Albemarle County Planning Commission
Draft Minutes Work Session and Regular Meeting
March 12, 2024

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, March 12, 2024, at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Fred Missel, Chair; Julian Bivins; Corey Clayborne; Nathan Moore; Lonnie Murray

Members absent: Luis Carrazana, Vice-Chair; Karen Firehock

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

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Missel established a quorum.

Mr. Clayborne motioned the Planning Commission amend the agenda to put Item 2, Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public, to precede Item 5, Public Hearings. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bivins and passed unanimously (5-0). (Mr. Carrazana and Ms. Firehock were absent.)

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda From the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Clayborne motioned the Planning Commission adopt the consent agenda, which was seconded by Mr. Bivins. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Work Session

a. CPA202100002 AC44 Goals and Objectives for Rural Area Land Use and Transportation

Mr. Missel said that during their previous meetings, they did not allow public comment in their work sessions due to numerous other opportunities for public input. He said that however, they made an exception last time, which took about 30 minutes of their time. He said that meant that they have added another work session this week to ensure thorough discussion and to avoid taking time away from their staff discussions. He said that he encouraged everyone to continue sharing their thoughts via email or directly with staff. He said that over the past six months, there have been several public comment opportunities for this specific topic, and there would continue to be more in the future.

Mr. Missel said that today's primary focus would be on rural area transportation, crossroads communities, and community resilience hubs, as well as rural interstate interchanges. He said that they would commit to dedicating 35 minutes for the rural area transportation topic and goals discussion. He said that last week, they covered rural area land use topics. He said that in phase three, they would see these goals and objectives with several action steps attached. He said that at this point, they were not providing input on action items; they were providing input on goals and objectives.

Tori Kanellopoulos, Principal Planner, said that this work session would be discussing draft goals and objectives for rural area land use and transportation. She said that this session was a continuation of the February 27 work session on the same topic. She said that they had not made any changes to the draft goals and objectives yet but would incorporate the Commission's feedback from both work sessions and comments received via email after holding the upcoming work session with the Board on March 20th.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the purpose of this work session was to receive Planning Commission feedback on draft goals and objectives for rural area land use, particularly focusing on the following topics: how to

proceed with crossroads communities, identifying appropriate land uses that support surrounding rural area community members in the rural area, to be further discussed in Phase 3, and how the comp plan should consider and prioritize opportunities for transit, walking, and biking in the rural area.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that as they finalized the goals and objectives, they must ensure that these higher-level plan recommendations were in the right direction before drafting implementation steps. She said that they wanted to note that they heard the Commission's interest in updated data for this chapter at the last work session, and they would return with updated information and presentations as they moved into Phase 3. She said that updated data and information would also be used to inform drafting action steps, and continually monitoring and updating data would be an important way to track plan progress after the plan was adopted.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that after this work session, they would summarize the Commission's feedback and share it with the Board at the upcoming March 20 work session. She said that they would like to highlight the rural area priorities that they had heard during the comp plan update process and were incorporating into the rural area chapter. She said that many of these priorities were consistent with the current comp plan, emphasizing the protection of the natural environment and providing usable land for agriculture and forestry.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the AC44 team had been hearing a need to consider appropriate and feasible land uses and multimodal transportation options for rural area community members, as approximately 45% of the County's population lived in rural areas. She said that they required the Commission's and Board's feedback on land use and transportation topics where there was less consensus before proceeding with action steps.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that during the last work session, there was a need for clarity around rural area land use goals. She said that while they had not yet entered Phase 3 of AC44, they had begun discussing ways that goals and objectives could be implemented. She said that they wanted to provide a high-level overview of general implementation measures that could support each land use goal.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the primary purpose of the first goal was to identify and protect the primary features of the rural area, reducing subdivision of rural land to maintain a land base for agriculture and forestry, reduce habitat loss and fragmentation, and avoid low-density development impacts and expenditures. She said that potential implementation measures included updating the County's land conservation programs, revising zoning and subdivision ordinances, implementing the stream health initiative, and developing a rural area plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the second goal focused on economic development in the rural area, concentrating on agriculture and forestry while supporting local food systems and sustainable agricultural practices. She said that implementation could involve local partnerships, County land conservation programs, updating zoning and subdivision ordinances, which overlapped with the first goal, and promoting proactive planning for areas with by-right non-rural development potential based on existing zoning.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the third goal addressed community resilience by increasing resilience and providing equitable access to resources and services in the rural area. She said that this goal had significant overlap with the community facilities chapter. She said that implementation strategies included resilience hubs, local partnerships, adaptive reuse of historic structures, and small area planning for future development. She said that this was one of the areas where they sought the Commission's direction on how to proceed.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the fourth goal involved proactive planning for areas with by-right non-rural development potential based on existing zoning, such as properties zoned light industrial or highway commercial. She said that the first objective was related to regional coordination, which was a carryover from the 2015 plan, primarily focusing on coordination with UVA-owned properties called areas A and B in

the rural area. She said that this would include locations such as Northridge Medical Center. She said that for objective 4.2, they focused on planning for Shadwell and Yancey Mills rural interstate interchanges.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the Commission and Board had previously directed the AC44 team in Phase 2 to incorporate recommendations for future small area plans for these two interchanges. She said that these plans should encompass recommended land uses, transportation connections and improvements, and other public infrastructure and utilities. She said that the commission prioritized completing a Shadwell small area plan first and emphasized not assuming future land uses in advance.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the feedback from the most recent work session overlapped with the community facilities chapter, allowing for cross-referencing of topics in the rural area chapter and providing more detailed action steps where necessary. She said that this included guidance for public water and sewer provision, broadband, community risk and resilience, including wildfire risk. She said that the AC44 team sought the Commission's feedback on rural area land use policy direction before drafting action steps while also addressing specific transportation questions.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the current comprehensive plan recommended land uses in rural areas for agriculture and forestry, supporting industries, and small-scale non-residential uses in crossroads communities. She said that the rural area zoning district aimed to preserve land for agriculture and forestry, protect water supply, limit service delivery, and safeguard natural environments and historic and scenic resources. She said that it allowed uses by right, including limited residential development, agriculture, forestry, fishery, farm winery and breweries, historic country stores, farm stands and farmers markets, and religious assemblies of less than 200 attendees.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that there was also a list of uses allowed by special use permit in the rural area, which included private community centers, private schools, daycare, non-historic country stores, public garages, and day camps. She said that currently, special use permits were granted for uses allowed in the district; however, these uses may not be suitable in every location and could necessitate mitigations such as hours of operation, noise, and lighting.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that some of these uses also had additional restrictions in rural areas. She said that for instance, rural area restaurants required approval by special use permit and must be located within a historic structure or site previously used for dining or be a non-conforming use previously approved. She said that the Commission was asked to consider four questions, two concerning land use and two regarding transportation. She said that they recommended that equal time be allocated for both topics since transportation was not addressed in the previous work session. She said that the commission may choose to answer one question at a time or provide combined responses for both questions simultaneously.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the purpose of the land use questions was to gather feedback from the commission regarding suitable land uses in rural areas and guidance for rural area communities. She said that this feedback would complement the input received from community members about allowing small-scale supportive uses in rural areas, prioritizing adaptive reuse of existing buildings. She said that they wanted to emphasize that protecting the natural environment and preserving rural land for agriculture and forestry remained priorities. She said that the Commission's input would be instrumental in guiding the ongoing zoning modernization project.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the first two questions were: should small-scale community-serving uses like doctors' and dentists' offices or professional offices be recommended for approval by special use permit in rural areas, specifically in locations with existing businesses and services and prioritizing adaptive reuse; and should the AC44 update focus more on developing crossroads communities or concentrate more on resilience hubs and adaptive reuse of historic structures for community-serving uses.

Mr. Murray said that at the last Natural Heritage Committee meeting, he proposed that if they wanted their rural area to remain rural, they must identify economically viable uses for that land that did not involve residential development. He said that over time, land would transition to its most profitable use, even if one

person chose not to use it for residential purposes. He said that therefore, in rural areas, they should focus on protecting existing uses rather than promoting new ones.

Mr. Murray said that they should identify and encourage uses that aligned with the goals and vision of a rural area, such as garden centers in places like Eltzroth and Thompson. He said that sustainable recreation, like campgrounds, could also be beneficial. He said that there was a need for accessible medical services in rural areas, which could be addressed by mobile units delivering medical care. He said that adaptive reuse of existing structures for essential services was another option. He said that however, these services must support their existing rural area and residents, not encourage further development.

Mr. Clayborne said that he believed that the short answer for him was yes, particularly in regards to locations such as doctors' and dentists' offices. He said that one question he would like to propose for further discussion with the Commission was: when examining crossroads communities that utilize the terms "essential public services" and "basic service needs," they must define what uses were considered essential or necessary. He said that he was convinced that it was possible to be rural without being desolate. He said that finding a balance between these two definitions was essential for discussion.

Mr. Bivins said that he agreed with the content of the first paragraph, which mentioned that rural doctor's offices existed in the past, providing medical care without requiring patients to visit large hospitals like the University of Virginia Hospital. He said that he found it beneficial to have human medical offices in rural areas where veterinary offices currently exist. He said that he supported this idea.

Mr. Bivins said that he did struggle with the notion that rural areas should only host businesses that directly supported those communities. He said that he questioned how wineries or wedding venues contributed significantly to local industries or citizens' activities. He said that he was trying to find a balance between these types of businesses and those that directly served rural residents' needs.

Mr. Bivins said that during their discussion that night about public garages, he would consider whether they benefited local car owners more than wineries or wedding venues did. He said that he was unsure what would be considered an allowable industry if they used that as a litmus test for rural area businesses. He said that in conclusion, he was supportive of the proposed initiatives for rural areas.

Mr. Moore said that Mr. Bivins made a good point. He said that considering the rural areas and their industries that faced opposition versus those that did not, he would note that people generally preferred picturesque landscapes over old cars. He said that this was often the deciding factor. He said that he supported facilities such as doctors' and dentists' offices in rural areas. He said that it would be preferable for pre-existing buildings to be repurposed for these services. He said that in areas where people resided, providing essential services was crucial for sustaining communities. He said that echoing Mr. Clayborne's statement, rural did not equate to remote; rural referred to population density in an area, where people still lived. He said that it was not synonymous with being in the middle of nowhere.

Mr. Missel asked how many questions there were in total.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that there were four in total.

Mr. Missel said that he would like to emphasize a few key points. He said that firstly, recognizing and protecting was undeniably crucial. He said that secondly, when considering compatibility, they must think beyond just the definition; location played a significant role in rural areas, particularly in places with existing businesses and services. He said that prioritizing adaptive reuse was essential in these situations. He said that he would refrain from stating his third point at this time.

Mr. Moore said that although they had discussed this topic in detail before, he found it somewhat unclear last time regarding the differences between a crossroads community and a resilience hub. He asked for a more detailed explanation before he offered his opinion.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that crossroads communities were rural areas that had traditionally or currently possessed businesses, services, and acted as gathering places for the community. She said that resilience hubs could be located within crossroads communities but did not have to be they could also be situated in development areas. She said that these hubs functioned similarly to Yancey Community Center, providing limited services such as classes and programming while also serving as emergency shelters. She said that they could support crossroads communities but remained distinct entities.

Mr. Missel said that he would like to request further clarification regarding that point. He said that there have been concerns raised by the community, and he wanted to understand if permitting two distinct yet potentially interconnected elements within a resilience hub implied recommending increased density or development in a rural area location, or if it involved considering existing uses that could be improved through complementary additions.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the intent of establishing a resilience hub would be to serve the existing community. She said that if there was a hub in a place where there was not much activity, it would not necessarily require additional hubs in that area. She said that instead, the need for a hub would have been identified in that specific location, leading them to place it there.

Mr. Moore said that resilience hubs were appreciated during their previous meeting, and he still believed they were an excellent idea. He said that these hubs represented public investment in making rural areas more resilient during emergencies and providing essential services. He said that crossroads communities did not pose significant concerns for him. He said that establishing small businesses in these areas, such as country stores or community centers, could serve local residents and reduce car travel for safety and environmental reasons. He said that he was open to this concept but acknowledged that details mattered in implementation.

Mr. Bivins said that he would like to discuss crossroad communities and resilience hubs. He said that for him, one aspect of this was not private-public investment. He said that when considering what would go into a resilience hub, he believed that the County should make an investment in such a facility. He said that in the event of a tragedy, weather condition, or one of those droughts experienced in previous years, this was a place where the County could ask people to come for certain services that would help alleviate the burden of that particular situation.

Mr. Bivins said that perhaps this happened at Yancey School or at the new recycling center in Keene, where the County could set up temporary facilities to provide water, food, bandages, and information. He said that he believed that in situations where people lived away from development centers, it was difficult for communities to receive assistance or essential items during emergencies. He said that in one of their conversations, people suggested that churches could serve as resilience hubs.

Mr. Bivins said that, however, he was not convinced that churches should be the first line of protection in such situations. He said that churches could be part of the solution, but they should not replace the County's responsibility for managing the network, controlling information, and ensuring access to essential resources during emergencies. He said that having designated resilience hubs under County purview was crucial for ensuring public safety and well-being as they faced more extreme weather events or natural disasters like earthquakes.

Mr. Bivins said that he agreed with the Supervisors that they should conduct a small area plan Shadwell. He said that for Shadwell, he believed that creating a plan would help people visualize what that area might look like beyond never having an Olive Garden. He said that focusing solely on Olive Garden or similar establishments was not going to happen. He said that they should have a conversation about attracting businesses to that area without limiting themselves to such establishments.

Mr. Bivins said that looking at Yancey, they had limited open space for new developments, so they would likely see companies or individuals redeveloping existing spaces. He said that he supported this approach because he also believed that communities benefited from having local amenities such as post offices,

recycling centers, and veterinary clinics. He said that by creating these community hubs outside of developed areas, they could foster a stronger sense of belonging for residents and maintain Albemarle County's identity.

Mr. Clayborne said that if asked to choose, he would prefer resiliency hubs. He said that as his colleagues had stated, they understood that disasters would occur; it was not a matter of if but when. He said that as these disasters became more intense, he believed focusing on resilience hubs may lead to capital improvements and investments. He said that these improvements could even inform the capital improvements plan, for example. He said that an Emergency Operations Center (EOC) could be located in rural areas to assist with staging and infrastructure needs after natural disasters. He said that he believed that resilience hubs would be a strong choice as it may inform the capital improvements plan.

Mr. Murray said that he generally supported resilience hubs. He said that after living near Batesville for quite some time and visiting extensively, he believed that public concern primarily revolved around new uses of crossroads communities. He said that the Batesville Store served as an example of the challenges faced in maintaining viability, as it closed multiple times and required significant support from the County, local citizens, and adaptability in use.

Mr. Murray said that in order to preserve existing uses and protect cultural institutions within crossroads communities, they should focus on easing the process for these adaptations rather than promoting new uses. He said that he was surprised to learn that Batesville was developing community trails. He said that in such cases where communities took initiative, County support should be directed towards addressing their priorities, such as trail easements or traffic calming measures. He said that by assisting in sustaining existing uses and community, crossroads communities could thrive.

Mr. Bivins said that he found it difficult not to be a literalist. He said that he had to balance the fact that people did not want anything to change in these crossroads communities, yet they wanted the County to be involved in improving community trails. He said that one may ask why, in a place where there was no community trail, the County was involved in helping to improve it. He said that at some point, it would be helpful to have a conversation about when they freeze the change. He said that if they froze change ten years ago or 50 years ago, then that could possibly say, in essence, that things happening today should not happen because they did not happen 50 years ago. He said that he would like to have a fuller discussion of the idea that they should freeze change at some particular point in time.

Mr. Murray said that he believed that it was not about freezing change since rural practices continued to develop. He said that agriculture now was distinct from agriculture in his grandparents' era. He said that he proposed that they acknowledge change but also consider rural areas through the lens of supporting natural areas, conservation, and agriculture. He said that this perspective should guide their evaluation of whether the new use was suitable or not.

Mr. Bivins said that he was in complete accord with that. He said that he was in complete agreement with the notion that things change and require examination through a modern perspective. He said that this was not the sentiment expressed by several of their individuals. He said that many people consistently argued that things should not change; they should remain frozen. He said that if they could adopt a modern perspective, then their views may be more aligned. He said that however, they must be cautious not to treat the environment as a green line, similar to a financial red line, which implies freezing it at a certain level before moving forward.

Mr. Missel said that this segued into his comments, which involved considering both subjects simultaneously. He said that crossroads communities and areas with potential for resiliency hubs should be assessed independently and individually based on available infrastructure and boundaries to avoid uncontrolled growth. He said that compatible uses should also be considered on an individual basis. He said that moving beyond small area plans, they should think regionally about how these plans complement each other without having identical resiliency hubs in nearby areas. He said that proactively identifying and defining compatible uses in a small area plan could help avoid unnecessary competition in these areas.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the second set of questions concerned transportation. She asked what more efficient, effective, and equitable transit services would look like in rural areas. She asked what bike and pedestrian infrastructure would best meet the needs of rural residents, and how the comprehensive plan recommendations should prioritize exploring and implementing these opportunities.

Mr. Clayborne asked if they had any insights on demographic data of rural areas, believing that this information would impact their response to the first question.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that she was not able to provide specific statistics for Albemarle County at that moment; however, she could mention that in general, rural areas in the United States have experienced a faster rate of population aging compared to urban areas.

Mr. Missel asked if they had considered other communities' experiences in implementing similar transit systems in rural areas like Albemarle County. He said that he was aware that some rural transit attempts had failed due to lack of usage. He said that he was curious about whether there were any successful ideas they could learn from in this context.

Jessica Hersh-Ballering, Principal Planner, said that their question was about the menu of options for transit in rural areas. She said that she would not provide the full menu, partly because she did not know all of the options. She said that she would like to highlight the microCAT transit service currently being developed in Admiral County. She said that this service was specifically designed for areas not well-served by fixed route transit, which could be a suitable model for rural areas as well. She said that if they required more information about other opportunities, their action steps for these goals and objectives included further investigation of potential transit services. She said that some of this work was still ongoing within their staff.

Mr. Missel said that it occurred to him that the way it was worded was asking what would more efficient and equitable transit look like for the rural area, and he wondered if any existed already.

Mr. Bivins said that JAUNT was one of those vendors. He said that there were private solutions like Uber, Lyft, and some commercial taxi services in town. He said that he wanted to expand the topic by discussing where people were going. He said that if they considered population centers, they could make decisions based on population, which included age factors. He said that they needed to understand the relationship between transportation needs and regional transportation authorities. He said that this might involve consulting experts in their community who could make better decisions regarding transportation rollout plans. He said that he was not trying to avoid responsibility; rather, he believed that involving knowledgeable individuals could lead to better outcomes.

Mr. Bivins said that if they could implement the microCAT service more effectively throughout the County, that might be a first-tier solution. He said that if they could partner this with JAUNT’s efforts to determine how to provide necessary services, they might begin to offer a set of services that they could explore if there was any demand for them. He said that before they considered integrating these services into a fixed hub or fixed service, they must remember that they did not own the fixed service; they purchased some of its time.

Mr. Bivins said that they did not own CAT; they bought time with CAT, and they could make decisions about serving specific areas based on their needs. He said that their most significant influence currently lay in the microCAT service because they were part of the granting area for that solution. He said that JAUNT’s efforts played a crucial regional role in providing a regional solution. He said that in some communities, vouchers were given for private Uber, Lyft, and taxicab services depending on their location.

Mr. Missel noted that they were ahead of schedule for this item, which they had allocated 35 minutes for.

Mr. Moore said that last year's report revealed that 83,000 out of 307,000 JAUNT routes were rural pickups. He said that this indicated that JAUNT was already providing transportation services in rural areas, and he

wondered if there was potential for expansion or better integration to improve the overall service for rural residents. He said that metaphorically, it seemed like the simplest way to slice the bread.

Mr. Murray said that he supported exploring options for JAUNT since it already offered valuable services. He said that when he commuted from Batesville to Charlottesville, he found navigating traffic on Route 29 and parking at UVA time-consuming and frustrating. He said that it took him as long to reach the bus stop and walk to his office as it would have if he had closer parking. He said that as a rural resident commuting into the city, he noticed that having parking lots on the outskirts of Charlottesville with efficient bus service would have been a significant time-saver.

Mr. Murray said that likewise, if there were designated commuter parking lots where he could meet other UVA employees and commute, this would have been beneficial for him. He said that for instance, having a designated area at Crossroads in North Garden would allow him to meet someone before commuting from that spot. He said that he believed that such additions would be effective in terms of transportation. He said that some of the improvements in Crozet had been beneficial for residents in rural areas who now had more transportation options to reach Charlottesville. He said that making adjustments to transportation options in places like Crozet could benefit more people, including rural residents.

Mr. Clayborne said that he believed that further examination of demographics was necessary for a comprehensive understanding of the target audience. He said that demographics played a crucial role in this context, such as which age ranges were predominant in this scenario and which occupations were prevalent among the population. He said that if the majority consisted of elderly individuals, their transportation needs may differ significantly from those of professionals working in major employers such as school systems, which constituted a significant portion of their workforce.

Mr. Clayborne said that conducting more research in this area would help them make more informed decisions. He said that he appreciated the suggestion of focusing on bus routes that catered specifically to these major employers. He said that given that many service industry workers in these sectors could not afford City living, they were often pushed out. He said that by collaborating with these employers, they could address issues of equity and better serve their diverse population.

Mr. Bivins said that there were several transportation services available for those traveling from Crozet into town. He said that one option was the Crozet Connect service, which transported passengers both into and out of town. He said that he would also mention that he had a staff member who participated in a van pool program managed by the Virginia Department of Transportation. He said that these options demonstrated that there were alternatives for commuters.

Mr. Bivins said that, however, they may need to consider how they gathered and disseminated information effectively so that people could make informed decisions about their transportation choices. He said that they could involve exploring creative ways of collaborating with local employers to develop community-based solutions that catered to individual needs. He said that in the past, train service was available between Crozet and Charlottesville but had since ceased. He said that the state now owned the train tracks, raising the question of whether they could be utilized for commuting purposes once again. He said that while he did not have the answer, there may be other innovative solutions worth exploring.

Mr. Missel said that he would like to make a few comments that echoed what had already been said. He said that he believed that identifying the types of needs through surveys and understanding them, which would drive the service, was an important first step. He said that considering alignment with resilience hubs and crossroads communities in areas with high density for potential pickup or drop-off points. He said that identifying achievable goals versus aspirational ones was crucial for the entire comprehensive plan. He said that focusing on solutions that had been successful in other communities and outlining how they could be funded at a local level would help guide this process. He said that they certainly should consider expanding existing services that had proven successful.

Mr. Missel said that he wanted to mention that they would have extra time to address this second question. He said that he would like for the Commissioners to keep in mind that they should ask staff to cover particular topics that had not yet been discussed, and would note that they had not discussed interchanges, historic resources, or natural areas. He said that he would offer this as an open conversation.

Mr. Murray said that when he was a child, he resided in Ivy in the Meriwether Hills subdivision, where it was safe for him to walk or run to the Ivy store for a beverage or snack before returning home. He said that however, this was no longer safe due to changing circumstances. He said that if efforts had been made since his childhood to improve safety along Route 76, it could now be a suitable cycling route into town. He said that unfortunately, this did not occur. He said that to address this issue, they must focus on making incremental improvements to existing transportation networks. He said that currently, they do not adequately recognize or collect data on walking, running, and cycling routes in rural areas.

Mr. Murray said that by engaging organizations such as the Charlottesville Track Club and Charlottesville Area Mountain Biking Club, they could better understand and improve these routes for public use. He said that they were not engaging those organizations, and he thought they should consider doing so. He said that this was a significant issue. He said that he also would point out that there was a fragmentary effect on many roads in the area. He said that for example, while running over Fox Mountain recently, he observed that paving the road would instantly be someone's mountaintop views.

Mr. Murray said that the forest block, identified as an area of high biodiversity in the County, could easily be developed into real estate if not for its current gravel road. He said that paving these gravel roads effectively rezoned the area, upzoning it for development. He said that they should start treating these roads accordingly. He said that also regarding the rural rustic roads program, one of the statements the Board of Supervisors signed when they added something to the rural rustic roads program was to confirm they were unaware of any pending development affecting traffic on the road.

Mr. Murray said that however, developers themselves sometimes were those proposing the roads be paved, yet this statement was still signed. He said that he considered this a lie by omission, as they did not consider the impact of paving roads in their decision-making process. He said that it was essential to ask these questions before proceeding with road paving projects. He said that he wanted these projects to be presented before the Planning Commission prior to their submission to the Board of Supervisors. He said that alternatively, a staff analysis should be conducted to examine the potential impact of these projects, such as the presence of cyclists and runners on the road.

Mr. Murray said that one crucial aspect of rural rustic road paving programs was that they preserved the appearance of rural roads while lacking adequate margins for safety. He said that consequently, when these roads were paved, they became hazardous for cyclists and runners. He said that for instance, the paving of Camp Holiday Trails made it extremely dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. He said that they must comprehensively evaluate all aspects of road usage, including walking, running, and cycling paths, before making decisions that may impact multimodal traffic.

Mr. Murray said that currently, they were ignoring existing multimodal traffic patterns in their planning decisions. He said this must change, and they should incorporate these factors into their planning processes. He said that as another example, the upcoming special use permit for Keene should include data on its high usage for walking, cycling, and running activities in the staff report.

Mr. Clayborne said that he did not have as much input as his fellow colleague in this matter; however, he would like to express that he found this topic somewhat challenging due to differences in purpose between bike and pedestrian infrastructure in rural areas compared to development areas. He said that in development areas, such infrastructure may be more destination-oriented, for instance, walking to a commercial area or taking children to school.

Mr. Clayborne said that in contrast, rural areas might seem to prioritize leisure activities. He said that he was cautious about this distinction because in development areas, walking or cycling could be a necessity,

like a three-mile walk to reach a convenience store. He said that context was different from that of rural areas. He said that he struggled with the concept of multimodal infrastructure in this context, and he believed they should consider rural areas separately when discussing bike and pedestrian infrastructure.

Mr. Murray said that when the TJPDC was developing their infrastructure plan, they intentionally excluded running because they believed running was not transportation. He said that he found this perspective interesting because if he drove his car to Ridge Road, the car travel was considered transportation. He said that however, when he exited his car and ran, this activity was not considered transportation.

Mr. Murray said that conversely, if he drove his car to a winery, that was classified as transportation rather than recreation. He said that similarly, driving to a physical therapist was considered legitimate transportation. He asked what if running served as his physical therapy. He said that the obesity epidemic in rural areas highlighted the importance of accessible locations for running, cycling, or walking for rural residents' health. He said that his own well-being and that of his daughters included walking and biking in the rural area.

Mr. Clayborne asked if Mr. Murray's daughters were riding their bikes for five miles.

Mr. Murray said no, but they would travel one or two miles away to their friends' houses.

Mr. Bivins said that they were discussing how to allocate dollars, particularly in the development area where sidewalks or multimodal ways of getting around within the area were not robust. He said that he expected people in this area to rely less on vehicles than in rural areas. He said that if he had to allocate transportation infrastructure investments, he would prefer to prioritize the development area because it offered the highest leverage for the return on investment.

Mr. Bivins said that he was considering the possibility of an economic benefit from well-defined pedestrian and biking infrastructure in certain areas, which could attract people to engage in activities there. He said that however, he would require a plan for such infrastructure before making a decision. He said that he was not in favor of having robust ped-bike infrastructure in rural areas at this time. He said that he would like to consider whether there were specific locations in the County that could benefit from such infrastructure as an economic driver.

Mr. Bivins said that while they could not recapture Route 76, they could explore other ways to achieve similar goals. He said perhaps there were some alternative methods they could employ. He said that they must consider how these initiatives contributed to economic goals. He said that if they could not increase the 5% solution, they should focus on improving it for bike and pedestrian use. He said that connecting the four development areas might be the best solution, as they were currently disconnected and isolated. He said that this disconnection was one of their challenges, and finding ways to bring these areas together was crucial for him.

Mr. Moore said that he appreciated what Mr. Murray mentioned about the ability for running on Fox Mountain Road and maintaining gravel in certain areas because it was correct that if they paved it, cars may suddenly drive at 50 miles per hour, regardless of safety concerns. He said that however, regarding Mr. Clayborne's perspective on the issue, he acknowledged that people tended to walk or bike to destinations more frequently in densely populated areas. He said that this was not to say that such behavior was uncommon in rural areas; however, he believed that essential bike and pedestrian infrastructure in densely populated areas was still insufficient.

Mr. Moore said that while it would be desirable to have these facilities, he maintained that they would be particularly beneficial in densely populated areas in some hypothetical future. He said that it would be fascinating to envision a designated biking area marketed as a tourist destination. He said that although they did not currently have such plans, this could be a possibility for the future. He said that in the meantime, he strongly supported infrastructure projects with placemaking components, Objective 3.2. He said that he was passionate about creating third places where communities gathered, fostering arts and parks, and

nurturing genuine bonds among community members. He said that this was far more important to him than providing additional recreational paths for individuals.

Mr. Bivins said that they should avoid focusing solely on the western part of the County, but if the Barnes Lumber area could attract visitors from both the development zone and other nearby locations, such as Jarmans Gap Road, or Route 76, it could create a safer connection between Old Trail and downtown. He said that downtown served as a hub for arts and natural gathering places, which could be accessed via walkable routes leading to Crozet Park. He said that by connecting these elements, they could develop solutions that benefited the new school and created walkable networks for residents living in repurposed buildings like the old Crozet Elementary School. He said that this area had the potential for significant investment in community development.

Mr. Murray said that analyzing cycling, running, and walking data for Jarmans Gap revealed that the heat map displayed bright white from Crozet to the Parkway, indicating high usage. He said that recognizing that transportation spokes connect growth areas to rural areas was crucial. He said that however, in rural areas, they did not seek investment in new bike lanes or trails; instead, they requested preservation of existing infrastructure.

Mr. Murray said that they identified small improvements that could be made within the existing right of way, such as increasing the road margin by a few inches for added safety in dangerous areas. He said that this cost-effective approach could make 17 miles of rural road safer without the high expense of creating new greenways in growth areas. He said that by focusing on protecting what they had, they could find little ways to enhance safety without creating new infrastructure.

Mr. Missel said that they should begin with a plan that looked at multimodal aspects of transportation and how it could be incorporated with small area plans as part of that effort. He said that if there was a small area plan, it should include aspects of pedestrian, bike, and infrastructure for multimodal transportation. He said that focusing on compatibility and safety in the plan's development was important. He said that this included considering the movement of goods alongside people and cars. For instance, in areas like vineyards or sawmills, there may be large and dangerous trucks that need to be factored into the plan's compatibility.

Mr. Missel said that they should leverage existing infrastructure and systems in the plan's development. He said that for example, the Rivanna Trails could be utilized to connect areas like Walnut Creek. He said that it was essential to identify areas where they can proactively think about connecting various locations. He said that lastly, when considering the plan, they should think about different uses, such as recreation, necessity, and choice. He said that each use should be compatible within the plan's framework.

Mr. Murray said that his primary concern was ensuring that they considered all road users equally and did not prioritize one group over another. He said that when car traffic increased on the road, they automatically provided accommodations for the additional vehicles. He said that for instance, on Ridge Road, there was an increase in runner and cyclist traffic, so instead of acknowledging this new use and finding ways to accommodate it, they put up no parking signs to discourage it. He said that he would encourage that they think more equitably about all road users and treat them all fairly, giving each group equal weight.

Mr. Missel said that this should be done while also considering the bounds of safety and compatibility. He asked if the Commission would like to address the topic of interchanges and pre-existing zoning in those areas.

Mr. Bivins said that he was unsure of what they were discussing in regard to that issue. He said that the two interchanges they had currently were Yancey Mill and Shadwell. He said that as they delved deeper into these discussions, this conversation would likely drive most of their decision-making process.

David Benish, Development Process Manager, said that the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors provided direction regarding interstate interchanges. He said that the Board directed them not

to pursue those interchanges but instead recommended small area planning for two areas, so Shadwell was a priority area. He said that if there were any further expectations or comments from the Commission, he would ask that they please share them so they could develop appropriate action steps. He said that otherwise, they were there to listen to the Commissioners' thoughts on this matter.

Mr. Benish said that what they had identified was that in these two areas, they had legacy zoning, which referred to outdated zoning types typically found in urban areas. He said that this also applied to parts of their rural area that had been developed and zoned differently. He said that this area included land from the hotel, which had commercial zoning, to the VDOT site. He said that some properties within this area remained undeveloped rural land. He said that this concept suggested that they had collections of areas, and small area planning would focus on these larger areas centered around these zones. He said that boundaries for these areas had not yet been finalized.

Mr. Barnes said that at the bottom of page 18 of the packet, there was relevant information.

Mr. Missel said that many of his questions were answered.

Mr. Bivins said that he believed that there was a fear that it may turn into something like a Route 81 exchange. He said that their Supervisors had been very clear that this would not happen there. He said that they would not see a Buc-ee's truck stop anywhere within their boundaries. He said that this was simply not going to occur. He said that the area with the most development at present was the 5th Street Station, but he was unsure if any of that was within the County.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that it was in the County, but not in the rural area.

Mr. Bivins said that the City had considered several projects: one at Yancey Mill, which had been paused; another in the Shadwell area; and the Fontaine project. He said that the Fontaine project could not proceed due to a different idea being proposed for that location. He said that consequently, the City had effectively two projects to focus on, with Supervisors directing staff to examine one of them in particular.

Mr. Murray said that he would add that there were industries serving rural areas that were not suitable for growth areas. He said that these included agricultural processing facilities and other uses that aligned with rural visions but were more industrial in nature. He said that near Crozet, there was Yancey Mills, which was an industrial use but supported rural areas. He said that encouraging such uses by right could be beneficial.

Mr. Bivins said that he would like to point out that they had witnessed two key issues in Shadwell. He said that firstly, members should recall the UPS location where someone had plans to establish a hardware store followed by a coffee shop. He said that however, due to zoning restrictions, customers could not sit inside the coffee shop but had to take their coffee and sit in the parking lot. He said that this was due to the area's zoning requirements that prevented a cost-effective solution. He said that they had to devise an alternative plan that might have been more expensive.

Mr. Bivins said that there were another set of brothers near the ice cream shop who tried various ways to utilize the land but faced numerous challenges in obtaining approval from the Planning Commission and ultimately reaching the supervisors. He said that these obstacles were largely due to the zoning restrictions in place near the 64 bypass. He said that examining that area to determine its potential for development was crucial. He said that the area of Rivanna Village was an area that was initially considered for growth but now faced limitations due to the inability to widen the road.

Mr. Bivins said that infrastructure improvements, such as acquiring easements for the little bridge nearby, were also impossible because the railroad company refused expansion. He said that additionally, a quarry further down the road added to the area's challenges. He said that the goal was to find ways to utilize this land effectively while considering its evolving uses. He said that it should no longer be seen as half a farm or a remnant of the past when celebrities like Elizabeth Taylor traveled through Keswick. He said that

instead, the zoning should align with current needs and applicants' proposals for innovative projects. He said that these constraints of the existing zoning made these projects too expensive to execute successfully.

Mr. Moore said that goal four was regarding the interchanges, particularly Shadwell, and there was recognition of existing developments. He said that the goal aimed to identify non-conforming areas and establish patterns for future action. He said that however, revisions from the National Heritage Commission suggested returning to previous methods.

Mr. Moore said that upon examining Shadwell along 250, various establishments had already been built, such as storage centers, hotels, UPS facilities, carpet stores, high-end stereo shops, and ice cream parlors. He said that being situated between major highways; these developments seemed to challenge the notion that certain lines should remain untouched. He said that while not advocating for immediate expansion, it was worth considering that these areas already had significant activity and could benefit from improved transportation outlets for optimal performance.

Mr. Missel said that discussing staff's capacity to address all of these small area plans would be helpful. He said that as they had talked about planning, plans, and small area plans, he believed that interacting to prioritize these areas would be beneficial in understanding which ones should be addressed first, second, and so on. He said that they could do this whenever it was convenient or made sense.

Recess

The Planning Commission recessed at 5:22 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Schaffer called the roll.

Mr. Missel established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Missel read the procedure for public comment.

Sherry Buttrick said that she resided in the White Hall District on Ballards Mill Road. She said that she had served on several County committees that supported agricultural and rural area initiatives over the years. She said that upon seeing the logo for the comprehensive plan revision, she realized that they faced challenges. She said that she noted that the surrounding landscape featured sprawl across open fields and houses on distant ridges, while the photographs depicted vast amounts of asphalt and gravel but no agriculture. She said that correspondingly, the statement "we will have thriving farms and working forests" appeared more like a regrettable statement of an inevitable outcome rather than something actively encouraged, promoted, and sustained by all.

Ms. Buttrick said that they must maintain traditional mainstream agriculture, niche and boutique agriculture, cattle farming, crop farming, and equestrian activities. She said that the plan must recognize that without agriculture and forestry, there would be no other resources in rural areas that they wished to promote. She said that without agriculture and forestry, there would be no intact natural systems, no scenic resources, no rural character that made this area attractive, and no equitable opportunities for those who wished to work in rural areas.

Ms. Buttrick said that in order for the land to remain undeveloped and for them to be able to reduce the rate of conversion, there needed to be some viable economic uses for rural land that did not convert it into something else. She said that the County should encourage such uses and provide attractive options for land conservation. She said that clear objectives were needed that promoted sustainable land use taxation without encouraging development. She said that losing the land use tax would severely impact rural areas.

Ms. Buttrick said that promoting agricultural and forest districts was crucial. She said that they said that wanted to enhance conservation program effectiveness, but the ACE program had been mothballed, which was a program that pioneered equitable land protection options for farmers. She said that they must protect scenic resources and be more clear and direct about it. She said that mountain protection ordinances, scenic byways, scenic roads, and important sheds should be protected once again.

Sally Thomas said that she was a resident of the Jack Jouett District. She said that she thought she knew what it would be like to be a member of the Board of Supervisors; however, she was not prepared for what rural roads would be like. She said that they were the most contentious issue during her tenure on the Board. She said that these were not simple matters that they were addressing today. She said that sometimes people feel strongly about the dust of gravel roads, but always paving was a disaster if what one desired was the preservation of what people appreciate in rural areas.

Ms. Thomas said that alternatives for transportation and general uses were debated, and it reminded her so much of when Crozet was at a crossroads, people were asked what they wanted, and they said that they wanted ice cream parlors on every corner and wanted to be able to walk to all of them. She said that the planners said, well, good. So, they would provide a community of many, many people. She said that the community said that they did not want that. She said that consequently, many excellent ideas for Crozet required more people than would be suitable for the rural area.

Ms. Thomas said that as a result, incorporating wish lists into the comprehensive plan would be detrimental. She said that their role was to act as the opposing force. She said that based on planning knowledge and higher goals, explain why suburban sprawl in rural areas was undesirable. She said that if they lacked this understanding, they should educate themselves. She said that ruining the rural areas was often cheaper than creating necessary infrastructure in the developed areas.

Ms. Thomas asked why not ruin the rural area. She said that the comprehensive plan's purpose was to reject such proposals. She said that on multiple occasions, the County made decisions that were challenged in the Court of Appeals. She said that despite these challenges, they prevailed. She said that they prevailed because their comprehensive plan was robust and clearly outlined the protection of mountain areas and reservoir land watersheds. She said that it was crucial to have a strong comprehensive plan.

Mr. Missel asked the Clerk if there were any attendees signed up online who wished to speak.

Ms. Shaffer said that there were none.

Public Hearing

a. SP202300016 Charlottesville Climbing Gym

Syd Shoaf, Senior Planner, said that he was presenting the staff report for Special Use Permit SP 202300016 concerning Charlottesville Climbing Gym. He said that this was a request to amend an existing Special Use Permit for an indoor climbing gym situated on a 0.94-acre lot within the development area. He said that the subject property was located west of Charlottesville City limits after the Ivy Road and Old Ivy Road fork. He said that the tax map parcel was 60-46C, and the site's address was 2200 Old Ivy Road. He said that the entire parcel was approximately 0.94 acres and contained an existing structure. He said that the site was zoned Commercial Office and was affected by the Steep Slopes Managed Overlay District and the Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Shoaf said that in the Albemarle Comprehensive Plan, it was part of Neighborhood 7 of the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan, designated as Community Mixed Use. He said that the surrounding properties consisted of various uses, including other office uses, a restaurant, an apartment complex, and some of the University of Virginia's athletic facilities and buildings. He said that lastly, the site was bordered by the Buckingham Railroad to the south and an underpass to the southeast. He said that in the previous slide, there was an existing 13,378 gross square foot building, which was currently used for

mixed purposes including office space, retail, and an indoor athletic facility of up to 2,000 square feet. He said that this facility was approved under SP201200001.

Mr. Shoaf said that due to the site's elevation, there were two driveways leading onto Old Ivy Road and two parking lots. He said that between these parking lots, there were 49 existing parking spaces. He said that the northwestern driveway was shared with the adjacent parcel to the northwest. He said that for this proposal, they were requesting an amendment to the existing special use permit SP 201200001 to allow for an indoor climbing gym. He said that this proposal involved expanding the existing special use permit area from 2,000 square feet to 6,125 square feet for the indoor athletic facility.

Mr. Shoaf said that this included climbing walls, bouldering areas, strength and fitness zones, yoga space, kids' zone, retail space, locker rooms, storage, a group fitness room, and a small office associated with the gym use. He said that the attached concept plan in the staff report showed this proposal. He said that the applicant had proposed minimal changes to the site itself. He said that the proposed building footprint remained unchanged, however, the applicant was proposing to raise the existing two-story building to three stories. He said that the existing 49 parking spaces were also sufficient for the requested recreational use. He said that additionally, the applicant proposed remodeling the bicycle parking area and adding more landscaping to the site.

Mr. Shoaf said that, as he had stated in the previous slide, the existing footprint of the site would remain unchanged, however, the applicant proposed raising the current two-story building from 16 feet and 1 inch to a three-story building at 32 feet and 4 inches. He said that Old Ivy Road was not an entrance corridor; however, the Architectural Review Board reviewed the proposal due to its potential impacts on Ivy Road, which was an entrance corridor. He said that the Architectural Review Board had no objections, and Albemarle County's Fire Rescue did not raise any issues concerning the increased height. He said that the Special Use Permit was assessed under the Factories for Consideration as outlined in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Shoaf said that staff believed that the proposed Special Use Permit would not be detrimental to adjacent properties, would not alter the character of the nearby area, would continue to be in harmony with the Commercial Office Zoning District, and was consistent with the comprehensive plan. He said that staff recommended one condition, which was that the indoor athletic facility use should not exceed 6,125 square feet.

Mr. Shoaf said that in summary, there were three factors that were favorable. He said that the first was that it met the review criteria for Special Use Permits contained in the Zoning Ordinance, the second was that the use was consistent with the Land Use Plan, and the third provided an additional athletic facility for people who lived and worked in the area. He said there were no unfavorable factors. He said that with this in mind, staff recommended approval with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Murray asked why there was a condition placed on the limit of athletic space.

Mr. Shoaf said that the purpose of limiting indoor recreation space was to match the 49 total parking spaces allowed on the site. He said that their ordinance specified one parking space for every 125 square feet of usable recreation space. He said that the applicant was requesting the maximum allowance to match the existing site conditions.

Mr. Missel opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Eric Wooley said that he was joined this evening by Mike Kinnick, co-founder of Rock Revolution, and Robert Nichols, an architect from Formwork Design. He said that they were pleased to present their proposal for the renovation and remodeling of the existing office building at 220 Old Ivy Street in the White Hall District. He said that the purpose of this project was to turn the building from a traditional office into an indoor climbing gym.

Mr. Wooley said that for those unfamiliar with indoor climbing gyms, they typically featured climbing walls adorned with colorful holds that recreational users could utilize to simulate rock climbing in a safer environment. He said that their team had done an excellent job in preparing this proposal, covering all aspects from the existing condition to the proposed changes.

Mr. Wooley said that they would like to take a moment to address any concerns regarding the expansion of the indoor athletic space. He said that the existing special permit allowed for 2,000 square feet; however, they were requesting an expansion to 6,000 square feet. He said that it was essential to note that the remodeling process would actually reduce the overall square footage of the building. He said that he would provide slides to illustrate this further. He said that before proceeding, he would like to invite Mr. Kinnick to share more about Rock Revolution's involvement in this project.

Mike Kinnick said that he was the co-founder of Rock Revolution. He said that he and his wife had established Rock Revolution at the beginning of 2020; unfortunately, she could not attend tonight due to work commitments. He said that they developed this concept to create a modern, clean, and safe indoor rock-climbing facility in Charlottesville and Albemarle County. He said that their motivation stemmed from observing the benefits of rock climbing for their six and eight-year-old daughters and themselves.

Mr. Kinnick said that they noticed their youngest daughter, who initially lacked confidence, blossom in self-assurance after visiting an indoor rock-climbing gym in Richmond over a couple of years. He said that rock climbing offered numerous mental and physical benefits, such as confidence, focus, courage, resilience, improved coordination, endurance, and strength. He said that they aimed to bring these benefits to their facility on Old Ivy Road.

Mr. Wooley said that he would discuss the appearance of the building from the outside. He said that if one imagined approaching from the City via Ivy Road and turning onto Old Ivy, as they traveled in this direction, the first visible aspect of the building was its south face, which was two stories tall. He said that the entire structure was built at ground level; however, there was a grade change. He said that as seen in the photograph provided, on the north side, one could see the first floor, so there were two stories on one side and one story on the other. He said that there were 49 paved parking spaces on site, which they did not anticipate needing to modify or increase. He said that the site featured several mature trees, which would not be disturbed by their proposal.

Mr. Wooley said that Mr. Shoaf had mentioned that the site plan included Old Ivy Road and Ivy Road, with Ivy Road situated within the entrance corridor. He said that they had no intention of altering or adding any impervious surfaces due to this proposal. He said that the gray circles on the concept plan represented existing mature trees that they planned to preserve. He said that they would also add additional trees to meet the County-regulated code for parking space requirements.

Mr. Wooley said that they proposed adding some additional parking for bicycles, which would provide secure spaces for storing bicycles to promote bike usage. He said that the darker red shape on the plan indicated the area that would be raised from two stories to three stories. He said that one of their objectives was to evaluate and present the impact of this change. He said that they utilized the IT trip manual to predict the potential impact of parking and traffic on the area. He said that the existing office space generated higher peak demand for trips than the gym. He said that overall, they should not see any negative impact from traffic.

Mr. Wooley said that moving to the section depicting the north side and south side, he pointed out that there was an open space upon entering. He said that the first floor's existing roof line was shown, and their plan was to raise the roof line to three stories. He said that this space became two stories tall inside. He said that on the other side, approximately one-third of the first floor's square footage would be removed, allowing for a full three stories of potential climbing space. He said that Robert Nichols would provide some background information about the architectural design.

Robert Nichols said that his firm was Form Work Design. He said that they operated in Charlottesville and its surrounding areas. He said that he would like to discuss some aspects of the building's appearance. He said that the most notable characteristic was its increased height. He said that the upper portion was entirely new, featuring limited narrow windows at the top for natural light while allowing for climbing walls. He said that in the evening, this design would create a lantern effect, making the building appear occupied. He said that the primary difference between the current building and this proposed design was its purpose.

Mr. Nichols said that the current building was office space, but with limited room for athletic activities. He said that it was a multi-tenant building, which gave it an anonymous appearance. He said that as more people worked from home and office dynamics changed, this building may seem underutilized. He said that this project aimed to transform the building into a single-use destination for activity. He said that they wanted the building to appear occupied and active, attracting people and bringing life to the area. He said that the increased visibility, height, signage, decorative elements, and lighting would contribute to this goal.

Mr. Bivins asked where the other activity spaces would be for the activities such as yoga.

Mr. Nichols said that the sectional view primarily explained the building's appearance changes but failed to address the question. He said that as they examined the lower level, the perspective was from the west side of the city. He said that the ground-level space was divided, so the lower right corner housed a yoga and group area. He said that the spaces towards the back of the building, which were largely subgrade and lacked daylight, contained locker rooms, utility areas, and a gym featuring strength and machine equipment.

Mr. Nichols said that the area above the existing floor, occupying more than 25% of the space, was effectively three stories tall. He said that ascending further revealed the missing floor's position, allowing individuals in various locations to look into lower positions. He said that this area served as a break spot for climbers to discuss their achievements. He said that it was still a sizable space, standing two stories tall. He said that bouldering, or smaller-scale wall climbing, took place in this area as well, and then they reached the higher side of the building,

Mr. Murray said that he understood that many commercial buildings with flat roofs had already been designed to accommodate the weight of a green roof. He said that if this had not been considered, it was worth evaluating. He said that it was essential to note that new construction may qualify for up to $30,000 in financial assistance towards a green roof, provided that other stormwater requirements had been met.

Mr. Missel said that he had a couple of questions regarding this item. He said that he would like to confirm if there would be any pedestrian safety measures in place, as he understood that this area could be quite hazardous for pedestrians. He said that additionally, he noticed that bike storage and bike racks had been mentioned several times. He asked if they could please provide more information on how one would access these facilities while riding a bike. He said that he wanted to know if there were designated bike lanes or paths available.

Mr. Wooley said that in Old Ivy, there were currently no sidewalks. He said that approximately one thousand feet to the west and northwest was where the first sidewalk could be found. He said that currently, VDOT and the City and County were studying the intersection. He said that they had completed Phase 1, which involved sending out surveys to gather public opinions. He said that many people expressed concerns about safety due to the narrow railroad underpass, which restricted biking and walking. He said that this issue required a great solution, but for now, they could only be prepared for potential improvements in the future.

Mr. Missel asked if understanding that further improvements might require sidewalks would lead to their consideration for incorporation in future improvements.

Mr. Wooley asked if Mr. Missel was suggesting this be included in a proffer or condition.

Mr. Missel said yes.

Mr. Wooley said that they could certainly talk to the owner of the property. He said that Mr. Kinnick was leasing the property, and the owner was very supportive of the project and proposed use. He said that he was sure they could talk to that owner about that potential. He said that they would be pleased to meet with staff and collaborate with them.

Mr. Missel said that they mentioned that peak hour demand for a particular location was slightly lower than that of an office building. He asked if the overall average daily traffic for this location was also lower than that of an office building.

Mr. Wooley said that it was likely slightly more due to the hours of operation. He said that the hours of operation were from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. He said that this was a longer operational period. He said that the aim was to ensure that there was enough parking to meet the County minimum standards but also accommodate the anticipated demand for the facility.

Mr. Missel asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak on this item.

Sean Cosette said that she owned a business called Be Just, located on the west side. She said that she would love to see this use happening on that side. She said that the west side had a different vibe that needed to be updated, and this would contribute positively to the community. She said that she loved the idea of doing a traffic study due to the severe traffic issues in the area. She said that she would love to see sidewalks, so it felt like more of a community and less of a suburb.

Mr. Missel asked the Clerk if there were any attendees signed up online who wished to speak.

Ms. Shaffer said that there were none.

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

Mr. Moore said that the proposal appeared entirely reasonable. He said that although he was familiar with that traffic bottleneck due to his work experience nearby and frequent travel through it, addressing this issue was beyond the scope of one proposal. He said that they could hope for positive outcomes from the VDOT study and City study.

Mr. Bivins said that he supported this effort. He said that he particularly appreciated this initiative since they had consistently discussed the importance of repurposing buildings, which was something they had been supportive of for some time. He said that this initiative aligned with their stated desire over many months, so he was glad to see that the property, which formerly had a tennis court, was being utilized in this manner.

Mr. Missel said that his sole comment was to encourage consideration of adding a sidewalk. He said that he was unsure if they needed to include this as a condition for the application. He said that considering the current extensive study being conducted by VDOT and the County, he believed his stance would be different if not for their efforts. He said that he was content to leave the decision as is, but for the record, he highly recommended including a sidewalk in the project.

Mr. Bivins motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP202300016 Charlottesville Climbing Gym, with the condition as recommended in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0). (Mr. Carrazana and Ms. Firehock were absent.)

b. SP202200026 Shull Property

Cameron Langille, Principal Planner, said that he would be presenting the staff's proposal for SP 202200026, also known as the Shull Property, which involved requesting a special use permit for a public garage.

Mr. Langille said that displayed was an existing conditions image showing the location of the parcel. He said that it was situated at the southeast corner of the intersection between Scottsville Road and Coles Rolling Road. He said that the parcel measured 6.41 acres in total and was currently undeveloped, featuring mature vegetation consisting of both deciduous and evergreen trees. He said that according to the comprehensive plan, this parcel was located in rural area 4. He said that surrounding uses of the parcel included various land types. It was bordered by Scottsville Road on its west side and Coles Rolling Road on its north side and northeast side, extending to the center of both public rights-of-way.

Mr. Langille said that starting with uses to the west, there was a single-family residential home immediately adjacent. He said that further away was the Keene Post Office, which could be seen labeled in the provided image. He said that north of the Keene Post Office, across Plank Road, was the Piedmont Veterinary Service Clinic. He said that across from that, on the indicated property, they had the Green Mountain Country Store. He said that there were residential properties nearby, as well as undeveloped land and the VDOT Keene area headquarters. He said that to the south were some single-family homes. He said that some of these properties did not have structures, while others did. He said that the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center was situated approximately 1,000 feet to the southwest, though it was not visible in the provided image.

Mr. Langille said that there was an error in this zoning map; this property was actually located within an entrance corridor overlay district. He said that however, no specific zoning districts were shown on this slide. He said that the primary zoning district applicable to this property and its surrounding parcels was the Rural Area (RA) Zoning District, indicated by the white color. He said that to provide additional context for this rural area property, he had included the critical resource layer, which showed no hundred-year floodplain, water protection ordinance stream buffer, or other restrictions on this property. He said that there were small areas of critical slopes represented by orange markings at the northern and southern corners of the property. He said that the total area affected was not significant; the exact square footage could be found in the staff report.

Mr. Langille said that before discussing the Shull Property SP in detail, he should clarify some definitions. He said that according to Section 3.1 of the zoning ordinance, a public garage was "a portion of a building or entire building other than a private garage that is designed or used for servicing or repairing motor-driven vehicles." He said that to elaborate, public garages may host activities such as engine work, battery and fluid replacement, flat tire repair, safety inspections, and other maintenance tasks. He said that however, public garages did not include body shops, which required a special use permit in more intense commercial or light industrial zoning districts. He said that body shops focused on repairing automobile exteriors and chassis, as well as dismantling, crushing, or painting vehicles, which were activities not permitted at public garages.

Mr. Langille said that the applicant had prepared a concept plan for this application. He said that he would discuss what they would construct on this site. He said that the design included a driveway entrance on Coles Rolling Road, leading to a parking area marked in gray. He said that the building itself, measuring 4,000 square feet, was represented by the blue footprint. He said that there were conceptual parking spaces for employees and customers depicted in the drawing. He said that a dashed rectangular shape indicated the parking travelway area where vehicles awaiting repair in the public garage would be stored. He said that storage containers for materials and parts needed for business operations would be housed within this area.

Mr. Langille said that the septic system drain field was proposed for this location since the area was rural and not connected to public water and sewer utilities. He said that a conceptual stormwater management pond was also planned. He said that the grading lines drawn by the applicant indicated what would be cleared for this project. He said that the existing vegetation, shown in green, would be retained. He said that the driveway entrance would be the only break in the perimeter of the site. He said that along Coles Rolling Road, the minimum width was 40 feet, while along Scottsville Road, it was approximately 50 feet. He said that the majority of the area was wider than these measurements.

Mr. Langille said that measuring the site from one corner to another, it was about 127 feet in length. He said that other aspects of the design included the proposed landscaping and lighting plans. He said that there would be an opaque fence surrounding the built portion of this property. He said that the fence would be at least six feet in height, and the applicant could make it taller if approved during the site plan stage. He said that the applicant had committed to providing an opaque gate for screening purposes. He said that the gate would help conceal the interior of the site while the driveway entrance remained unobstructed.

Mr. Langille said that staff must evaluate this special-use permit application based on specific criteria. He said that these criteria were detailed in pages four, five, and six of the staff report. He said that he would highlight some key points here. He said that firstly, there would be no substantial detriment to adjacent parcels due to retaining existing mature vegetation and installing the privacy fence. He said that these measures would limit visual and noise impacts from this property. He said that the concept plan included information from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) manual, which showed that the combined a.m. and p.m. peak traffic would generate approximately 19 vehicle trips. He said that this use would not create a significant amount of traffic affecting other properties in the area.

Mr. Langille said that retaining existing vegetation would help maintain the character of the area by acting as a visual buffer, making this use less noticeable compared to properties without vegetation or those that have been clear-cut. He said that the existing non-residential uses in the immediate vicinity of this parcel were predominantly found in rural areas. He said that regarding the intent to keep harmony and align with the zoning ordinance chapter in the RA zoning district, it stated that development should be limited but still provide service delivery to rural area residents.

Mr. Langille said that this was not a large-scale auto service repair shop like those in development areas; it was smaller in scale. He said that the applicant could provide more details, but there would be four service bays in the structure. He said that initially, they proposed a larger area of disturbance and parking lot, but this had been reduced by more than half. He said that in terms of consistency with supplemental regulations, they had reviewed the concept plan and believed it could comply. He said that they would discuss these details if this special use permit was approved.

Mr. Langille said that regarding consistency with the comprehensive plan, the use was not directly supporting agricultural or forestal uses, but there was mature tree cover on the property, which had value in terms of natural resource conservation. He said that if developed by right, three single-family detached homes could result in more clearing than this proposal. He said that the concept plan did not disturb critical slopes, which was consistent with some aspects of the rural areas chapter of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Langille said that factors favorable in the proposal included its consistency with review criteria for special use permits in the zoning ordinance and the nearby vicinity having several non-residential uses. He said that unfavorable factors included not supporting agricultural or forestal activities. He said that staff recommended approval of a special-use permit with conditions. He said that these conditions ensured development aligned with the concept plan, addressed hours of operation, prohibited bodywork, gasoline sales, and vehicle rentals, limited storage containers, and regulated vehicle storage outside for up to 30 days. He said that lastly, details of the sliding gate at the entrance must be provided at the time of site plan review to maintain visual privacy.

Mr. Murray asked for information regarding the other approved garages in the rural area. He said he wanted to compare their sizes. He said he wanted to know how this particular garage's size compared to those previously approved. He asked if it was similar in size or larger or smaller.

Mr. Langille said that information had been provided regarding approved public garage building special use permits since 1980. He said that there had been 18 approvals in total. He said that the largest permit granted was for 8,200 square feet in 2013. He said that approximate footprint acreage included the area of the property built upon such as buildings, driveways, parking areas, and other physical improvements. He said that the first permit listed had a 2,000 square foot building, with the entire parcel covered in impervious surface.

Mr. Clayborne asked, considering the conditions, specifically point one, bullet four, regarding fencing materials and heights, how upkeep was managed. He said that he noticed that the initial specification mentioned a wooden fence; however, after eight or nine years of use, the fence would begin to decay, with missing planks and boards. He asked how this issue was monitored and addressed.

Mr. Langille said that the approval process would involve two aspects. He said that the site plan would be approved for this location, providing construction details in both plan and profile views that demonstrate materials, colors, heights, and so forth. He said that this was actually a requirement by the zoning ordinance for screening purposes. He said that whenever a site required screening to adhere to these ordinances, this was another layer of compliance.

Mr. Langille said that this condition would also be part of the special use permit. He said that if there was a section of the fence that was deteriorating and allowed visibility into the site, it was not fulfilling its intended purpose; this would constitute a zoning violation. He said they would cite the property owner and they would need to rectify the situation.

Mr. Bivins said that there was a conversation regarding the project mentioned in one of the staff notes. He said that the applicant had since revised the built area size to 1.3 acres. He asked if that was reflected in what was presented to the Commission.

Mr. Langille said that is what was shown on the plan. He said that for 1.3 acres, he was discussing everything within the gray area, including the driveway entrance. He said that in terms of the cleared area, 1.3 acres did not include the white area. He said that he did not use it in the count for the built area.

Mr. Bivins said that in the conversation with the applicant, they initially intended to clear significantly more. He asked if they were discussing the type of containers used on freighters, specifically those that can be locked up and secured.

Mr. Langille said that the applicant would provide further details, but based on current information, yes. He said that there was a condition or note added by the ARB staff where the applicant had included in the concept plan that the containers must be painted in earth or muted colors. He said that this measure aimed to minimize visual impact.

Mr. Bivins asked if it would be similar to Renata on US 250, where shipping containers had been used to build outdoor spaces.

Mr. Langille said that those containers were similar. He said that in that example, they had stacked them; however, that was not what would occur in this situation.

Mr. Moore said that he was curious about having any data regarding the size of parking areas for garages. He said that in his local development area, he had observed that parking areas seemed to be about five times larger than the garage's square footage. He said that some garages appeared to have parking areas that were 10 or 15 times larger.

Mr. Langille said that he did not have an answer for that. He said that when measuring the area designated for storing vehicles awaiting repair there, it was approximately 10,000 square feet. He said that in the development areas, parking lots generally were double the size.

Mr. Missel said that his remaining question pertained to the preservation of existing dense vegetation in areas depicted on the map. He asked whether the vegetation was confirmed to be dense.

Mr. Langille said that when he conducted his initial site visit over a year ago, the area appeared quite dense. He said that it was not just trees; there were also shrubs at ground level. He said that if the special use permit were to be approved, the conditions outlined in the concept plan evidently aimed to create a visual

screen. He said that they could require a conservation plan in certain situations. He said that this plan would necessitate the applicant, who was proposing to develop the site, to hire an arborist. He said that the arborist would then provide a tree survey that identified every existing feature on the site. He said that if this survey revealed gaps or unobstructed lines of sight, they could stipulate that the area must be landscaped or planted with vegetation, in accordance with the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Missel asked if it was a subjective determination.

Mr. Langille said that they had staff members in their natural resources planning teams who could assess the land. He said that since this was in the entrance corridor, landscaping and screening would be significant factors for the ARB's consideration. He said that the project would require a comprehensive ARB review.

Mr. Missel asked if the ARB had any other comments regarding the staff report.

Mr. Langille said that returning to the initial layouts, which were significantly different from this design, there were numerous comments from everyone regarding the changes. He said that when the applicant reduced their proposed plans and demonstrated further improvements on site, such as replacing the original gravel parking area with pavement, concerns from ARB staff lessened. He said that the last issue they had was the color of the storage containers.

Mr. Langille said that if approved, this project would still require a complete review by the ARB and staff. He said that the applicant was aware of this process.

Mr. Missel asked whether the gate had to be closed at all times.

Mr. Langille said that they did not have a condition specifying the gate to be closed at all times. He said he would allow the applicant to address whether this was their intention. He said that at the community meeting, they mentioned they would not oppose closing the gate for security reasons. He said that if the Commission believed this condition would be beneficial, staff would not object to it.

Mr. Bivins said that the operating hours in the conditions should be extended to 6 or 6:30 p.m. He asked how people would drop off vehicles before the business opened if there was a gate.

Mr. Langille said that staff would not be opposed if the Commission wanted to amend the condition.

Mr. Murray asked about past instances during vegetation maintenance assessments when dense vegetation consisting of multiflora rose, a state-listed noxious species, was discovered. He said that he wanted to know what measures would be taken in such cases. He asked if the maintenance plan would require them to preserve this vegetation or if they would be required to remove it and replace it with alternative landscaping.

Mr. Langille said that they had never encountered that question before. He said that to address it, they would need to evaluate each situation individually with both the Zoning Administrator and natural resources staff. He said that it was a valid point; however, he was unable to provide a specific answer at this time without further speculation.

Mr. Missel opened the public hearing.

Clint Shifflett, Timmons Group in Charlottesville, said that he collaborated with applicant, Tommy Shull. He said he would present three or four slides to provide additional context for the area in question. He said one of the presented images highlighted the existing vegetation in the area. He said that it consisted of a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees, primarily deciduous but with some evergreen trees as well. He said that there was also ground cover, shrubs, and thick vegetation in the region. He said that the VDOT headquarters were nearby the development. He said that the VDOT facilities stored salt and loaded dump trucks during inclement weather.

Mr. Shifflett said that although the building was difficult to see in the image, the aerial photo he presented demonstrated the land cover adjacent to the site. He said that the VDOT headquarters, an industrial facility across the street to the east, could be seen. He said that the Green Mountain Country Store and U-Haul facility, Piedmont Veterinary Service, and Post Office were located to the west, surrounding the site. He said that the area consisted of both commercial and industrial uses.

Mr. Shifflett said that they aimed to address concerns raised during the community meeting in June 2023. He said that after receiving criticism of the initial proposal, Mr. Shull and he had reevaluated the design to minimize its impact. He said that they had reduced the paved area by approximately 40% compared to the original proposal, resulting in an overall clearing of about 50% of what was initially approved. He said that this reduction was based on community feedback.

Mr. Shifflett said that they also planned to provide larger buffer areas. He said that most of these buffer areas would be three or four times wider than those in their original proposal. He said that these changes were made in response to community input.

Mr. Bivins asked whether the applicant would propose an amended condition since if the gate was locked, it would prevent customers from dropping off vehicles early.

Tommy Shull said that they could arrange for drop-off by calling ahead and scheduling it. He said that they could also modify the gate's placement, perhaps creating a small area for vehicle drop-offs.

Mr. Bivins asked about picking up. He asked whether customers were able to get to the site by 5 p.m.

Mr. Shull said yes for repaired vehicles.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification about the requirement that no vehicle shall be on the lot for more than 30 days.

Mr. Shull said it was not an issue.

Mr. Bivins asked if they were connected to the business on Avon Street Extended.

Mr. Shull said yes.

Mr. Bivins asked whether that business would relocate to this site.

Mr. Shull said no, the business would reside where it was.

Mr. Bivins asked whether bodywork would occur and whether there would be wreckers parked at the site.

Mr. Shull said that there would be no bodywork, and there would be no wreckers unless something was being repaired.

Mr. Bivins said that he wanted to know if the containers would be similar to the freight containers commonly seen in various places. He asked if there was a plan to construct a building around them and shield them in some way.

Mr. Shull said that they could consider an alternative if necessary. He said that primarily, it would depend on their requirements regarding color coordination, but in general, it would involve a 40-foot C container.

Mr. Bivins asked whether they had considered shielding.

Mr. Shifflett said that opaque fencing was a requirement specified in the application.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the applicant anticipated forming a partnership with VDOT.

Mr. Shull said that they were not at this time.

Mr. Clayborne asked how the applicant would manage spill containment within the facility.

Mr. Shull said that they were a certified hazardous materials and hazardous waste operations and emergency response (HAZWOPER) spill cleanup company in Charlottesville, so they had extensive experience in containing incidents like that.

Mr. Clayborne asked for more information about spill cleanup in the facility.

Mr. Shull said that it would involve various aspects, including having spill kits in every bay and having proper containment and disposal of waste oil and similar materials.

Mr. Clayborne asked whether hazardous materials would be stored on-site.

Mr. Shull said no.

Mr. Moore asked about the approximate height of vehicles and containers stored in the parking lot.

Mr. Shifflett said that he believed they were standard sizes. He said that they were approximately nine feet in height.

Mr. Moore asked if the proposed fence was six feet.

Mr. Shifflett said that was correct.

Mr. Missel asked why, despite reducing the size of both the paved area and storage area, the overall dimensions appeared large. He asked if they had considered dividing the asphalt field into smaller sections.

Mr. Shifflett said that the sizes on the plan were related to ensuring that vehicles could safely exit Coles Rolling Road, make turns, and navigate the parking lot appropriately. He said that they used vehicle modeling software in CAD to run auto turns to avoid situations where large vehicles, such as 18-wheelers, might back up into Coles Rolling Road during deliveries. He said that the focus was on vehicular circulation within the lot, and they aimed to be conservative in their application plan. He said that they understood that increasing parking areas would be difficult during the site plan process. He said that they planned for potential larger vehicles coming in and out while maintaining appropriate parking lot navigation.

Mr. Missel asked for clarification about the location of the storage containers.

Mr. Shifflett said that they attempted to maximize the buffer area specifically, which was done in response to feedback from the ARB regarding the entrance corridor.

Mr. Missel asked for clarification about the presence of wreckers on the site.

Mr. Shull said that if a tow truck needed repaired, it would be stored on the property.

Mr. Missel asked for some details regarding the standard operating procedures implemented at their site. He said that he was specifically interested in understanding how they managed tasks such as ensuring gate opacity and visibility mitigation from the entrance corridor. He said that he was seeking insight into their organization's approach for minimizing site impact.

Mr. Shull said that at their current location, they had an electric-operated gate in place. He said that this is what they proposed for the new location as well.

Mr. Missel asked if the gate was automatic.

Mr. Shull said that was correct.

Mr. Missel asked if they considered pervious pavement.

Mr. Shifflett said that they have not had that discussion yet. He said that the cost was quite high. He said that the stormwater quantity and some of the quality will be managed through the stormwater management facility on site. He said that this facility had been approximately sized based on the development, providing a reasonable estimation of its appearance.

Mr. Shifflett said that in terms of overall size, cost was important. He said that if there was an opportunity for them to reduce the size of the parking lot, allowing Mr. Shull to spend less money in the process, they would consider it. He said that they did not want to limit themselves to a very small parking lot at this stage and wanted to provide flexibility in the site planning stage.

Mr. Murray asked where they anticipated the customer base to travel from.

Mr. Shull said that he was from Scottsville, and their company had been serving that area for over 15 years. He said that they had customers from both Scottsville and Charlottesville. He said that the new location would help them split their business in auto repair and provide more space. He said that their current location was on Avon Street, which was not even an acre in size, making it difficult to handle the volume of auto repair and tow service. He said that they decided to expand for better management.

Mr. Bivins asked if they were performing auto maintenance at the Avon Street location.

Mr. Shull said yes, and they offered towing services.

Mr. Bivins asked if the auto repair operations would stop at Avon Street once the new site opened.

Mr. Shull said yes, they would start referring customers to the new location.

Mr. Missel read the rules for public comment.

Carol Carter, 852 Redlands Farm, said that she would like to express her opposition to this commercial development in the rural area. She said that the majority of neighbors, both immediate and further away, did not desire this development. She said that this area was located along Route 20, which was already very busy. She said that if people coming from Charlottesville attempted to make a left turn at this location, it would likely cause significant traffic congestion. She said that Route 20 was particularly busy during peak commuting hours.

Ms. Carter said that this development would contribute to increased noise, light pollution, and runoff in the area. She said that the current screening was insufficient. She said that this development did not align with the rural area plan, which should be strongly upheld. She said that she was concerned that allowing this development could set a precedent for further commercialization in the area. She said that there were many residents in the vicinity who opposed crossroads designation or interchange development in their neighborhoods.

Jerome Beasley said that he owned two homes directly across the street from the property in question. He said that he was there to urge them to reject the application to convert the residential property at the corner of Coles Rolling Road into a light industrial site for a proposed auto mechanic shop, large parking lot for trailers and towing vehicles, and numerous box-like containers.

Mr. Beasley said that cities had zoning laws that regulated land uses for different purposes, such as residential, commercial, and industrial activities. He said that these laws created a balance between various activities and protected the interests of the community. He said that auto repair shops belonged to the commercial and industrial category and were not allowed in residential zones. He said that their activities could result in unsightly conditions that could affect property values and the character and overall look of the neighborhood.

Mr. Beasley said that approving this application would have detrimental effects on the living standards, safety, character, and environment of the residents next door, the King community, and even all who traveled along Route 20 due to the noise, traffic, and pollution caused by the applicant's activities. He said that the shop would generate loud noises from machinery, tools, and vehicles, disturbing the peace of the residents and the quality of life while endangering travel due to increased traffic congestion on the narrow rural, rustic roads.

Mr. Beasley said that the proposed site development contradicted the goals being discussed at the County workshops and the rural area comprehensive plan rewrite. He said that the site was not what the community wanted; it had zero value to the neighborhood. He said that the size, scale, and activity that would occur would not benefit the 55 households in King but would lower their property values, create road safety issues, and other major problems.

Mr. Beasley said that approving this application would go against the guidelines promised from the community workshop sessions on the rural area rewrite and forever change King's rural and industrial character, turning it into a commercial industrial zone, contributing to more sprawl from the development area. He said that this was not planning; it was spot zoning for the benefit of one party at the detriment of all others.

Mr. Beasley said that once transformed, there would be no going back, and the area would attract more undesirable businesses that would further degrade the environment and quality of life. He said that he urged them to consider the long-term impacts of their decisions and to listen to the voices of the community.

Shirley Phillips, 1621 Coles Rolling Road, said that her property bordered Tommy Shull's house, which currently had a three-bay garage and storage containers on an additional lot. She said that she believed placing these storage containers in a more visible location would negatively impact their home values. She said they may affect their wells, and due to the poor percolation of land in that area, they could also impact their septic systems. She said that many residents in their neighborhood had experienced issues related to septic systems in this area.

Ms. Phillips said that the runoff from the building project would likely affect the house next door and may cause problems further down the road. She said that traffic congestion on Route 20 had increased significantly in recent years, especially around 5 p.m. She said that she had observed vehicles passing her on the right when she was turning left, which she found unsafe. She said that the presence of state trucks in the area had grown since she moved there in 1972 when the state had a satellite office; now, it was a larger facility. She said that adding these trucks would increase danger for people in that area. She said that they would like their section of Route 20 to be treated similarly to other areas in Albemarle County.

Adelaide O'Brien said she had moved there to experience rural living in an area with trees, ample acreage, and clean surroundings. She said that she believed the proposal posed a significant threat to their neighborhood and environment. She said that it was crucial to assess how this plan would allow them to coexist peacefully with industrial runoff so close to an area identified by planners as having critical flows on this parcel. She said that if they proceed, they should conduct a thorough environmental impact study of the runoff from the cars parked there for 30 days and its proximity to the critical flows.

Ms. O'Brien said she was concerned about increased traffic. She said that while 19 vehicles per day was not a lot, the intersection was already dangerous. She said that her daughter was rear-ended there last

September, resulting in ongoing back pain and hip injury. She asked how many other accidents had occurred there and urged them to review this aspect and the traffic study.

Ms. O'Brien said that she was unsure how their communications and concerns would be considered as they progressed. She said that they had attended meetings and expressed their concerns. She said that it was essential to address the concerns of local residents, in addition to planning issues and information provided by the applicant.

Peter Bertone said that he lived approximately two miles from the proposed site in the Samuel Miller District. He said that the application was not for a public garage. He said that the applicant operated a successful towing, impoundment, and vehicle storage business on Avon Street Extended and had parked tow trucks and associated equipment at a nearby residence for years. He said that based on this history and specifically the design of the site, it was evident that the applicant intended to replicate that business in Keene. He said that knowing that such a commercial establishment would not be permitted under the rural area's regulations, the applicant was attempting to present the proposed facility as a public garage. He said that the Commission should not be fooled because this was no public garage.

Mr. Bertone said that there were four public garages serving the Keene area: South Side Garage, East Main Garage, West River Garage, and one on Plank Road, just a quarter mile from the applicant's site. He said that these garages had an average roofed footprint of 2,100 square feet, including storage. He said that the Plank Road Garage and South Side Garage had no hard surface for parked vehicles awaiting repairs. He said that while East Main had less than 5,000 square feet, excluding the area for gas pumps, and West River also had less than 5,000 square feet, excluding its driveway, the applicant was requesting over 50,000 square feet of asphalt. He said that this was over 10 times larger than even the largest public garage in the area.

Mr. Bertone said that the reason for this discrepancy was that the applicant required ample space to park and maneuver a fleet of large tow trucks and stored impounded cars. He said that unlike existing public garages, the applicant was requesting a retaining pond because of the area of asphalt cover. He said that while existing public garages did not require gates, the applicant's proposal included one to secure impounded cars. He said that unlike existing public garages that operated with very low inventory due to same day or next day delivery, the applicant was requesting four storage containers. He said that it was clear the applicant was trying to site a towing and vehicle impoundment business, not a public garage.

Paula Beasley, 6198 Green Mountain Road, said that she opposed this application. She said that the staff's recommended conditions were insufficient to protect the nearby community. She said that the application should be denied because it was inconsistent with the comprehensive plan due to its purpose, proposed scale, size, and incompatibility with Keene and the requirements of the Special Use Permit in rural areas for "a public garage." She said that the rural area designation allowed uses that preserved and protected agricultural, forestal, open space, natural, historic, and scenic resources, and may permit supportive uses for agricultural tourism and crossroad communities.

Ms. Beasley said that the proposed Shull SUP did not preserve and protect and was not supportive. She said that it was inappropriate in a residential zone rural area and did not comply with the definition and supporting regulations for a public garage. She said that the proposal was entirely incompatible with rural areas and the historic and rustic nature of Keene. She said it would negatively impact residences, neighborhoods, and character while detracting from its historic resources, equestrian businesses, conserved land, running, biking, and tourism. She said that this was due to its impact on traffic, safety, noise, activity, and sightliness, as well as its inconsistency with the area's CO2 emissions, environmental concerns, biodiversity, and fragmentation, all situated along a rural, rustic road, a scenic byway, and entrance corridor.

Ms. Beasley said that the public garage definition permitted only buildings or portions thereof, excluding external storage containers. She said that the proposed garage was twice the size of area pier garages, providing ample storage space and covering over 1.2 acres of asphalt for parking and service areas. She

said that this design accommodated approximately 200 cars in rural areas, with the building itself being twice the size of nearby garages.

Ms. Beasley said that this plan clearly demonstrated that the site's purpose was not limited to serving the local 55-household community or functioning solely as a public garage. She said that the rural location was not essential for its success. She said that profitability depended on attracting customers from the surrounding development area. She said that the proposed garage was not supportive of existing resources and was unnecessary.

Ms. Beasley said that considering that Scottsville was just six miles away and offered three public garages, along with another one across Plank Road, there was no legitimate reason for this garage in Keene. She said that utilizing one of these nearby garages would be more advantageous from the standpoint of climate, CO2 emissions, traffic safety, and maintaining Keene's rural character. She said that the proposed garage would generate significantly more traffic than the three residential homes allowed in the area, causing detrimental effects for everyone except the applicant.

Ms. Beasley said that encouraging expansion through spot zoning in rural areas promoted low-density, automobile-dependent, wasteful land clearance and inefficient land use, leading to sprawl. She said that combating sprawl was one of the most effective ways to address climate change and enhance resiliency in their rural areas, which protected wildlife habitats, biodiversity, air and water quality, and secured food supplies for their communities. She said that by doing so, they created a healthier environment for all residents of the County.

Tim Schmidt said that he owned Grayson Farm with his wife, which was located approximately one thousand yards south of the proposed site. He said that it was crucial to clarify that this was not an application for a public garage; rather, it was an application for a towing and impound lot. He said that they had discussed the size of the asphalt area. He said that for instance, Bob's Wheel Alignment had twelve bays, allowing them to service twelve cars simultaneously. He said that these bays required approximately 14,000 square feet of parking space, which equated to over 1,000 square feet per bay for parking. He said that the proposed development included four bays, yet they required over 43,000 square feet of space, which amounted to 10,000 square feet of parking for each bay.

Mr. Schmidt said that some of their suggestions included limiting the duration of vehicles at the lot to 30 days. He said that it was unclear who would be responsible for monitoring this or how it would be enforced. He said that this proposal seemed impractical for a tow yard and impound lot, where vehicles may be held for extended periods due to legal processes or insurance claims.

Mr. Schmidt said that concerns had been raised about noise and light disturbances from the tow trucks entering and exiting the facility at night. He said that the idea of having a tow yard and impound lot in close proximity to residential areas was not compatible with the surrounding rural environment. He said that it appeared that the use of a public garage was merely a way to bypass the restrictions associated with rural areas, which was not ideal for the community's well-being. He said that if the Planning Commission voted in favor of this proposal, they would be approving a tow yard and impound lot for Keene, which would negatively impact all residents.

Linda Vachtmeister, 906 Plain Dealing Farm, said that her farm was adjacent to the VDOT facility. She said that she operated an equestrian center that was accessible to the public, which meant she frequently received trucks and trailers filled with horses at her facility. She said that she owned numerous horse trailers, including one that could accommodate six horses. She said that Coles Rolling Road was a small road, and she was accustomed to consistently slowing down for approaching traffic, regardless of whether she was driving her compact car or pulling a vehicle carrying horses.

Ms. Vachtmeister said that she was relieved they mentioned 18-wheelers arriving at this facility. She said that this was a significant concern for her and her community. She said that she would encounter these large tow trucks while transporting her horses. She said that she had witnessed these tow trucks pulling

semitrailers. She said that she assumed that these tow trucks, along with their 18-wheelers delivering equipment, would likely appear at this location. She said that this was a small road, and she was unsure of how this would work, particularly with increased traffic at this hazardous intersection. She said that she did not support this project.

Bill Randall, Fairview Farm, said that he was not supportive of the application. He said that much had been said already, he was struck by the visual when comparing the amount of space for the four-bay building with the small rectangular customer parking space at the other end. He said that this left a large amount of asphalt in the center. He said that he had heard about tractor-trailers needing a place to turn around when they delivered parts but had never seen one come up to any garage in the area. He said that compact cars brought parts quickly from Fishers or Advance Auto and the like daily, if not twice a day.

Mr. Randall said that he was very suspicious of all the asphalt and the number of vehicles. He said that he did not know how many vehicles were at Mr. Shull's house but estimated upwards of 20. He said that Mr. Shull could perhaps provide them with the exact number. He said that currently, there was earth-moving equipment on the space they were discussing and a large garbage container. He said that others had expressed concerns about what would happen in the future. He asked if they could limit storing machinery overnight.

Sean Cosette said she wanted to acknowledge Mr. Shull for his efforts in running a successful business in the City and attempting to establish another one. She said that as someone who owned two small businesses, she understood the importance of support for small businesses and the challenges they faced. She said that she was unable to support Mr. Shull's request for rezoning in this area due to her concerns about the size of the structure and the amount of asphalt. She said that the proposed structure appeared to be smaller than the VDOT facility nearby, which was an eyesore in the community. She said that Route 20 was a historic rural corridor that should be preserved and respected, as these areas were becoming increasingly rare. She said that this development would not support their rural, rustic, historic area.

Susan Love, 1331 Coles Rolling Road, said she had 34 years of experience as a school teacher and believed in simplifying matters. She said that she appreciated Mr. Shull for towing a propane truck that got stuck in her yard. She said that she passed the location two to three times daily, sometimes four times due to her role as a math teacher. She said she could observe everything present there, as the location was not concealed by trees or bushes; it was easily visible. She said there were several items on the site, including a dumpster and various equipment. She said the site was not hidden at all; its entrance was wide.

Ms. Love said that construction workers should avoid using beeping sounds at night, especially as it impacted her as a middle-aged woman. She asked who would ensure that all ordinances were followed. She said she had spent her life adhering to rules but emphasized that almost every government employee she knew was overwhelmed and overworked. She said that if the proposal was approved, nearly every rule would be broken, and there would be no one to address the resulting chaos. She asked what an opaque fence was. She asked the Commission to consider how they would vote if they owned property within a half mile of the site.

Carol Jenny said she moved to Albemarle from Virginia Beach. She said that they often referred to the oceanfront area as Virginia Beach but acknowledged that there was also a vast rural area known as the Green Line, which no longer existed despite promises that it would remain in place. She said that Virginia Beach's Princess Anne area had since transformed into sprawl due to individual businesses expanding one at a time. She said that she had moved there to escape such urbanization and seek a rural lifestyle.

Ms. Jenny said that she had observed significant litter along Route 20 and other roads in the County. She said that proposing a business in this area raised concerns about increased litter on public roads. She said that when she relocated there, there was discussion about a rain tax due to nonpermeable surfaces. She said that although this was postponed, they now faced the prospect of more impervious areas being developed, which raised questions about the potential impact on runoff and the rain tax.

Mr. Missel said that the applicant had five minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Shifflett said that the community meeting previously discussed various concerns that they attempted to address. He said that they reduced the site size by 40% from their initial proposal. He said that some of the issues mentioned included zoning violations, which had a pre-existing process in place throughout the County. He said that regarding runoff concerns and pollution, they must adhere to state and local stormwater guidelines during the site plan process. He said that this limited them to a minimum 20% reduction in the volume of water leaving the site post-development. He said that both quantity and quality were closely monitored through the site plan process, requiring calculations and demonstrations of compliance.

Mr. Shifflett said that the stormwater management facility was designed to prevent excessive or damaging amounts of water from being sent off-site. He said that this concern was addressed during site plan approval. He said that their current proposal involved less than 20% impervious area coverage on the site. He said that this was a maximum percentage, not a definite figure. He said that it was crucial to consider vehicular circulation when evaluating parking lots; they accounted for over 40% of any parking lot area. He said that Mr. Shull may provide additional information regarding late night towing frequency. He said that Mr. Shull and he previously discussed data on this topic, which indicated that late night towing operations were very rare occurrences.

Mr. Shull said that at present, their location had received four disabled vehicles in the past 30 days that were towed in from being stranded in the middle of the road. He said that two of these incidents occurred 15 minutes before and after their regular business hours.

Mr. Clayborne asked how many cars they serviced per day and how much they anticipated serving.

Mr. Shull said that it was dependent on the required service. He said that typically, it was four to six vehicles.

Mr. Clayborne asked for clarification about the 30-day storage limit.

Mr. Shull said that depending on the reason for the vehicle being on the lot, by law they must hold the vehicle for 30 days before they can either dispose of it or move it.

Mr. Moore said that he was particularly curious about the area surrounding the location, specifically the mention of a garage on Plank Road. He said that the land was owned by two individuals who did not appear to be operating a garage. He asked if staff had more information.

Mr. Langille said that that was the first time he had heard about a garage on Plank Road tonight himself. He said that fortunately, they had some zoning staff present, and if they could provide more information about its exact location, they would be pleased to investigate further.

Mr. Missel closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Commission.

Mr. Moore said that he had noticed the property had had parked vehicles.

Mr. Langille said that there was not a special use permit for a public garage on the Plank Road property. He said that if they were running a business, it would need to be investigated.

Mr. Missel asked whether there were ongoing zoning compliance issues on the property.

Bart Svoboda, Zoning Administrator and Deputy Director of Community Development, said that he was not familiar with the parcel that was mentioned. He said that their department handled approximately 400 complaints annually; however, without an address or further information, he was unable to determine its status. He said that he had taken notes in order to gather information and investigate the situation. He said

that it may involve a violation due to lack of appropriate permits or possibly a non-conforming garage that had been present for some time.

Mr. Moore asked how frequently zoning conditions were enforced.

Mr. Svoboda said that the County's enforcement program operated on a complaint basis. He said that the 30-day timeline was not specified in their zoning ordinance; it was only applicable under vehicle total law. He said that Mr. Shull would be better suited to address the specifics of that situation. He said that he was unaware of any such requirement for repair unless there was a provision in the code stating that failure to pay a bill necessitated retaining the item for a certain period. He said that in that case, Mr. Shull would be more knowledgeable about the details.

Mr. Moore asked what would happen if someone made a complaint.

Mr. Svoboda said that they logged complaints within two to three days. He said that they contacted complainants to ensure information accuracy. He said that they dispatched a Community Compliance Officer (CCO) from the assigned area to investigate. He said that throughout his 30-year career, he had encountered various violations, including fence violations at apartment complexes. He said that upon discovering these issues, they issued notices of violation and addressed the situation accordingly.

Mr. Moore asked if there were different types of escalations if someone was a repeat offender.

Mr. Svoboda said that there was an appeal period after a notice was sent. He said that during this time, individuals fines escalated for each offense. He said that the initial fines ranged from $250 to $500 but could reach a maximum of $5,000 per year. He said that for a special use permit, revocation could only be carried out by the Board. He said that in his 30 years of experience, he was aware of one instance in two localities where a permit was revoked due to willful non-compliance.

Mr. Moore asked whether the applicant had a history of zoning violations.

Mr. Svoboda said that they had a violation in a separate area that was not relevant for their consideration tonight. He said that generally, they did not research the number of parcels owned by an applicant, whether they were an individual or a business, prior to their application submission. He said that they focused on examining the specific property in question.

Mr. Moore asked what size storage sheds were allowed by-right.

Mr. Svoboda said that any size storage building was permitted. He said that they required a primary use for accessory purposes. He said that the structure's size, approximately 256 square feet, determined whether building inspections were necessary. He said that this rule did not apply uniformly to residential or commercial structures. He said that there was also a building code provision exempting convex-type containers from inspections but not necessarily from zoning permits. He said that the specifics of this exemption may be limited to residential uses, not commercial ones.

Mr. Moore said that he was also curious about the operations at the VDOT facility, specifically how it was constructed and its current level of inbound and outbound traffic, along with other significant uses.

Mr. Svoboda said that he was not familiar with that. He said that the basic concept was that it was state-owned land, which was outside their jurisdiction.

Mr. Bivins said that the VDOT facility serviced southern Albemarle County. He said that during bad weather, it was pressed into action when needed. He said that it consistently performs its duties for that part of the County.

Mr. Murray said that earlier they had a significant discussion about crossroads communities and their importance in determining their own fate and preferred uses within those communities. He said that they had also emphasized that a crucial aspect of their comprehensive plan was to focus on uses that supported rural areas and local communities. He said that what he was hearing was that this service was not desired in this area. He said that if they were to plan for a crossroads community in this area, they would likely express that this use was not desired in their community.

Mr. Clayborne said that the work session prompted him to consider the question of what constitutes an essential service or basic service need in rural communities. He said that this topic seemed particularly relevant for their discussion. He said that one aspect they could explore was whether this would be considered an essential service or basic service need in rural areas in the future.

Mr. Clayborne said that in terms of the pros or positive aspects of this service, there was a small business that had been successful, was looking to expand, and had done well for itself. He said that on the other hand, there were negative impacts associated with this service that had been attempted to be addressed through certain measures. He said that the addition of a public garage did not necessarily detract from the rural nature of an area.

Mr. Clayborne said that the amount of asphalt he saw seemed disproportionate to the number of vehicles being serviced daily, which was four to six. He said that the site plan did not reflect this discrepancy. He said that considering the overall harmony of the area, the VDOT site had negative implications. He asked what additional impact this had. He said that while they must evaluate each site individually, he did not want to lose sight of the broader context of the area.

Mr. Bivins said that Scott's Ivy Exxon was an old business that wanted to expand its number of garages from 4 to possibly 6 or 7 or 8. He said that it was located near what was once a crossroads community. He said that in comparing and contrasting these sites, it seemed out of proportion. He said that the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center was more suitable for a garage.

Mr. Bivins said that he was concerned about the footprint. He said that during his comparison process, he noticed that Coles Rolling Road felt very different compared to placing an entrance off Scottsville Road onto Route 20. He said that the Route 250 exit and Scottsville Road felt similar in nature, as they were both main roads running east-west. He said that in contrast, exiting onto a subsidiary road felt very different when attempting to accommodate that amount of traffic for a business.

Mr. Bivins said that another issue he was trying to address was the degree of distrust between the community and this particular applicant. He said that there was suspicion within the community regarding the applicant's claims, even though they said they were not doing something. He said he was unsure of how to resolve this issue or if there was a way to repair the relationship between the community and the applicant. He said that before submitting this proposal to the supervisors, he suggested that they clarify their objectives and address any concerns regarding the applicant's credibility.

Mr. Bivins said that he found it challenging to understand why there was so much space for few bays and so much asphalt for few bays. He said that the entrance from Coles Rolling Road was also problematic, especially after observing a significant equestrian event further up the road. He said that although the frequency may not be the same, the size of horse boxes was comparable to the traffic they might encounter at this property. He said that while he believed there may be potential solutions, he thought they needed to reassess their approach, particularly given that the garage up Plank Road was likely not legal. He said that he could not support the application at this time.

Mr. Moore said that there was vocal opposition, and it raised questions about what sort of business plan would work. He said that he did not hear the word lying but heard every word around it from several commenters. He said that some aspects of this project bothered him more than others. He said that the rural nature of the vicinity, in terms of density, was not significantly affected by this development. He said that this was just one business on one parcel between a gas station and a VDOT facility. He said that the

garage did not add much density, and the number of cars going in and out of this location was not a significant traffic issue. He said that they were not talking about a stadium or large events; they were talking about 19 cars a day.

Mr. Moore said that he had concerns about a couple of things. He said that the runoff of fluids from car maintenance was a matter of concern, given that these chemicals could be quite hazardous, regardless of their efforts to manage them. He said that the gas station and VDOT facility may also contribute to this issue. He said that he was unsure about how to address this concern in relation to neighboring parcels. He said that he was questioning the necessity of such a large amount of paved lot for a relatively modest pace of business, even considering potential growth. He said that he was somewhat uncertain about this proposal. He said that visibility could be an issue due to height differences between vehicles and fences. He said that there was potential for addressing or fixing this problem. He said that he was quite undecided about this entire project.

Mr. Missel said that he had attempted to consider potential impacts of the site and ways they could be mitigated. He said that he believed he heard the applicant mention that the impervious area was less than 20% of the site. He said that he calculated the total acreage of 6.41 acres and divided that by 3.02 acres. He said that although this did not account for impervious areas, it indicated that over 50% of the site was being impacted.

Mr. Missel said that while he appreciated the comment about supporting small businesses, he would like to emphasize that this was not the focus of their discussion today. He said that regarding stormwater management, he was confident that the requirements would be managed through state and local regulations. He said that the proposed development would generate 19 cars, which was a small percentage of the existing traffic in the area. He said that he had no reason to doubt this number.

Mr. Missel said that he believed that the aesthetic impacts on the entrance corridor would be mitigated by the ARB's careful consideration of such matters. He said that he had considered asking the applicant whether there were any active zoning issues on their property but had decided against it. He said that perhaps these suspicions were based on accurate information or not; however, he did not place much weight on this. He said that he believed it was crucial for them to be cautious not to let these suspicions influence their progress with the comprehensive plan or rural areas. He said that they must discuss their current situation clearly.

Mr. Missel said that the Commission's primary role was to serve as an advisory body to the Board, promoting orderly development in the County and its surroundings. He said that this development should consider location, adjacencies, uses, scale, land disturbance, aesthetic appeal, visibility, community input, existing patterns of development, and access among other factors. He said that they must determine whether this location was suitable for the proposed use. He said that he could not support or endorse the belief that this was an appropriate location for this use. He said that he would not support this application in its current form.

Mr. Shifflett said that the applicant would request a deferral over a vote to deny the recommendation. He said that they could engage the community and retool the application.

Mr. Missel asked if the record needed to reflect that the applicant requested a deferral.

Mr. Herrick asked if the applicant could confirm they were requesting an indefinite deferral.

Mr. Shifflett confirmed that they were requesting an indefinite deferral.

Mr. Herrick said that there needed to be a motion by a member of the Commission to grant the deferral.

Mr. Missel motioned for the Commission to grant the deferral of SP2022-00026 indefinitely as requested by the applicant. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (5-0). (Ms. Firehock and Mr. Carrazana were absent).

Committee Reports

Mr. Bivins said that he was reporting on his CAC meeting. He said that they had two interesting presentations. He said that one was about Charlotte Humphreys Park in the Jack Jouett District. He said that due to lack of attention, invasive species had taken over the park. He said that the Parks and Recreation department had presented their plan to address this issue in a thoughtful manner.

Mr. Bivins said that the second topic of interest was the installation of speed cameras along Hydraulic Road near the Lambs Lane campus. He said that starting this year until 2025, speed cameras would be operational during yellow light flashing periods. He said that he would advise drivers to maintain speeds below 30 miles per hour in these areas. He said that the Western Albemarle area may also see similar speed cameras in the future. He asked everyone to be aware of this during the fall semester. He said that the cameras would capture video, still images, and regular images.

Review of the Board of Supervisors Meeting

Mr. Barnes said that the Board had been meeting frequently, but none of them concerned land use issues. He said that they were going through budget season. He said that they met on February 28, March 6, and March 11. He said that they would meet again tomorrow. He said that at this time, he did not have anything to report at that moment.

AC44 Update

Mr. Barnes said that this was the last of their goals and objectives that they would present to the Board on March 20. He said that the Board would review the package of information they had been working on during their past few sessions, which focused on development areas and rural areas, land use, transportation, and community facilities. He said that they had begun transitioning into Phase 3.

Mr. Barnes said that the work group for Phase 3 commenced last Monday. He said that they had received draft action steps, which would be informed by the goals they had collaborated on with other departments and stakeholders. He said that they would synthesize these drafts and bring them back for review. He asked everyone to be prepared for a busy summer and avoid scheduling vacations during that period. He said that they would review the schedule for completing the remaining tasks in the process as they approached the final stages. He said that they would engage in extensive public outreach and collaborate closely with everyone. He said that depending on the workload from rezoning and special use permit applications, they might need to hold three meetings per month in the summer.

Mr. Bivins asked what time the summer meetings would be scheduled.

Mr. Barnes said they would likely be 4 p.m. meetings.

Mr. Bivins asked if the meetings would be open to public comment.

Mr. Barnes said that he was not certain and perhaps he should have waited until he had a clear plan in place.

Mr. Missel said that having a schedule fed his project management soul, which was great. He said that thinking strategically about handling that workload was crucial. He said that they should consider options such as scheduling 4 p.m. meetings or dedicating one day to complete many of the topics. He said that many of them had day jobs, so managing this workload effectively was essential.

Mr. Missel said that discussing public comment opportunities during Phase 3 would be helpful. He said that this should include an overview of the community input process provided by staff during a public hearing. He said that by clarifying available opportunities for community involvement at the beginning of Phase 3, they could refer back to the community plan when public comment opportunities arose.

Mr. Herrick asked if Mr. Barnes was intending to discuss the March 6 Board of Supervisors meeting, specifically addressing the Arbor Life tree care proposal and the rezoning of 4102 Dickerson Road.

Mr. Barnes said yes. He said that the Board approved both of the requests.

New Business

Mr. Bivins said that he believed that at some point, it would be beneficial for them to review the points they had made thus far regarding the development areas and rural areas. He said that this would help ensure that they had all reached a mutual understanding of their current position or decision-making process.

Mr. Barnes asked if Mr. Bivins was requesting an overview of what they had discussed over the past eight chapters.

Mr. Bivins said that he did not want to reach a point where people had completed all this work and believed that they had heard their input, only for there to be a significant change in direction. He said that people's opinions can shift over time, especially since they had been discussing this for approximately a year now. He said that they should verify everyone's current stance on this matter.

Mr. Missel said that he was aware that staff was compiling comments for the Board of Supervisors based on their discussions. He said that those compilations should also be provided to the Commission.

Old Business

Mr. Murray asked about the status of the riparian buffer and stream protection ordinance update.

Mr. Barnes said that he could follow up with that information.

Items for follow-up

Mr. Missel said that they had had several conversations about a joint Planning Commission meeting with the City. He said that they had vetted some topics, and they would share those with the Commission at the appropriate time.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the meeting would coincide with the Phase 3 work.

Mr. Missel said that it remained undecided.

Adjournment

At 8:40 p.m., the Commission adjourned to March 26, 2024, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium.

_____

Michael Barnes, 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: