarding proffers and concept plans before the public hearing with the Board.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Kendra Moon stated that she was representing Cornerstone Community Church with Line + Grade Engineering. She said that since 1933, Cornerstone had been in existence and currently

had over 100 members. She said that the church did not have a permanent home and they temporarily hosted their services at the Regal Cinemas movie theater. She said that tonight, they were there to discuss the rezoning of this property along Sony Point Road, where they were under contract. She said that this location was ideal because it featured existing infrastructure that could be utilized in the near term and renovated.

Ms. Moon said that also with the C1 rezoning, Cornerstone had the opportunity to expand and accommodate potential future partners who may assist in funding their growth. She said that they chose a rezoning over a special use permit to avoid returning in three years for revisions or a new permit. She said that the existing metal garage onsite would serve as the main church building in the near term, with plans to expand upon it. She said that the residence may be used as a parsonage in the short term. She said that the site was currently zoned R1.

Ms. Moon said that as they could see from the map, the surrounding uses were more intensive, including highway commercial and R10 to the rear. She said that it appeared out of place at present. She said that rezoning was inevitable for this site, particularly since the comprehensive plan designated it as urban density residential and it fell within a neighborhood service center. She said that they believed that the church use aligned with this classification, as it was considered a primary use in the urban density residential designation.

Ms. Moon said that it also allowed for other primary and secondary uses such as childcare, offices, and commercial activities. She said that it was also noteworthy that, as an urban density residential area, there remained potential for a special use permit up to R15 within this region or parcel. She said that the parks and green system, which occupied half of the site, would likely be adjusted in future comprehensive plans to only include the stream buffer. She said that this was due to its creation to protect sensitive environmental features like floodplains, and they anticipated that it would no longer be within the floodplain.

Ms. Moon said that in 2019, there was a rezoning application for a daycare, proposing to retain all existing structures onsite, including the parking area within the floodplain. She said that the main concern across the board was the floodplain, and traffic was also a concern due to peak traffic coinciding with rush hour. She said that a church's traffic impact was mostly on Sundays, making it less significant. She said that since the previous ZMA, FEMA had released a draft revision of their floodplain limits.

Ms. Moon explained that this update was based on new construction as well as increased accuracy in topography and modeling systems, however, FEMA remained conservative in their floodplain limits. She said that the current limit was shown on the map in red, while the pink area represented the actual elevation designated by FEMA from a field run survey. She said the draft floodplain limits were shown in blue. She said that they were expected to be adopted in 2024, but it was not certain.

Ms. Moon said that since the beginning of the application process, the onsite stream had been designated as perennial. She said that as a result, a 100-foot stream buffer had been implemented from the start. She said that the applicants were unaware of this condition and its impact on the usable area of the site. She said that recognizing the importance of the environment, they were not informed about it beforehand.

Ms. Moon said that there was a phase one immediate move-in plan and a Phase Two vision for the church and site's potential development. She said that parking had been initially planned in

this area but would now need to be considered elsewhere due to the changes. She mentioned that a special exception coincided with the application. She said that the applicants were no longer proposing to keep the carport and a portion of the garage, as they encroached on the R10 residential zone at the rear of the site.

Ms. Moon said that they proposed retaining these two buildings; one would be 2.5 feet into the 50-foot setback, while the other would be 21.5 feet away. She said that they did propose installing screening behind the garage building to minimize any negative effects on the neighboring residential property. She said that she would next discuss how the site could evolve in the future. She said that although they initially provided more specific concepts, they chose not to limit options by presenting only one idea. She said that the site's geometry, stream buffer, setbacks, and use buffer significantly restrict potential development.

Ms. Moon said that it was unlikely that the area would become densely built with ample parking, as they encountered during their research. She said that to address one of staff's questions, they proposed closing the northern entrance and maintaining the southern entrance in its current location, which aligned well with Riverside Village. She said that VDOT would ensure that that happened appropriately.

Ms. Moon said that she would briefly skip over the uses but would like to emphasize the importance of checks and balances. She indicated on the slide the entrance corridor, and the Architectural Review Board would have to review buildings. She acknowledged that there were some concerns in the community meeting regarding flashy vape shops; however, she believed the ARB would address these concerns as well as the regular site plan process, which required them to meet the County ordinance.

Ms. Moon said that the last proffer to discuss was stream buffer mitigation and they proposed replanting the stream buffer in areas where it had been disturbed. She said that it was a significant area. In the case of the proposed gravel parking lot removal, she said they would replant and address any other disturbances during the site plan process.

Ms. Moon added that a stream buffer mitigation plan must be developed for review by the County Engineer. She said that in summary, the church had been responsive to staff and community members, she said that they made changes as necessary to protect sensitive environmental features, remained consistent with the comprehensive plan, and ultimately provided a permanent church location for the congregation of 100 people or more.

Mr. Missel said that Ms. Moon had shown a few outdated concept plans. He said that he would like to know if there were any new concept plans.

Ms. Moon said that they had been working on some diagrams to ensure that the parking and buildings could be accommodated on the site. She said that however, she did not have any prepared for the presentation tonight.

Mr. Missel said that he had been thinking mostly about the constraints. He said that given that the site was so small when they took everything else out, he was curious as to whether he thought they could fit the necessary parking and have any green space left. He acknowledged that they already had a lot of green space.

Ms. Moon said that they made sure of that before moving forward with this.

Mr. Bivins said that he was directing his question to their counsel. He said that he would ask the client to examine the future use table and suggested revising it to better reflect the type of traffic generated by a church. He said that he believed the site would be difficult to see that a food and grocery store might be suitable for the space, given the current traffic situation. He said that another suggested one was visual and audio appliances, which he compared to a modern-day Best Buy. He said that that was number 13. He said that if they considered the constraints as a religious organization, their future use table would ideally restrict the property for other entities to have the same light footprint and traffic flow that the church might have. He said that there would not be a Sunday church service, but it could still have a minimal impact on the restricted area. He asked counsel if he had gone too far.

Mr. Herrick said that he was not suggesting that. He said that the uses, restrictions, and limitations that the applicant was willing to offer on those uses were part of a proffer. He said that it was obviously up to the applicant to offer what it wished through proffers. He said that certainly, it was appropriate for the Commission to state the impacts that were of concern to the Commission; however, ultimately it would be up to the applicant to decide what to include in its proffers and determine which uses it wished to proffer out.

Mr. Bivins said that he was considering the potential implications for those beyond them if the project were to proceed.

Mr. Clayborne opened the public hearing for public comment.

Kirk Bowers stated that he was a long-term resident of the area, having lived over 35 years within half a mile from the location in question. He said that his opposition to rezoning Parcel 078058KO was strong and based on the following context and historical perspective. He said that for many years, his family and he had lived, worked, and paid taxes within half a mile of this property's location, which was an area that had been home for half of his lifetime. He said that as a civil engineer with a professional license in land development and civil engineering. He said that he possessed a deep understanding of the process and requirements involved. He said that throughout his career, he had completed numerous projects in Northern Virginia and the Albemarle area.

Mr. Bowers said that when they moved to this area, the property was surrounded by woodlands and featured a driveway leading to a large, beautiful house that also housed a doctor's group office. He said that the house had been demolished, and the woods cleared. He said that they witnessed construction of Fontana, Cascadia, Wilton Farms, and other site development projects. He said that the changes were accepted as part of the Pantops Growth Area Development Plan, which constituted 5% of the reserved land for growth areas. He said that this was one of the few remaining parcels of land in this area, situated near the intersection of Route 250 and Route 20.

Mr. Bowers said that he urged the Planning Commission to recommend denying this rezoning application for the following reasons. He said that traffic had increased exponentially over the past 35 years. He said that the current traffic count at this location was an average annual daily traffic of 8,000 vehicles per day. He said that even on Sundays, there was a significant amount of traffic in this area as people traveled to Darden Towe Park for recreation and visited the various subdivisions located nearby. He said that the master plan for Pantops stated that it should contain small-scale mixed-use development patterns compatible with surrounding uses. He said that a

church at this location was not compatible with the surrounding areas. He said that a mixture of residential and commercial uses would better serve this property.
Mr. Bowers said that this would not disrupt the existing development pattern of the area. He said that parking on the site needed to be relocated as shown on the concept plan. He said that the current layout did not work effectively. He said that it was also too vague to make an informed decision based on what was presented. He said the property was too close to Route 20, as the property across the street, Riverside Village, was offset by at least 40 feet. He said that there has been considerable skepticism regarding the FEMA plan due to numerous changes in policy criteria over the years. He said that he was quite skeptical about these changes as well.

Dick Ruffin stated that he lived in Riverside Village in the Rivanna District, across the street from the subject property. He said that while he did serve as Chair of the Pantops Community Advisory Committee, which hosted a public meeting on Cornerstone's initial application, he was speaking tonight in a personal capacity. He said that many of those in the neighborhood would prefer to maintain the single residence with its R1 zoning that it had been for decades. He said that he acknowledged that this preference was not realistic given the vision in the Pantops master plan and the market dynamics in the area. He said that it was understandable but not practical to expect the property to remain undeveloped.

Mr. Ruffin said that given these factors, he said that it was inevitable that there would be development on this property. He said that the question, in his view, was not whether it would be developed, but what kind of development it would be. He said that among potential users, a community-oriented church could be as good an option as they might get. He said that a church was preferred over dense housing, high-traffic retail, a school, or crowded offices. He said that Cornerstone, which saw itself as a community builder, avowed a particular intention to reach out to the surrounding community and become an integral part of Pantops.

Mr. Ruffin said that he believed they should welcome such outreach and do what they could to encourage them to assist their ongoing efforts to create in Pantops a lively, diverse, pedestrian-friendly, and well-connected community. He said that it was not difficult to imagine that they might want, at some point, to help beautify the promenade along Free Bridge Lane. He said that for those who worried about traffic, he asked what could be better than a religious institution whose peak usage occurred when traffic was lowest. He said that it was true that some traffic would result from their proposed office space.

Mr. Ruffin said that however, given that most of the property would be dedicated to a space for worship, it was unlikely that community traffic would be as significant as it would be with most other options. He said that no doubt, lurking behind such concerns were unspoken fears that Cornerstone may not be able to meet whatever financial commitment it made to secure the property and would sell to another potential user. He said that a user taking advantage of C1 might then do things that the neighborhood would find objectionable. He said that theoretically, it was possible, but in his view, unlikely.

Mr. Ruffin said that considering this, Cornerstone, after several moves in recent years, deeply desired a permanent home. He said that it had every incentive to make it work. He said that their experience indicated that alternative users would be hard to come by. He said that it was evident from the Riverside Shops, which had only half the space rented after five years. He said that other areas, such as Cascade, had not shown any interest at all. He said that every option had risk, and Cornerstone was not exempt from risk, but he believed the Planning Commission should take the risk and recommend support for the application.

Richard Allen said that he resided in Riverside Village in the Rivanna District. He said that he wanted to address the potential consequences of Cornerstone moving on from this property. He said that he wanted to stand with Commissioner Clayborne's remarks at the beginning, where he expressed concern about considering uses beyond just a church for this site. He said that he was aware of the commercial pressure along Pantops and the numerous glitzy automobile sales options nearby. He said that this property was almost 14,000 square feet, which could eventually transform into an exclusive small and upscale commercial area. He said that his fear was that within five years, a small retail auto sales operation would be established adjacent to their residential neighborhoods of Wilton Farms and Riverside Village. He urged the Planning Commission to reject this proposal.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there were any other members of the public who wished to speak on this item. Seeing none, he asked the Clerk if there were any speakers signed up online who wished to comment.

Ms. Shaffer said there were none.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the applicant would like to give a brief response to the public comment.

Ms. Moon said that she appreciated everyone who spoke. She said that she would speak to the fact that while they understood the concern for future uses, specifically they had made efforts to exclude any facilities that were out of scale or not walkable. She said that this site would inherently limit the size of a facility that could be constructed on it. She said that they had specifically excluded automobile service stations and truck repair shops, ensuring that small auto shops would not be seen in the area.

Mr. Clayborne closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Commission.

Mr. Moore asked for clarification regarding the staff's response about the permitted exclusions for uses within the C1 zoning. He asked staff to reiterate these exclusions. He asked if the church were to sell in the future, those profit exclusions would still apply.

Ms. Ragsdale said yes, those ran with the land.

Mr. Murray asked what would occur if the newly released FEMA maps did not align with the flood plan.

Ms. Ragsdale said that if approved, they could develop according to the concept plan they provided, which might leave some parking area in the floodplain, an issue she would not encourage. She said that this, as she mentioned earlier, was something that remained unaddressed as a concern.

Mr. Murray said that he understood that in the past, FEMA had occasionally underestimated the extent of flooding. He said that for example, there had been instances where the area experienced flooding despite FEMA's predictions, such as at Free Bridge Auto. He expressed his concern about receiving reassurance that the floodplain was not a floodplain.

Mr. Missel said that he shared the question about FEMA but also believed that, if understood correctly, regardless of the end result as to whether the maps change or not, it would supersede their ability to develop. He asked if this understanding was accurate.
Ms. Ragsdale said that the parking was permitted in the floodplain, but it did not allow for overnight parking. She said that the concept plan aimed to decrease the area designated for parking. She said that no habitable structures were allowed within the floodplain.

Mr. Missel said that he had generally looked at both the positives and negatives of the situation. He expressed his concern about FEMA and the draft proposal, specifically whether they were relying on it too heavily. He said that eventually, it would be superseded by law. He said that there was no concept plan provided, although Ms. Ragsdale referred to a concept plan. He asked if she was referring to a concept plan or the site development plan.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the terminology used by staff was concept plan, but in terms of how the applicant had labeled it, it was the plan. She said that the major element of the plan involved the building envelopes. She said that considering all factors such as property and ordinance regulations, they determined there were no concerns beyond this type of plan for this specific site.

Mr. Missel said that with the positive aspects, he acknowledged the limitations of the site. He said that its surrounding area was part of the Pantops Master Plan. He said that it was a constrained site with specific requirements from the ARB as street trees and site planting for tree canopy coverage within the development and parking areas. He said that there would be access control to be determined by VDOT, and was not something that the applicant could easily bypass. He noted that stormwater management must be considered, as if the entire parcel was paved, it would be necessary to find a way to handle runoff. He said he would support this application as presented.

Mr. Bivins said that he had been waiting for this property to turn over, because it felt to him that the area had evolved past the single-family home there. He said that he had been expecting something to happen there. He said that he was on the Commission when an applicant came through about the daycare center there. He said that there were a whole host of things that he thought were not appropriately addressed when that application came through.

Mr. Bivins said that balancing the use on this property for it to be primarily a Sunday-focused or even Wednesday, if they had midweek Bible study, was something that he was quite willing to accept and quite supportive of. He said that however, he suggested that the applicant look at those uses being proffered and see if those uses aligned with such a constrained piece of property. He said that the proposal for the development of the area might send the signal that they were trying to find a structure when lots of churches were looking to get out of their structures.

Mr. Bivins said that the development would benefit those who could attend events by providing them with similar good conditions and seating within the community. He said that he supported the application. He said that he believed that establishing a car dealership in that location would be challenging due to its distance from the Pantops car center. He said that the largest car dealer in Charlottesville had closed its dealership on that corner and relocated. He said that it would be difficult to place a car lot there. He said that therefore, he was in favor of the plan and believed that using the site for a church or limited use facility was an appropriate application.

Ms. Firehock said that she was in support of the site concept plan. She acknowledged that it did not have all the details they would like but believed that it met their statute for what was required.

She said that she was not concerned with the commercial building encroaching into the buffer because that building was already there. She said that the changing of the use and zoning made it an encroaching structure, and it was already there. She said that it seemed that the new design would be less impactful than what was currently present. She said that she was in support of it.

Mr. Clayborne said that when he initially reviewed the matter, he struggled with it. He said that it was often the case that when listing items, one may forget something. He said that after discussing the context of the situation across the street and considering the vacancies present there, such as at the restaurant nearby, where it still did not seem as bustling on weekends as he would expect. He said that taking this into account, along with the site constraints, he had shifted his position to support the proposal. He said that in his view, the potential benefits outweighed the risks in this instance, so he was in overall support of the application.

Mr. Bivins stated that the Commission was not addressing the exceptions. He said that although they had been informed about the exceptions, their task was not to rule on them; instead, this responsibility would be left to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Herrick said that special exceptions are for the Board of Supervisors to consider. He said that typically, the Commission had not made recommendations on special exceptions, however it could if it chose to do so.

Mr. Missel moved the Planning Commission to recommend approval of ZMA202300004 Cornerstone Community Church for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Committee Reports

Mr. Murray said that Mr. McDermott joined him at the Crozet CAC to discuss transportation with the community. He said that they had a lively discussion about the transportation priorities based on the cost of constructing a key road through Crozet. He said that the bridge for this road would be significantly more expensive than initially anticipated, making it infeasible in the short term. He said that this been discussed before and raised concerns within the community. He said that there were also concerns about sidewalks on parks and safety at intersections with Route 240 and Route 250, around the location of Miller School.

Mr. Murray said that additionally, Mr. McDermott presented the multimodal plan for Crozet that focused on pedestrian, cycling, and alternative traffic connections in the area. He said that there were many excellent suggestions regarding the map of Crozet which proposed adding more spokes leading out from the area, such as Jarman's Gap. He said that many people traveled from Crozet to the orchard and accessed the national park through this route. He said that there were also other trail networks and features in the area, including the Three Notch’d Trail and Route 76. He said that when planning improvements, it was essential to think about how to expand the connections while remaining realistic. He said that some pedestrian connections may be more aspirational than practical, so prioritizing those that were likely to be made was crucial.

Ms. Shaffer informed the Commission that Ms. Firehock had communicated to her that she did not have a committee report.

Mr. Bivins said that they had their CAC meeting for Hydraulic 29 last night. He said that David Benish presented Phase 3 of AC44, which was both interesting and informative for everyone

involved. He said that the prioritization of action steps was emphasized during the presentation, and engaging with this aspect of their work proved to be quite helpful. He said that Mr. Benish did an excellent job, but he noted that the presentation was a little bit too long.

Mr. Missel said that he would bring up one point of interest as it might be relevant; however, he would not attend the event. He said that this Thursday would be the meeting of the 5th and Avon Street CAC to discuss two items. He said that one was the Granger development, which had returned for review. He said that he was unsure if everyone was familiar with its location, but it was situated behind Fontaine Research Park. He said that they planned to rezone approximately 70 acres from R1 to PRD, allowing for a mix of single-family detached and attached houses at a net density of six dwelling units per acre. He said that Stribling Avenue was a connection to the area, so it would be interesting to see how that all worked.

Mr. Murray said that he had had great interest in that area because it was currently a greenway. He said that it was highly used by runners and contained wetlands. He mentioned that there had been disputes regarding whether or not they were natural wetlands in this area, which he could confirm were indeed natural due to the existing flora. He said that the Rivanna Trail passed through this area as well. He said that this location held significant interest for him, being on the border of both the City and County.

Mr. Missel said that there was also access with the railroad track being present. He said that there was quite a bit of interest in this, so it should have been intriguing to see. He said that the second item he wanted to announce involved a Biscuit Run stream restoration project. He said that this would be undertaken by the CAC, so eventually, it would arrive at the Planning Commission.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: November 1, 2023

Mr. McDermott said that at the November 1, 2023 meeting, the public hearing was held for the Covenant School tennis courts, which the Commission had seen and recommended approval for after a thorough discussion. He said that the applicants addressed many of the concerns raised by the PC, including additional screening, changes to the layout, and lighting concerns. He said that as a result, the Board unanimously approved the project, with strong support due to the comprehensive response to the comments provided by the PC. He said that this was the only public hearing at that meeting.

AC44 Update

Mr. Clayborne noted that the Commission had discussed AC44 at their work session held earlier in the day. He asked if there was anything else that Mr. McDermott would like to add regarding this item.

Mr. McDermott said no, but he would clarify that presentations Commissioner Murray and Commissioner Bivins were discussing were the same presentation, and they would be going to every one of the CACs. He said that the CAC audience directed it a little bit, and Commissioner Murray's presentation focused on the transportation elements, but it was primarily regarding the multimodal transportation plan and land use changes. He said that they were doing these specific to each CAC area. He said that in Crozet, they discussed how those affected the Crozet area. He said that then, they went to the Hydraulic Places 29 CAC and talked about that. He said that they would be doing it at the other CACs over the next three weeks, so Commissioners would see the presentation at their own CAC.

New Business

Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors Joint Work Session – Affordable Housing and Development Incentives, Scheduled for December 4, 1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Mr. Clayborne asked Mr. McDermott if this joint work session would be happening in their current building.

Mr. McDermott said that it was not. He said that he had sent out a revised invitation stating that it would instead be held at North Fork. He said that a room has been reserved at the North Fork facility to accommodate the large crowd, which would not only include members of both the Planning Commission and the Board, but also representatives from one of the local housing organizations. He said that he would follow up with all of the Commissioners to ensure they were prepared. He said that some materials containing a substantial amount of background information would be sent out likely early next week. He said that everyone should review the material before the discussion, which would also be sent likely early next week regarding housing.

Albemarle Planning Commission/Charlottesville Planning Commission Joint Meeting

Mr. Clayborne asked if there was any further information regarding this meeting.

Mr. McDermott said no, he still needed to schedule a meeting between the Chair and Vice Chair. He said that he would be working to get something scheduled in the early new year for that joint meeting.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had one final point to add, which they should not have a deep discussion about tonight but could place a marker on this topic for future reference. He said that similar to previous niche presentations, such as economic development, they should plan to explore other topics in their workflow. He said that he recalled discussing utilities, specifically the water sewer authority, and possibly transportation. He said that his idea was to have subject matter experts provide presentations to facilitate more informed and engaging discussions. He said that before the next meeting, he would like staff to collaborate with him to identify suitable presentations for these topics and put them on the agenda to track it.

Old Business

Mr. Clayborne said that he would like to extend a warm welcome back to the Planning Commission Clerk Carolyn Shaffer, and stated that it was truly delightful to see her in person with her radiant smile. He said that they had certainly missed her presence.

Items for follow-up

There were none.

Adjournment

At 8:44 p.m., the Commission adjourned to November 28, 2023, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium.

_____

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:
Initials: