Albemarle County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes November 25, 2025

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public meeting on Tuesday, November 25, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Luis Carrazana, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Karen Firehock; Nathan Moore

Members absent Fred Missel, Chair; Corey Clayborne; Lonnie Murray.

Other officials present were Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Jered Tate, Senior Planner; Cameron Langille, Planning Manager; Jenny Tevendale, Assistant County Attorney; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commissions.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Carrazana established a quorum.

Public Comment on matters pending before the Commission, but not listed on this agenda

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Moore motioned that the Planning Commission approve the Consent Agenda. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (4-0). (Mr. Clayborne, Mr. Missel, and Mr. Murray were absent.)

Mr. Carrazana said that the Commission's work session on this evening's agenda was proposed to be rescheduled for December 9, 2025. He asked for a motion to approve the schedule change.

Mr. Bivins moved that the Planning Commission hold the work session on December 9, 2025, at 4:00 p.m. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (4-0). (Mr. Clayborne, Mr. Missel, and Mr. Murray were absent.)

Public Hearing

SP202400017 Funk Brothers Furniture RA – Special Use Permit for Craft Shop

Jered Tate, Senior Planner, said that he would provide the staff report for the special use permit SP202400017 Funk Brothers Furniture. He said that the existing parcel was approximately 3 acres in size and was located at the northeast corner of Richmond Road and Moose Lane, roughly 4.5 miles east of Pantops and across Route 250 from the Rivanna Village development. He said that currently, the parcel was vacant and underutilized, with the building also being vacant.

Mr. Tate said that the building had formerly been a Moose lodge and was now a non-conforming structure due to rural area setbacks. He said that the zoning for the parcel was Rural Areas, and

the same zoning applied to the majority of the surrounding parcels. He said that there was a small area of C-1 Commercial zoning to the west along Route 250, represented by the pink shading on the zoning map. He said that there was also Neighborhood Model District (NMD) zoning for Rivanna Village across Route 250, shown in green on the map.

Mr. Tate said that Funk Brothers Furniture had operated in Charlottesville for over 15 years and had requested a special use permit to relocate their operations to a larger space within the County. He said that they had proposed a gift craft and antique shop, with a focus on the craft shop use. He said that according to Section 3.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, a craft shop was defined as an establishment where handmade goods were offered for sale.

Mr. Tate said that under their proposal, the existing structures on the parcel would remain and be reused. He said that the applicant proposed to remediate existing infrastructure as needed, add landscape screening adjacent to Route 250 and Moose Lane, and utilize the portion of the existing building farthest from neighboring properties for their active operations to minimize potential impacts. He said that the existing building was a nonconforming structure in relation to rural area zoning setbacks, with its nearest point approximately 17 feet from the adjacent residential property to the east.

Mr. Tate said that to mitigate this, the applicant proposed to repair and maintain the existing screening fence along the property line and plant new vegetation to provide additional screening between the two parcels. He said that staff's analysis concluded that the proposed special use permit would not be detrimental to adjacent parcels, would not change the character of the nearby area, would be in harmony with the Rural Area zoning district, and was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tate said that staff had identified two positive aspects of the proposal: first, the proposal aligned with the review criteria for special use permits outlined in the Zoning Ordinance; second, no adverse impacts to adjacent properties were anticipated. He said that staff had also identified one concern, namely that the existing structure did not meet setback requirements; however, a use buffer and screening would be implemented to address this concern. He said that in summary, staff recommended approval of SP 202400017, subject to the proposed five conditions.

Ms. Firehock asked if the applicant was the owner of the property.

Mr. Tate said that yes, they were the owner of the property, but he would let the applicant explain that arrangement.

Ms. Firehock said that it appeared the prior owners, the fraternal organization, had built the existing building too close to the property line. She asked if the County's Zoning Ordinance was in effect when they constructed the building.

Mr. Tate said that he was not certain. He said that County records indicated that the building was constructed in 1965, so he did not know what the standards were at that time.

Ms. Firehock said that it was possible that the County did not have that standard back then.

Mr. Tate said that it was possible.

Mr. Bivins said that the house on the neighboring property did not exist at that time; it was just a field.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Mike Funk, applicant, said that they were acquiring this property in partnership with another buyer. He said that half of the building closest to the adjacent property would be occupied by the other buyer, so their operation was not located near that area, but they had proposed a 50-foot setback voluntarily. He said that they planned to install a firewall in the building to further separate it from the other half of the building.

Mr. Funk said that regarding the 17-foot setback, as the building was constructed before the adjacent neighbor's house was built. He said that he was not sure whether that property was part of the Moose Lodge's property or just a wooded area, but there was no concern about the setback at the time. He said that he had not planned to speak at the hearing tonight, but their planner was coming in from Richmond and had run into some traffic. He said that he and his brother Dan were both craftsmen who restored antique furniture, sometimes building furniture by order for customers in the area. He said that they believed their work would be harmonious with this rural setting. He said that they were locally owned, their customers were locally based, and they worked by hand with locally sourced materials.

Mr. Bivins said that he appreciated the further context about the building being occupied by two separate entities. He said that he was glad to learn that his partner was someone he was familiar with, a local mechanic and car enthusiast. He said that in the application, it mentioned a bilateral crossing where people could easily go between businesses. He asked if Mr. Funk could explain that in more detail.

Mr. Funk said that there was an access road that ran through their property and intersected with Moose Lane. He said that this access road enabled them to enter their parking lot without having to exit onto Route 250.

Mr. Moore asked if the co-owner would also need a special use permit for their portion of operations in this building.

Mr. Funk said that to his knowledge, the co-owner would be using it for personal use. He said that they were applying for their business operations in their portion of the building.

Mr. Moore said that the application mentioned the aspect of economic development and employment as they related to this type of fine woodworking industry. He asked what the size of their shop was at present and if they anticipated growth in employment in the future.

Mr. Funk said that when they left their previous location in the City, they had between four and six employees at any given time, and they were always busy. He said that he believed they could add more employees in the future. He said that they were planning to open a retail space within this building, which would also bring in more employees. He said that, in a small way, he felt they were contributing positively to their local economy. He said that he thought there was a steady demand for their type of work.

Mr. Funk said that they often received calls from individuals who could not find anyone else to repair or fix their items. He said that it was a niche service that they provided, and he was proud to be able to offer it. He especially said that he enjoyed being able to salvage and reuse items, which was especially important in today's culture where people tended to buy and discard things.

Ms. Firehock asked why the applicant was moving to this new location. She asked if they needed more space.

Mr. Funk said yes, they would be able to double their floor space. He said that in a sense, it was an investment for them because they would own this building and had been renting their previous one. He said that it was becoming difficult to find space in the City, so this was an economic and financial move for them as well.

Ms. Firehock said that in looking at what they planned to do with the building, considering its current state, she imagined it could only get better looking. She asked if they would be generally tidying up the property besides installing the new vegetative buffer.

Mr. Funk said yes, they would also restore the property. He said that it had been vacant for about ten years with people living there from time to time. He said that they wanted it to look nice and for people to feel good when they showed up there.

Mr. Carrazana said that he had only a few questions on this item, and most of his had already been addressed. He said that this was the kind of project the County typically looked for, which involved not only restoring properties but also reusing them. He said that this was particularly relevant in infill projects, such as this one, although it was located in a rural area. He said that it was a great project, and he appreciated that they were reusing and giving a second life to a building that had been underutilized for decades, as it appeared.

Mr. Funk said that yes, there was a lot of activity going on across the street as they were building up the neighborhood. He said that this was the last bit of eyesore, so they would do their part.

Mr. Carrazana said that he would like to emphasize the comments made by some of his colleagues. He said that in terms of thinking outside the box, there were various ways to utilize that land for community activities, such as hosting a farmers market or other events, that would be great.

Mr. Funk said that he was glad to hear that because this was the first time they had navigated a situation like this. He said that they had been very focused on their current efforts, but they were also aware that there was a significant amount of land on this parcel that could be utilized for various purposes. He said that his son had been in Boy Scouts, and the troop had used to meet in that building. He said that considering things like that, he was thinking about how they could foster a sense of community and be welcoming in this space.

Mr. Carrazana asked if any members of the public wished to address this item.

Connor O'Donnell stated that he was scheduled to present, but traffic was particularly heavy due to the Thanksgiving holiday. He said that Mr. Funk had done a good job of providing background on the business, but he would like to delve a bit deeper into how they had arrived at this point. He said that this was relevant as the County moved forward with their Zoning Code rewrite.

Mr. O'Donnell said that as they were moving to the County, they had assumed that an artisan craft shop would be able to operate without issue with a special use permit. He said that however, they discovered a significant gap in the process. He said that in Rural Areas, a home occupation was allowed, but the next step was to establish a manufacturing facility in a commercially zoned area. He said that they had researched localities such as Nelson County and Goochland, which had different regulations for makers and craft artisans in rural areas.

Mr. O'Donnell said that they had identified the term "artisan manufacturing" as a suitable definition, as it was included in the Rio 29 Overlay District. He said that this definition aligned with their goals of expanding artisan manufacturing to rural areas. He said that when they began this process, they had initially focused on establishing artisan manufacturing in a Zoning Text Amendment, which was approximately a year and a half ago. He said that staff and some Board of Supervisors members had since acknowledged the gap but wanted to address it in the overall Zoning Code rewrite.

Mr. O'Donnell said that he wanted to bring this to the Commission's attention and reiterate that it was something missing here. He said that Supervisor Mallek was very supportive and recalled the Monticello Artisan Trail from the early 2010s and the County's efforts to help businesses navigate the zoning and tax aspects of the home occupation business.

Mr. O'Donnell said that however, there was still a significant gap in the current regulations. He said that they had been working with staff to establish this as a craft shop, but it had not been an easy process. He said that therefore, as the Zoning rewrite came before them, he sincerely requested that the Commission examine the definition of artisan manufacturing and consider moving it to the Rural Areas to facilitate the growth of artisanal businesses in these areas, such as cabinetmakers, blacksmiths, and woodworkers to operate in these areas without having to jump through so many hoops.

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

Ms. Firehock said that she believed the requested use was an appropriate use for the location. She said that the applicant had mentioned in their application that they were trying to utilize locally sourced materials, such as locally sourced wood, and this aligned with the County's values and made sense for a rural area. She said that the current location was very accessible for customers, making it convenient for them to visit. She said that she had no concerns with this application.

Mr. Moore said that he also supported the request but wanted to echo the comments of Mr. O'Donnell. He said that with this item and the next one the Commission would be hearing, he was considering some things they might want to consider changing in their Zoning Modernization process. He said that artisan manufacturing was very consistent with the ideas they had about the Rural Area for a long time, so it was something to put on the table for conversation.

Ms. Firehock said absolutely. She said that she remembered someone who just wanted to make paintings, arguably one of the quietest activities one could do, and people were concerned that once a month someone might come and visit them. She said that it seemed ridiculous and at that time she noted that they should update their Code. She said that she still supported that.

Mr. Bivins said that he remembered the situation Ms. Firehock was referencing. He said that he agreed that if there was a way to better accommodate commerce, they should make that happen. He said that he remembered when this location was operating as the Moose Lodge, but the population of members had diminished greatly over time. He said that the population had shifted within their local community, and he thought they should keep that in mind and consider what opportunities they could bring to serve the new populations. He said that artisan work was serving a different segment of the community and economy, and he absolutely supported the request. He said that he knew the Funks' business partner was familiar with farm markets, as one was hosted on his current property, so he hoped they could arrange that successfully. He said that he thought this was a good use of this property.

Ms. Firehock motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP202400017 Funk Brothers Furniture, with the conditions outlined in the staff report. Mr. Bivins seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (4-0). (Mr. Clayborne, Mr. Missel, and Mr. Murray were absent).

ZMA-2025-00011 5546 Three Notch'd Road – Rezone R2 to R4

Cameron Langille, Planning Manager, said that he would present the staff report and recommendation on ZMA-2025-00011 for 5546 Three Notch'd Road in Crozet. He said that this property was located on the north side of Route 240, or Three Notch'd Road, approximately 1,000 feet west of the Star Hill Brewery. He said that the surrounding properties have a mix of uses, with most being single-family detached homes. He said that to the north was an agricultural use, and to the south was the railroad, followed by higher medium-density neighborhoods like Glenbrook.

Mr. Langille said that the property measures 0.603 acres and was currently zoned R2 residential. He said that the proposed rezoning, ZMA 2025-00011, seeks to rezone it to the R4 residential district with proffers. He said that the Crozet Master Plan recommends neighborhood-density residential future land uses, allowing for residential uses between 3 and 6 units per acre, and also calls for green systems in the center of the property. He said that the map showed the Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) stream buffer in purple, so the master plan recommended neighborhood density everywhere except the buffer, and green systems within the buffer.

Mr. Langille said that provided was a conceptual development plan prepared by the applicant, demonstrating the feasibility of building a duplex on the property and subdividing it into two individual parcels. He said that the applicant was requesting R4 zoning for two reasons: one, the R2 district did not allow duplexes, and two, the parcel acreage requires a higher density zoning district. He said that the proposed development showed two future lots, one approximately 15,000 square feet and the other 10,900 square feet, both larger than the minimum lot size requirement in the R4 district. He said that this plan intended to show it would be feasible to build these dwelling units outside of the stream buffer, as well as subdivide them and apply Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Mr. Langille said that the positive aspects of this request included that it was consistent with the land use and density recommendations from the Crozet Master Plan. He said that the applicant had submitted a proffer statement that committed to providing both new units as affordable units, consistent with the Housing Albemarle Housing Policy. He said that however, staff's concern was regarding the 40-year affordability requirement recommended by Housing Albemarle, as the proffers only committed to 30 years. He said that in summary, staff recommended approval for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Mr. Bivins said that if this request were to move forward, this would significantly change the value of the land adjacent to it. He said that he did not want this to lead to a movement to make the taxes for those individuals move at a dramatic rate. He said that the neighboring properties were modest houses, and he did not think the requested duplexes would be similarly modest. He said that he was seriously concerned that the neighboring homes would appreciate out of existence.

Michael Barnes, Director of Planning, said that he was not the County Assessor, so he could not speak with authority to that point, but from his perspective, there would be two different zoning districts between this parcel and the neighbors with this ZMA. He said that the other properties would not automatically have the right to put extra dwelling units on them, so while these

renovations may raise the value of the structure on the subject property, the neighboring ones would remain the same. He said that he assumed this request would not affect the assessed values on the adjacent properties significantly.

Mr. Moore asked if this proposal qualified for the property tax discount as part of their new Housing Policy.

Mr. Langille said that it was not part of this request, but they might. He said that the Housing Office had evaluated the proffer statement and the applicant's commitments. He said that according to their assessment, in terms of the affordable price rate they had in Housing Albemarle, this proposal would provide 100% affordability with the new units, and although it was only two units, both would be affordable.

Ms. Firehock asked if these houses would be constructed for sale.

Mr. Langille confirmed that it was correct and spoken to directly in the proffers.

Ms. Firehock said that most mortgages are for 30 years, not 40. She said that according to Habitat for Humanity's structure, they had the right of first refusal for these properties, and this was stated in the application.

Ms. Firehock said that if someone owned the property and their 30-year mortgage ends, that would be the time they may want to sell. She said that Habitat would then either acquire the property or be able to obtain a similar one elsewhere. She said that although the mortgage period was 30 years, rather than 40, Habitat's sales structure ensured that there would still be affordable units available in the County, even if these were sold later on. She said that therefore, she did not consider it a concern, as it would continue indefinitely as long as Habitat for Humanity existed.

Mr. Carrazana said that he noticed the Area Median Income (AMI) range noted in the application was very wide at 25% to 80%. He asked if staff had discussed getting to a particular percentage instead of the large range.

Mr. Langille said that he did not believe staff from the Community Development Department had spoken with the applicant about the range, but it was possible they may have discussed it with the Housing Office. He said that they had not made it to the public hearing stage yet, but their Department had begun to see applications submitted for affordable units with much wider ranges than in the past. He said that the Commission would likely see some of these in the near future.

Mr. Carrazana said that he would ask for more information from the applicant. He said that it was great to see 25% AMI being considered, but he was intrigued by the wide range.

Ms. Firehock said that this arrangement may provide more flexibility, as it may depend on the clients, they had available and who was available to move, etcetera.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Amy George, Roudabush, Gale, & Associates, said that she was representing Habitat for Humanity, the applicant. She said that she was joined by Dan Rosensweig, President and Ceo of Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville, David Schmidt, Chief Construction Officer, and Amanda Harlow, Residential Planning and Design Manager. She said that this was a small, 0.6-acre site, and Habitat was approached to purchase the site from the owner, with the goal of

developing it into two units on the site. She said that currently, the house that was previously located there has been removed due to its condition.

Ms. George said that the applicant was seeking to rezone the property from R2 to R4 to allow for side-by-side two-family dwellings or duplexes, as this use was not permitted in the R2 zoning designation. She said that the minimum lot size was the second reason for the request. She said that they were considering the remaining Zoning Ordinance recommendations, except for that reason. She said that the proposed density was 3.30 units per acre. She said that she had provided a close-up view of the proposed residences along Three Notch'd Road, with two parking pads in front of the residences. She said that Habitat had provided a sketch of the proposed residences.

Ms. George said that Habitat had also been approached by a potential collaborator regarding the Beaver Creek Hill property. She said that they were hoping to receive more information or an opinion on the possibility of rezone this property to R6, allowing for a smaller minimum lot size. She said that this would enable them to purchase the residue land in the back and allow it to be purchased by Beaver Creek Hill, with the option of using the land in the front on the adjacent parcel outside of the stream buffer unit as a land swap. She said that this would allow us to protect the stream buffer entirely and potentially develop more affordable products in the area.

Mr. Bivins asked if the illustration provided was of one of the duplexes or if it contained both.

Ms. George said that the illustration depicted the sole structure. She said that there were two dwelling units within a single structure.

Mr. Bivins asked if the property line would bisect the house.

Ms. George said yes, that was correct.

Mr. Bivins asked how nearby this property was to the stream itself.

Ms. George said that this was actually located at the headwaters of the stream buffer itself. She said that it ended about two lots over, so this was truly the location of the headwaters.

Ms. Firehock said that to clarify, they were not making a decision tonight regarding the back part of the property.

Ms. George said that no; the intent was to propose the idea of a potential collaboration in the future.

Ms. Firehock said that the Commission would only decide on whether these two structures could be here at the desired density.

Dan Rosensweig, President and CEO of Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville, said that their ideal outcome for the evening would be a recommendation to approve R4, with the possibility of a side note to Supervisors stating that if an agreement could be reached with the adjacent neighbors, they would be open to revising the plan to R6, provided the density remained at 2 units. He said that the main difference between R4 and R6 would be that R6 would allow them to create a larger area in the back, potentially swapping it for the adjacent property, which they had been trying to acquire.

Mr. Rosensweig said that the property he was referring to was owned by the investors of the large parcel behind it, who had purchased it solely to have an option to access it. He said that they had no intention of building a road there and had been unwilling to sell until they found an alternative. He said that he believed that R4 would be a suitable recommendation, but R6 would ultimately be preferable, as it would give them a larger bargaining chip to potentially exchange for the adjacent property and create more affordable housing. He said that to reiterate, they would be supportive of the R4 recommendation with a side note that if the Supervisors were willing to go to R6, it may be even better.

Ms. Firehock said that she did not understand how the back part of the lot would be a buildable spot or a legitimate swap, considering there was no access to it.

Mr. Rosensweig said that it would be buildable by the owners of the parcel behind it, should they gain access from a different location. He said that they had been attempting to acquire access to that location via Firehouse Lane and had struggled to achieve this. He said that they had been working with the Fire Department for some time to try to secure this access. He said that assuming they could gain access to the property, they could extend the back part of this property onto their land and enable them to swap it for the adjacent property.

Mr. Rosensweig said that this was a more complex issue than a zoning question; it involved another type of transaction. He said that they would be perfectly happy with this R4 recommendation and would appreciate it if they would provide a note to the Board of Supervisors stating that R6 would be acceptable as well.

Jenny Tevendale, Assistant County Attorney, said that she wanted to remind the Commission that this rezoning was specifically advertised for a change from R2 to R4. She said that staff had not had the opportunity to review any proposal for an increase to R6.

Mr. Rosensweig said yes, they would resubmit an application that would be readvertised for that.

Mr. Carrazana asked if Mr. Rosensweig could elaborate on the offered range of 25% to 80% AMI for this property.

Mr. Rosensweig said that their average AMI had been 34% of the area median income. He said that they were one of the few providers that reached that level. He said that their normal range was actually 25% to 60%, and with a special exception the Board could approve above 60%.

He said that in addition to building housing, they also served as housing counsellors, so ideally, after a year or two of working with them, families increased their income. He said that therefore, they set the AMI at 80% in order to accommodate a family who may come in at 45% and eventually reach 65% by the time they purchased the property.

Mr. Carrazana said that he greatly appreciated the clarification. He asked if the initial target was still the 25% to 60%.

Mr. Rosensweig said that that was correct. He said that the reason for the 25% to 80% income range was that if a family came in below 60% of the area median income and they excelled in their program, they would be in violation of zoning regulations if they were sold a house and their income exceeded 61% of the area median income. He said that to provide a buffer, they were requesting the proposed range. He said that their own data collection indicated that the average area median income had been 34% over the past two years.

Mr. Moore asked why they would divide this property into two separate parcels rather than the duplex being on a single R4 parcel.

Mr. Rosensweig said that in the case of the latter, they would need to create a condo association. He said that it was better to own something simple, so each family would own the property from their house to the road.

Mr. Bivins asked how the common wall between the units was negotiated.

Mr. Rosensweig said that Habitat maintained an escrow account used for external maintenance. He said that this was particularly relevant for attached products, so mortgage payments included a portion to be set aside in a reserve account. He said that this arrangement ensured that when exterior maintenance was necessary, the costs were covered by the escrowed funds rather than the owner's own pocket. He said that this was helpful so that if a shared part of the home, such as the roof, were to need maintenance, the property owners were not responsible for their neighbor's portion of the roof.

Mr. Carrazana asked if any members of the public wished to speak on this item.

Mary Jane Gore said that she owned the house next door. She said that she was wondering if they would be fencing on the property. She said that along one side of the street, most people had relatively narrow driveways. She said that the proposed 18 by 18-foot pad seemed quite wide to her. She said that she just wanted to make that comment. She said that she was wondering if landscaping would be included in the design. She said that currently, the entire property had been razed, except for the trees visible there.

Ms. Gore said that she was wondering if there were any other plans for more units on the property, but it appeared in the design that there were none; rather, there may be access to the agricultural area behind her. She said that as someone who valued a peaceful neighborhood, she would not be in favor of that. She said that she would prefer to be away from any access road, and currently, there was one adjacent to the right-hand side of the property.

David Ferrall said that he and his wife owned the properties at 5474, 5484, and 5492, and they had recently purchased 5498. He said that he wanted to state that he supported the applicant's proposal. He said that however, he also wanted to state for the record that when they purchased 5498, the house was in a deplorable condition and tore it down, similar to what the applicants had done on this property.

Mr. Ferrall said that they had met with a senior planner and discussed the possibility of putting a duplex on the property, and they were informed that it would not be feasible. He said that since they owned the property next door, they had inquired about adding four-tenths of an acre to the six-tenths on their 5498 and making it a by-right R2, and they were told that this would also not be possible. He said that as a member of the public, he was concerned that another applicant may be receiving consideration that he and his wife had not received.

Mr. Ferrall said that he was also interested to hear that the applicant was interested in the lot next door. He said that he thought that was great; he and his wife owned properties down the street that were some of the most affordable housing in Crozet, and they were committed to helping Crozet maintain affordable housing. He said that however, he believed the applicant's proposal would result in an R4 property, and to Mr. Bivins' earlier point, taxes would certainly go up.

Mr. Ferrall said that as a former member of the Board of Equalizations, he disagreed slightly with Mr. Barnes in that he saw a precedent being set here. He said that these homes and properties would now be viewed by potential buyers as upzoning possibilities, leading to the potential for teardowns and increased property values. He said that this was a modest neighborhood, and he believed the possibility of rezoning would lead to further changes. He said that he was in favor of the request to upzone this property because it made sense for this area. He said that he supported it but also acknowledged that prices and taxes were going to go up along with the development.

Mr. Ferrall said that he would be putting up a modular home, which was all that he and his wife could provide to maintain modesty and affordability. He said that he would have loved to construct a duplex if it were possible and had learned from this process that next time he would talk to staff and present this type of request to the Board to do so.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the applicant would like to respond to the public comments.

Ms. George said that one of the first comments mentioned the setbacks on the side. She said that they had used the 10-foot setbacks for this infill lot, and it was the responsibility of the lot owners to install fences, rather than the Habitat organization. She said that she understood the neighbor's concerns about landscaping. She said that they were proposing two trees, one on each side of the property, to meet the Architectural Review Board (ARB) requirements for the entrance corridors.

Ms. George said that the trees in the back, which were the light green ones, were actually existing trees that had been physically surveyed, located, and measured. She said that they were approximately the size of the drip line and were the largest trees in the grouping that met the criteria of being greater than six inches in diameter or breast height. She said that as for the upzoning on other properties, there were many variables, and she was unsure what could be discussed at this juncture.

Mr. Carrazana asked if Ms. George could address the parking area.

Ms. George said that the parking pads would be 18 by 18 feet, and for reference the standard size for a parking space in a parking lot was typically nine feet wide by 18 feet deep. She said that this meant that an 18 by 18 parking pad could accommodate two cars, as it was the same width as two standard parking spaces in a typical parking lot.

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

Mr. Bivins said that he first wanted to express his support for this project. He said that he thought it was a good thing to develop these properties in Crozet, but he was concerned with upzoning and redeveloping, it may lead to a shift from modest, moderately affordable properties being transformed into more expensive properties and current residents would be priced out as time went on. He said that however it was developed from here on out, they were cognizant and appreciate of the working people of this neighborhood that made it what it was. He said that they were currently stepping away from that in their community. He said that to reiterate, he supported the application because it was the right thing to do for this piece of property, but he saw it in the greater context of future development of this neighborhood.

Mr. Moore said that Mr. Bivins' comments on this matter were appreciated, as he had highlighted the challenges that low-income wage earners faced in affording to live in their County and City. He said that this was a significant issue that went beyond the scope of this proposal for two

homes. He said that he agreed that this was a real problem. He said that if Commissioner Murray were present tonight, he would likely discuss how Crozet, a generation or a half ago, was a predominantly a redneck, working-class area, with blue-collar workers from ConAgra living there. He said that this was a fact that was well-documented and was known to have transformed greatly in the past two decades.

Mr. Moore said that he believed that this proposal made sense, not only because of Habitat's commitment to providing low-income housing for these two units, but also because the neighborhood density residential configuration aligned with the rezoning potential for three to six homes per acre. He said that two homes on 0.6 acres easily fit within that range. He said that he did not have any issues with this proposal. He said that it resonated with their ongoing work on modernizing their zoning regulations, particularly with regards to R2 zoning, which was currently quite restrictive.

Mr. Moore said that he would like to see R2 redefined to include cottages, duplexes, or triplexes in the future, as this could be a simpler way to increase the availability of homes for their community. He said that this was something he was putting forward for future conversations.

Mr. Carrazana said that he was also in support of this proposal. He said that he believed it was a valuable opportunity, as they had limited options for low-income housing that truly met the definition of low-income with 30% to 40% AMI being considered, which was uncommon. He said that he thought this location would be ideal. He said that with the growing development in Crozet, this project would provide needed access to that community. He said that he was in full support of this proposal and was ready to entertain a motion if someone was prepared to make it.

Mr. Bivins moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval ZMA-2025-00011 5546 Three Notch'd Road for the reasons stated in the staff report. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (4-0). (Mr. Clayborne, Mr. Missel, and Mr. Murray were absent.)

Work Session

2025 Land Use Buildout Analysis

This item was rescheduled to December 9, 2025, at 4:00 p.m.

Committee Reports

Mr. Moore said that the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) met last week. He said that they received a requested presentation on travel demand models for both bike and pedestrian infrastructure. He said that about half the presentation focused on the limitations of the data, as there was no comprehensive statewide data available. He said that the national surveys were limited, and the counting programs were sparse and inconsistent. He said that all travel demand models were built around car traffic, making it challenging for them to capture small improvements like crosswalks, trail connections, and protected lanes.

Mr. Moore said that with that being said, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) does use localized non-motorized vehicle counts, which had informed various projects in Alexandria and Richmond, among others. He said that the presentation was quite interesting. He said that however, most of the meeting centered around whether the CTAC should continue. He said that they discussed the original purpose of CTAC, which was to inform and serve as an engagement conduit for the long-range transportation planning process.

Mr. Moore said CTAC was presented with a couple of options, and the committee ultimately expressed a desire to continue, seeing value in maintaining its presence, but requesting a bit more time from the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) to provide a more comprehensive recommendation.

Ms. Firehock said that she was disappointed to report that the Historic Preservation Committee did not reach a quorum and therefore did not have their regular meeting.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: November 19, 2025

Michael Barnes, Director of Planning, said that the Board's November 18 agenda was relatively light, with work sessions focused on fiscal planning over the next five-year horizon and discussions on fiscal policy in the County. He said that they also reviewed a special exception or waiver of setbacks for access to a parcel located on Route 250 East. He said that the parcel, currently home to a European car repair business at 2238 Richmond Road, was requesting to accept clean fill. He said that the business would not be affected, as they would bring their trucks to the site for the fill. He said that the fill would be placed on a parcel behind the hill. He said that this was the only land use-related issue discussed.

Mr. Barnes said that he would like to take this opportunity to discuss the Commission's next meeting. He said that he had several things moving on and off the agenda, some of which were outside his control. He said that they were planning to bring the Riparian Buffer Ordinance to the Commission next week, as well as Belvedere. He said that Belvedere had requested to move their discussion to the first meeting in January. He said that the Riparian Buffer Ordinance would be discussed at the second meeting in January.

Mr. Barnes said that they would have their next meeting on December 9, including their work session moved from today's meeting, as well as a presentation on Stillhouse Mountain at the edge of the development area that was seeking a conservation easement, but no action was requested by the Commission. He said that on December 16, the Commission would be considering the Sieg rezoning and a proposal to fill in the floodplain in Woolen Mills.

Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk of the Planning Commission, said that she would send an updated calendar for December and January to the Commission tomorrow.

Mr. Moore asked if they had an open application process for the two Planning Commission members who would be newly appointed.

Mr. Barnes said that the Clerk of the Board was working on that. He said that ultimately, it was the prerogative of the Board members. He said that he would confirm with Ms. Borgersen that the applications were available.

New Business

There was none.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

There were none.

Adjournment

At 7:12 p.m., the Commission adjourned to December 9, 2025, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 4:00 p.m.

_____
Michael Barnes, Planning Director

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date:
Initials: