Albemarle County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes April 28, 2026

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public meeting on Tuesday, April 28, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Luis Carrazana, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Nathan Moore; Lonnie Murray; Mary Katherine King; Catherine Brown.

Members absent Corey Clayborne.

Other officials present were Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Bart Svoboda, Deputy Director of Community Development; Jered Tate, Senior Planner; Jenny Tevendale, Deputy 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 for a Public Hearing on this agenda

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Firehock motioned that the Planning Commission approve the consent agenda. Mr. Murray seconded the motion, which carried (4-0). (Mr. Carrazana, Ms. Firehock, Ms. King, Mr. Murray, and Ms. Brown voted aye; Mr. Moore abstained; Mr. Clayborne was absent)

Mr. Moore said that he abstained from voting since he was not present at the previous meeting.

Public Hearing

ZMA202400007 and SP202400002 Beaver Hill Mobile Home Park

Jered Tate, Senior Planner, said that he would present the staff report on the Beaver Hill Mobile Home Park application for a rezoning and special use permit with special exceptions and an Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) jurisdictional area amendment. He said that the property was located in western Albemarle County, on the north side of Three Notch'd Road, approximately two miles east of downtown Crozet.

Mr. Tate said that the surrounding area was characterized by rural uses, including low-density single-family residential, forests, open space, agricultural uses, and the Beaver Creek water supply reservoir. He said that the property was situated just north of the Crozet Development Area boundary. He said that to the south of Three Notch'd Road, properties included single-family detached and attached dwellings.

Mr. Tate said that the property consisted of 47.38 acres and contains two single-family residences, an existing non-conforming manufactured home park, and open fields previously used for cattle. He said that a Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) buffer and critical slopes were present on the property, which also included a pond and a stream that drained to the Beaver Creek reservoir. He said that approximately 23.02 acres are proposed for rezoning. He said that the property was located within the Beaver Creek water supply watershed, with the site approximately 1,125 feet from the Beaver Creek Reservoir. He said that additionally, there was a conservation easement on the adjacent parcels to the west and north.

Mr. Tate said that the zoning of the subject parcel was Rural Areas, as were the surrounding parcels north of Three Notch'd Road. He said that to the south of Three Notch'd Road, within the Crozet Development Area, were areas of R4 Residential and Neighborhood Model District (NMD) zoning. Some uses were permitted by right and by special use permit within the Rural Areas, which he had listed on the screen. He said that the Comprehensive Plan designation for the property was Rural Areas.

Mr. Tate said that the Rural Area Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan describes the Rural Area of Albemarle County as containing some of its most valued assets, including farms and forests, historic buildings and sites, and abundant natural resources. Albemarle County aimed to minimize new home building in the Rural Area to protect these preferred uses and prevent rural landowners from feeling pressured to subdivide their land. He said that multiple Comprehensive Plan strategies and objectives aimed to achieve this vision.

Mr. Tate said that the Growth Management Policy promotes residential development in the Development Areas where infrastructure was available to avoid conflicts with the above-mentioned Rural Area land uses. He said that the Natural Resources Chapter places importance on water resource protection, especially the public water supply system; objective one stresses the importance of this. He said that additionally, the Crozet Master Plan explicitly addressed preservation of rural edges, as stated in Goal 4, which was displayed on screen.

Mr. Tate said that the proposed project was to rezone 23.02 acres of the 47.38-acre subject property from Rural Areas to R4 Residential with a special use permit (SUP)request to establish a manufactured home park on the site. He said that R4 was the lowest-density residential zoning that allows a manufactured home park with a special use permit. He said that the proposed concept plan demonstrated a conceptual layout of an additional 49 manufactured homes to be located within an expanded section.

Mr. Tate said that the concept plan also showed entrances, proposed travel ways, recreation, trails, some landscaping, stormwater management facilities, and other features. He said that the total gross density proposed was 3.99 dwelling units per acre. He said that the applicant had volunteered proffers to restrict the uses and density of the property and to provide affordability. He said that certain uses that were not compatible or supportive of the surrounding area had been proffered out.

Mr. Tate said that the affordable component of this proposal was the only positive aspect identified by staff; however, the proffered affordability measures did not currently meet the standards set by Housing Albemarle. He said that for the housing review, the Housing Albemarle standards should apply to all units on the site, as the entire site was being rezoned and the existing units were non-conforming. He said that affordable rental units should remain so for a minimum of 30 years, rather than 10 years.

Mr. Tate said that while the proposal could address some of the objectives, staff believed the intent of the housing policy was to encourage new development units in the Development Area. He said that staff had provided comments on how policy expectations could be applied should the rezoning and special use permit be approved.

Mr. Tate said that the applicant had requested special exceptions to modify or waive supplemental regulations related to manufactured home parks under Section 18.5.3 of the Zoning Ordinance. He said that staff had evaluated these special exceptions and made recommendations, which were outlined in the matrix included with the staff report as Attachment 5. He said that as staff recommended denial of the ZMA and SP, they also recommended denial of SE 2024-20.

Mr. Tate said that if the Board of Supervisors decided to approve the ZMA and SP applications, staff was generally in support of the requested SE application. He said that the Planning Commission was not required to make a recommendation on this special exception application, but if the Commission chose to provide comments, staff would include those in the transmittal summary to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Tate said that based on the factors for consideration outlined in Section 33 of the Zoning Ordinance, he had identified the following positive elements and concerns for the proposed rezoning. He said that the positive element was that the proposal provided a minimum of 10 affordable housing units. He said that the concerns were that the proposal was inconsistent with the Rural Area goals, objectives, and strategies found in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tate said that the proposal was also inconsistent with the County's Growth Management Policy, as it proposed residential development in the Rural Area. He said that the proposal was located within a water supply protection area for the Beaver Creek Reservoir and the site contained existing streams with inadequate riparian protection throughout most of the property.

Mr. Tate said that finally, the proposal was not currently compliant with Housing Albemarle. He said that to conclude, staff recommended denial of both the rezoning and the special use permit application. He said that if the Commission decided to recommend approval of the ZMA and SP applications, staff recommended the following conditions on approval for SP 2024-21.

Mr. Murray asked if, in there were any conditions that prevented this mobile home park from being redeveloped into something else in the future, such as apartments or other types of housing.

Mr. Tate said that the rezoning, as proposed, was for R4 development. He said that within that, yes, there were other residential uses that could be proposed under R4. He said that, however, most of those uses had been proffered out in the proffers submitted with this application. He said that, based on the application, he believed that no other type of development would be proposed or allowed under the specific proposal they had evaluated.

Mr. Murray asked how this proposal differed from expansion of the Development Area.

Mr. Tate said that according to staff's analysis, in terms of the alignment with the Comprehensive Plan, the Com Plan aimed to keep Rural Area residential development at a minimum and at minimum densities under the existing Ordinance. He said that residential density was limited to half a dwelling unit per acre within the RA permitted area, and there were additional standards that must be met. He said that he believed the main difference between this proposal and Development Area proposals was the density, as well as the other impacts identified in staff's reports.

Mr. Murray said that to clarify, if this were proposed as a Development Area expansion, he would like to know what the resulting product of each would be, and whether it would be significantly different in any way.

Mr. Tate said that in that case, staff's analysis would be based on different recommendations outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. They would be examining the Development Areas chapters, as well as the recommendations within those chapters, as opposed to the Rural Area chapters. He said that if he understood the question correctly, he believed there would be no significant difference beyond how staff approached the analysis, which was a fundamental difference.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to clarify a couple of points. He said that the proffers that restricted R4 housing types, except for mobile homes, would remain in effect even if the property were to be sold to another owner in the future.

Mr. Tate said that that was correct.

Mr. Moore said that the packet mentioned that the fields behind where the mobile homes would be built were previously used for cattle. He asked when the fields were last used for that purpose.

Mr. Tate said that he was uncertain, but the applicant may have been able to provide that information.

Mr. Moore said that it had been a while, and he was aware that their Comprehensive Plan aimed to have agricultural uses in their Rural Areas. He said that he did not see that this parcel was being utilized for that purpose, and he wanted to confirm that they did not currently have any economic activity or agricultural tax base associated with that property.

Mr. Tate said that he would defer to the applicant to provide an answer.

Mr. Moore said that he had a call from someone and he wanted to ask a follow-up question regarding water supply and Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA). He said that ACSA did not have concerns about delivering the necessary water service. He said that the denial would be part of the package of staff-recommended denials, not due to a lack of water.

Mr. Tate said that in their analysis, the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) examined capacity and did not identify any concerns with deliverable capacity; however, ACSA had some comments regarding the proposed system, which would not be acceptable for public ownership and operation.

Mr. Barnes said that the mobile home park was currently served by a pump station, and this proposal would require an expansion. He said that ACSA did not want to maintain the pump station.

Mr. Moore said that he also noticed that this parcel was very close to the Highlands subdivision. He said that in terms of parcels per acre or homes per acre, they were looking at approximately 0.25 acres per home here, which was actually a slightly larger space per home compared to the Highlands area across the street. He said that he would like to inquire about the proximity of this parcel to the Development Area. He said that he thought it was very close, and it was interesting that this area was not originally included in the Development Area when the boundaries were drawn in 1980.

Mr. Barnes said that he believed it was related to the drinking watershed policy, because this area drained into the reservoir.

Ms. Firehock asked if they decided to include it in the growth area, would they have to draw it around the entire parcel rather than the footprint of the homes? She said that however, she acknowledged these questions were second-guessing those past decisions.

Mr. Barnes said that he recalled a point in the past when some land in Crozet, located along 250, a little east of Clover Lawn, was initially designated for the Development Area, but it was taken out. He said that at the time, some land in Crozet that was part of the drinking watershed was added to the Development Area as a trade-off for the land that was removed. He said that prior to this, parts of Crozet were not included in the development area due to the presence of the drinking watershed.

Mr. Moore said that he understood there were some challenges related to water service delivery in this area.

Mr. Barnes said that he believed it was less about providing services than it was about implementing a policy aimed at reducing impervious coverage in the drinking watershed to protect water quality and the water itself. He said that this was particularly relevant in terms of runoff, which would impact Beaver Creek, as well as the overall supply of water.

Mr. Moore said that that was a question he had been pondering as well, particularly regarding water supply protection. He said that the stream buffers were indeed part of the package of measures they needed to take to protect the water supply. He said that he was not sure if the parcel still had remaining development rights in the Rural Area, but he would like to consider a hypothetical scenario.

Mr. Moore asked, if this lot were to be divided into four or five parcels, and a large mansion were built on each one, could they potentially be located where the mobile homes were located, with the required setbacks still in place?

Mr. Barnes said that regarding the by-right capacity of Rural Area development, along with the buffer setbacks, in theory, it was possible to have single-family homes, rather than the 49 mobile homes that were currently proposed.

Mr. Murray said that in the past, there were a number of mobile homes on this site that exceeded the permissions of past special exceptions. He asked if there were any current zoning violations at this mobile home park.

Mr. Tate said that there were no open violations that he was aware of presently. He said that the park, as mentioned in the presentation, was a nonconforming use on the property, but it was permitted to continue to exist as that nonconforming use under the current Zoning Ordinance because it predated the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. King asked if staff could elaborate on the differences between the current stream buffer shown on the plan and the limits of the riparian buffer, and how the latter would be affected.

Mr. Tate said that the Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) buffer, as depicted on the plan, was the buffer established to protect the existing stream. He said that in other words, the two were identical.

Ms. King asked if, therefore, the current limits of development would be outside the buffer.

Mr. Tate said that that was correct.

Ms. King said that additionally, there was a mention in the narrative about the potential effects on water quality related to the buffer. She said that she assumed that the watershed from this property flowed into the creek. She said that if they developed in the watershed, even though it was not within the buffer, they would still be contributing to issues in the creek and ultimately the reservoir. She said this happened throughout the area, not only within the proximity of 30 or 150 feet from the reservoir.

Mr. Tate said that generally speaking, yes. He said that to provide some clarity, the intent behind the recommendations of the Growth Management Policy was to direct new units to development areas in order to preserve the water supply watershed. He said that this intent was to avoid increasing impervious surface areas in Rural Areas and within the water supply watersheds. He said that the aim was to keep most, if not all, development away from the RA, unless explicitly permitted.

Mr. Brown said that she thought the main difference was that the Development Area appeared to drain primarily into Lickinghole Creek, whereas the area on the side of Route 240 drained into the reservoir. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Tate said that that was correct.

Ms. King said that her next question pertained to the preservation of viewshed. She said that as she understood, the topography of this new section would be somewhat below the grade of the road. She said that staff had mentioned earlier that the septic system would require pumping.

Mr. Tate said that if they examined the plan, he would attempt to clarify. He said that the site's topography fell into the stream corridor and then rose back out again. He said that the hill slopes downward and then upward again into the area where the proposed additional units would be located.

Mr. Murray said that he had a follow-up question regarding the existing buffer. He said that he would like staff to characterize the quality of the existing buffer in terms of the percentage of native vegetation that was present and actively filtering stormwater from the reservoir. He said that he would like to know if the buffer was currently completely forested.

Mr. Tate said that the current buffer lacked forested cover; it was not presently forested.

Ms. King said that it was previously a livestock pasture.

Mr. Tate said that that was the staff's understanding, but the applicant may wish to provide further clarification.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Justin Shimp, Shimp Engineering, said that he and his staff were pleased to be there tonight to represent the Sprouse family, who had owned this property since the 1960s. He said that the family's great-grandfather had founded this property and was a tenant in the park originally. He said that for those familiar with Crozet, they may recognize the property as they passed by. He said that the homes were set back, and there was a lake to the right. He said that the property

had always been well-maintained in his time here in Albemarle County over the past 20 years. He said that people had enjoyed living in this neighborhood for a long time.

Mr. Shimp said that to summarize, their requests, which had been thoroughly reviewed by staff, was to rezone to R4 with restrictions to only allow a mobile home park and a special use permit, specifically for manufactured homes. He said that if meant that if the park proved financially unviable, nothing else could be developed there, but agricultural uses could continue.

Mr. Shimp said that he would like to highlight a key distinction between this zoning application and the growth area expansion. He said that while growth area expansion would involve a blanket of three to six units per acre, this was a specific provision for a specific housing type to the community, and it was restricted to this; an important distinction here was between a specific addition versus an overall expansion.

Mr. Shimp said that the map showed the outline, which was the subject parcel with the red area being the limits of the zoning they had broken down into 20 and 23.23 acres, according to the documents they had submitted. He said that one of the things that interested him most about these kinds of projects was the purpose of zoning. He said that in fact, one could argue that the Planning Commission existed to make decisions like this or recommend bodies to make recommendations. Certainly, the County staff looked at the Comprehensive Plan for guidance on these issues and found that this did not match the Rural Area growth policy.

Mr. Shimp said that however, if one looked at the underlying intent of zoning, it was to promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the public, and he thought that sometimes they looked to that to answer these questions. He said that housing was a critical item for human well-being, particularly secure housing that people could afford. He said that when he looked at why they were there and what the purpose of zoning was, they had to give a high weight to what made people's lives better, and that was secure housing that people could afford.

Mr. Shimp said that in their Comprehensive Plan adopted most recently, it was identified that there were 10,070 affordable units needed to be created or maintained by 2040. He said that in 2017, Housing Albemarle policy addressed the cost burdened individuals in Albemarle County. He said that the numbers were quite striking, for example, individuals with incomes between 50% to 80% of the area median income (AMI) range, 60% were cost burdened.

Mr. Shimp said that for those with incomes between 30% to 50% AMI, 83% were cost burdened, and individuals with incomes at 80% AMI, 60% were cost burdened. He said that currently, individuals making $80,000 a year, by and large, could not find housing that fit their budget. He said that these numbers were from 2017, and he was certain that they had worsened since then.

Mr. Shimp said that the key aspect of this project was finding ways to establish alternative housing options. He said that given the location, it was not feasible in the growth area due to the high cost of land. He said that this site was uniquely positioned adjacent to the growth area, making it an ideal location for expansion. He said that the goal was to increase the park's capacity from 40 units to 92 in total. He said that they were pleased to meet the Albemarle housing criteria, and they believed that all these units would meet the requirements.

Mr. Shimp said that they had checked the math for the current units, and the rents for new tenants, who were not current residents, ranged from $1,100 to $1,750 for two- to three-bedroom units. He said that when crunching the numbers for the 60% AMI and Albemarle, there was an affordable

housing option for all those individuals. He said that the creation of more units like this was a positive development.

Mr. Shimp said that another important consideration was the character of the area when evaluating zoning and special use permits. He said that this site had been a manufactured home park since the 1960s and had essentially established that character. He said that notably, the Development Areas around Highlands, Western Ridge, and Parkside were farmland at the time, whereas this site was a preceding development.

Mr. Shimp said that he had provided a picture that showed the first phase of development. He said that it was established in 1965 and many of the original tenants worked in the Crozet area and the factories were located there at the time. He said that currently, there were 43 units, with 23 of those being owned by tenants who own their own homes. He said that many of these long-time residents enjoyed the benefit of very low lot rents and owning their own homes, which they could live in as they choose.

Mr. Shimp said that another important statistic was that approximately 80% of current residents were on fixed income, a common characteristic in these types of communities. This was an excellent opportunity for those who could purchase their own homes and live there for 20 or 30 years, with the added benefit of low lot rents for those on fixed income; it was a significant savings. He said that again, this area was established 15 years prior to the Comprehensive Plan's establishment of boundaries.

Mr. Shimp said that moving ahead to the north portion, which included the new units, there was some passive amenity space and active space. He said that this area would be converted from cattle land to a vegetated stream buffer with the development of this property, which they viewed as an environmental positive. He said that the south portion showed the existing homes, some of which had been relocated over time, and this established the future master plan for the entire park, including both the old and new sections.

Mr. Shimp said that there was a pump station nearby that pumps to the public sewer. He said that the new units would be connected to this system, providing public water and sewer. He said that one of the County's comments was that this development was not consistent with Rural Area growth policy. He said that he acknowledged this but would point out that the policy did not allow for creation of affordable housing in Rural Areas. He said that the Comprehensive Plan actually suggested that affordable housing should be provided primarily in Development Areas but also implied that it could be found elsewhere.

Mr. Shimp said that in his opinion, this type of product is the best way to provide affordable housing in Rural Areas. He said that there were several important considerations regarding this project, which aligned with the Comprehensive Plan's focus on health, safety, and the public's well-being. He said that the Plan also addressed the need for affordable housing, and he thought it was essential to carve out Rural Areas, such as this site, where access to public water and sewer made it possible to develop projects like this.

Mr. Shimp said that he would like to briefly address the watershed concerns. He said that while development could impact watersheds, it was also true that agriculture was a significant source of pollution. He said that according to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), agriculture was the largest source of pollution in America. He said that cattle could cause erosion, and crops could produce pesticides, which could contaminate watersheds. He said that they planned to

revegetate the buffers with this project, which they believed would ultimately create a better condition.

Mr. Shimp said that he would like to quickly address affordable housing. He said that there was a miscommunication between himself and the staff regarding the Albemarle requirements, which had been in place since 2024. He said that they were prepared to meet those requirements, but prior notes could be reviewed if needed. He said that the staff could also address how this project aligned with the Albemarle housing requirements, which included current rents.

Mr. Shimp said that he wished to conclude by saying that this site had established the character of the area since 1965 as a community that provided affordable housing. He said that it had been a wonderful part of the County, and they had addressed environmental concerns through their stream buffer plantings. He said that this project was consistent with their goal of promoting healthy, safety, and welfare of the public.

Mr. Shimp said that there were nuanced aspects to this, and there were good reasons for rural preservation. He said that the issue of cost burdening 5,000 individuals in 2017 highlighted the need for solutions like this. He said that they believed this project was a good solution, and he appreciated the Commission's time.

Mr. Carrazana said that his questions centered around the affordable housing provided by this project. He said that Mr. Shimp had stated that basically all of these units would be considered affordable housing. He asked, in that case, why it was a challenge to meet the current guidelines of Housing Albemarle, why there were only 10 affordable units, and why they limited the years of affordability.

Mr. Shimp said that the answer to this was that it was not a problem. He said that the source of the confusion lay in a 2024 issue, where he had misunderstood the language in the code. He said that specifically, they had incorrectly assumed that the 10-year policy applied to all projects, rather than the 30-year policy. He said that this had not been updated, so to clarify, the applicant was entirely comfortable with the Housing Albemarle policy and were willing to make any necessary adjustments if it was presented to the Board.

Mr. Carrazana asked if there were any issues with amending the application to include 20 homes with 30 years of affordability.

Mr. Shimp said that no, there was no issue with that. He said that it should have been amended to reflect that prior to this meeting. He said that it was a miscommunication on his part.

Mr. Carrazana asked if people were renting the lots and bringing their own mobile home, or if they were renting the lot and the unit.

Ms. Firehock said that it was previously stated that 23 units were not owned.

Mr. Shimp said that it was a mix. He said that the proposal would continue that approach; residents would have either option available.

Mr. Moore asked if the lot fee was for owned units, while the rent was inclusive of the lot and the home.

Mr. Shimp said yes, the rent included the entire property, including the lot and the home.

Mr. Murray asked if the illustrations where trees were on the concept plan were an example or if those were the only areas they would be locating trees.

Mr. Shimp said that the trees shown in the buffer here were representative, but likely not nearly as many as the actual number. He said that according to the staff's condition, planting was required at a certain quantity per specific codes. He said that in reality, planting thousands of seedlings would be necessary. He said that this representation was a boundary of the area, with the blue indicating the pre-vegetated section according to standard codes.

Mr. Shimp said that one of the staff's questions was whether another section could be replanted, and their hesitation stemmed from the fact that many long-time residents enjoyed viewing the lake, and that area was well-stabilized with turf. He said that however, the area that posed a problem was the former cattle farm, which had been vacant since at least 1966 and lacked any native vegetation. He said that that area would be planted with native vegetation to improve the condition.

Mr. Murray said that Mr. Shimp was likely familiar with the issues at Chris Green Lake and Mint Springs, where toxic algae blooms had formed around those lakes. He said that one of the significant problems contributing to this issue was the lack of native vegetation. He said that without native vegetation, geese were more likely to inhabit the area, as they tended to avoid areas with taller native vegetation.

Mr. Murray said that as a result, the geese waste flows into the pond, leading to toxic algae blooms. He said that in one of their parks, a dog unfortunately died due to exposure to toxic algae. He said that this incident highlighted the potential health risks associated with this contamination, particularly in areas with families. He urged the applicant to consider this issue, as it did not necessarily require the presence of trees specifically, but rather the inclusion of native vegetation.

Ms. Brown asked what the policy was for a mobile unit hookup fee to Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA). She asked if it was different from the hookups in the growth area.

Mr. Shimp said that the connection fee was paid to both ACSA and RWSA, and he believed they charged either three-quarters of a connection fee per unit or the full connection fee per unit, which could be something they would ask to reconsider. He said that since most of these homes were small, two-bedroom units, they would likely have lower water usage compared to larger homes. He said that nevertheless, they would still be required to pay a significant connection fee, which was charged on a per-unit basis.

Ms. Brown said that another question she would like to pose was related the screening from Route 240. She said that there was a beautiful lawn there, but the goal of infiltrating stormwater and promoting water quality was crucial, and continually mowing a large lawn may include toxic chemicals and air pollutants, which could have negative environmental impacts. She said that specifically, around the pond, she wondered if the community was open to exploring alternative, sustainable design options that could better align with the County's goals.

Mr. Shimp said that he thought that was a reasonable request. He said that again, people did not want their view of the lake to be blocked, but they could consider planting shorter native plants to achieve that. He said that he did not see any issue with that.

Ms. Brown said that she had been thinking about this project comprehensively and how it fit into the entire place. She said that she was from eastern North Carolina, so she was aware of the significance of manufactured homes for rural, affordable housing. She said that this was an

important aspect of affordable housing, which their Comprehensive Plan did not adequately address. She said that it felt like they were approaching this in a novel way every time, without a clear commitment to mitigate the inconsistencies with the rural plan, particularly regarding screening, character, and stormwater protection.

Ms. Brown said that she wanted to support this project because the mobile home park was already existing, but she was not seeing a strong commitment to protecting water quality during construction and throughout the development's life. She said that without these measures, it was difficult for her to believe that this project could effectively address the significant gaps in their current zoning.

Mr. Shimp said that, at this level of a zoning action, they typically did not delve as deeply into those details. He said that staff had included conditions that required more stringent measures. He said that, for example, staff had suggested that the water quality treatment must be on-site, rather than relying on off-site credit, and must be twice the required amount. He said that this was a condition that must be met in the actual construction drawings.

Ms. Brown said that because this request was so different from what was typically allowed, she believed that the level of commitment required was important, and it was essential to be able to clearly communicate this to everyone, including neighbors, the water authorities, and other stakeholders.

Ms. King said that the existing pump station had limited service, and staff had indicated the Service Authority did not want to take on the responsibility of a new pump station. She said that the staff notes had referenced the 2015 Comp Plan, and she would like more information on that point.

Mr. Barnes said that the AC44 Comp Plan was adopted last year and became active on January 1, 2026. He said that applications that were submitted before that time were reviewed under the 2015 Comp Plan to maintain consistency.

Ms. King asked if staff could provide insight on how the new and improved Comprehensive Plan would address extending a sewer to this already limited approved space. She asked if the new Plan would be in favor of this extension, or would it be opposed to it.

Mr. Barnes said that both Comp Plans were tied to the Rural Area policy. He said that the Service Authority typically only served the jurisdictional area, within the Development Area. In this case, the question was less about whether or not they should have public water and sewer service, and more about the Service Authority not wanting a new pump station.

Ms. King said that she understood. She said that her question for the applicant was whether the cost of owning and operating the lower station and pumping it to the existing upper station was a financial burden for the owner.

Mr. Shimp said that the pump stations would remain owned by the park. He said that they had owned and operated one for 60 years, and it had been upgraded at some point. He said that this was a typical situation, and these types of facilities were not especially expensive to operate.

Mr. Barnes said that to clarify, the existing pump station was privately owned and maintained; the one that would be located farther back on the site, to accommodate the additional ones, would also be in a similar arrangement, privately owned and maintained.

Ms. King asked why the Service Authority had stated they did not want to maintain it, if it was going to be privately owned from the outset.

Mr. Shimp said that to clarify, that was more of a footnote from ACSA. He said that they were trying to convey that if the owner built the pump station and later tried to give it to ACSA, they would not accept it. He said that ACSA was letting them know that the owner was on their own with developing the connection from the private sewer to the public sewer. He said that it was normal in this situation.

Ms. King said that to clarify, that had no impact on staff's recommendation for denial.

Ms. Firehock said that she wanted to confirm her understanding of the staff report. She said that in reviewing the report, she noted that the waste treatment was not originally part of the RWSA's system. She said that it was added because the RWSA was experiencing issues with failing septic systems. She said that to address that concern, they added this into the public system. She said that she was unclear about the water supply aspect. She asked if the owner had requested RWSA to include them in the water system as well, or if another factor led to that development.

Mr. Shimp said that he was unsure of the origin of that development. He said that at some point in time, the Board of Supervisors approved that limited connection.

Ms. Firehock said that she was aware that type of connection had happened a few times in the past, usually when there were safety issues that could be resolved through a connection to the public water and sewer.

Ms. King said that the waterline was already in place when the park was established in 1960, and the distinction between rural and development areas did not exist at that time, so the jurisdiction did not have to consider it.

Ms. Firehock said that it had been a County policy to not extend water services to certain areas. She said that sometimes, it was not about a lack of water, but about trying to limit growth by restricting access to water outside of the growth areas. She said that the fact that the mobile home park had some service was based on a past hardship in terms of the failing septic systems.

Ms. King said that in this case, the connection was on the street in front of this mobile home park, so it was not expensive to connect this Rural Area parcel, and therefore she thought it was an acceptable connection.

Ms. Firehock said that she had provided the policy example because there were areas along the water line where the County would not allow people to hook up, so it was not just a matter of physical presence. She said that it was tied to the Growth Management Policy of the County, which the Board of Supervisors had established.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing to comments from the public.

Rob McGinnis, representing the Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC), said that the PEC supported proposed infill housing within this proposal, particularly if that infill was affordable housing that met the Housing Albemarle policy. He said that their concerns were focused on the protection of Crozet's drinking water supply. He said that it was useful to test this proposal against Albemarle's AC44 Comprehensive Plan process for reviewing proposals for expansion of the Development Areas.

Mr. McGinnis said that the criteria for determining the adequacy of land to be added to the development areas included, among other factors, whether the area was in the water supply watershed. He said that according to the criteria, priority should be given to the protection of natural resources and public water supply watersheds. He said that he wanted to emphasize that the priority was a significant one. He said that the proposed land development was located within the Beaver Creek watershed and water supply reservoir watershed.

Mr. McGinnis said that the construction of the proposed rows, utilities, and home sites would require mass grading, resulting in substantial areas of soil disturbance, only 1,500 feet away from the edge of the reservoir. He said that the site contained stream buffers with inadequate riparian buffer protections, which was mainly focused on the character of the vegetation. He said that it had been grazed and lacked a woodland character in those buffers.

Mr. McGinnis said that the Natural Resources Chapter of the Comprehensive Plan placed importance on water resource protection, especially the public water supply system. He said that Objective 1 of the chapter was relevant: to ensure clean and abundant water resources for public health, business, healthy ecosystems, personal enjoyment, by preventing shortages and contamination. He said that while the proposed greenfield portion of the project may be a good idea, it was in the wrong space.

Dave Lubke, White Hall District, said that he would like to start by saying that he was a neighboring landowner, and he would begin by echoing concerns that had been expressed about the impact on the water supply. He said that to provide context, the proposed development was situated on a hillside that drained directly into the stream, approximately 400 paces from the reservoir. He said that as they had discussed, the primary reason for the creation of the Rural Area decades ago was to protect the watershed and the water supply.

Mr. Lubke said that this concern was more pressing now than ever. He said that the proposed expansion of the mobile home park from 40 to 92 dwellings would more than double the number of allowed home sites. He said that if they considered the existing structures, the actual number of homes would be even higher. He said that the associated construction disturbance and resulting impervious surface from the homes, roads, and driveways would have a significant impact on the watershed.

Mr. Lubke said that he strongly believed that this plan ran counter to both the current zoning and the underlying reason for that zoning, which was to protect the water supply. He said that County staff, including the Chief Engineer, had expressed concerns about the watershed impact and recommended mitigation measures, such as planting hardwood trees, native grasses, and shrubs. He said that he was dismayed by the applicant's response stating that they did not plan to implement these measures.

Mr. Lubke said that instead, they seemed to be prioritizing the retention of the lakeside view, which he believed was not a sufficient reason to compromise the water supply protection measures. He said that if they prioritized the viewshed preferences, he would also suggest prioritizing the view of the Albemarle residents who commuted daily along Route 240.

Mr. Lubke said that the view from this route was a key connection to the Rural Area and the Blue Ridge Mountains, which was an important aspect of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that the hillside was not simply an unwooded pasture, but was actually planted with towering trees that had been cut down. He said that the riparian buffer, once filled with large trees, had been largely cleared, with visible stumps remaining.

Heather Taylor, White Hall District, said that she lived in the Highlands subdivision, which was adjacent to this property. She said that she was speaking tonight in opposition to the rezoning and the three linked applications. She said that she would like to make three points. She said that first, regarding the Comprehensive Plan, this application was inconsistent with the AC44 Comprehensive Plan adopted by the Board of Supervisors six months ago.

Ms. Taylor said that the Plan stated that the County would emphasize efficient land use within existing development area boundaries and did not recommend boundary revisions at this time. She said that it also required distinct boundaries between Development Areas and Rural Areas, without low-density transition areas. Furthermore, prior to approving the Comprehensive Plan, the Board of Supervisors added an amendment stating that property owner-initiated amendments to AC44 may not include additions to the Development Areas.

Ms. Taylor said that the County's 2025 Build-out Analysis confirmed adequate capacity within the existing Development Areas through 2044. She said that the Beaver Hill parcel was located outside the Crozet development area, within the South Fork Rivanna Reservoir watershed, and outside the Lickinghole Creek sediment protection area. She said that approval of this rezoning request would contradict the protective policies in place for these areas.

Ms. Taylor said that the second item was ACSA's jurisdictional area amendment. She said that by extending public water and sewer into Rural Areas, the Comprehensive Plan was clear that the jurisdictional area followed the Development Area boundary. She said that if granted, the amendment would be cited in every future rural rezoning application. She said that the third item was the affordable housing provision. She said that the Southwood development was a good example of affordable housing within the Development Areas.

Mr. Taylor said that instead of extending into Rural Areas, the Development Areas could be used for affordable housing, preserving the agricultural and scenic beauty of the area. She said that in closing, it was mentioned earlier that the Scottsville area had a comparable manufactured home park rezoning, and staff recommended denial based on the same policy grounds. She said that she respectfully asked the Commission to follow that precedent and recommend denial, leaving the question of boundary revision to the Development Areas Utilization Review and the Comprehensive Plan itself.

Emily Lubke, White Hall District, said that she had been a County resident since 1978 and owned a parcel adjacent to this property. She said that she would like to take a moment to express her objections to the rezoning proposal for the Beaver Hill Manufactured Home Community. She said that the Comprehensive Plan's Growth Management Policy stated that the Rural Area would provide land for agriculture, forestry, protection of public water supply, conservation of ecosystems and climate resiliency.

Ms. Lubke said that the Plan did not mention expanding the Development Area into the Rural Area. She said that rezoning this parcel to R4 and providing it with a more suburban type of density was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and had not been recommended by the County staff in part for this reason. She said that one of her major concerns was the watershed.

Ms. Lubke said that it was less than 1,125 feet to the Beaver Creek Reservoir. She said that she was concerned about the sediment pollution and impervious cover that would create a conduit for that to get into the stream and directly into the reservoir. She said that her concerns had been heightened by recent activity on the property, including the removal of many trees along the lot

line in the upper northeast corner and along the steep slope in the critical zone, which was also part of the water protection area.

Ms. Lubke said that this area was previously forested with many large oaks and other native trees.; they had all been removed. She said that given that activity, she was hesitant to rely on verbal assurances that the necessary measures would be taken without it being documented. She said that given that the County had spent $1.3 million in 2008 to put 229 acres into conservation easement to protect the watershed. She believed it would be seriously inconsistent to rezone rural land adjacent to that, as well in the Beaver Creek Reservoir watershed, which was also protected, when the County had chosen to preserve this area.

Ms. Lubke said that finally, the Comprehensive Plan represented the work of County staff, committees, and community members. She urged the Commission to follow the thoughtful recommendations of those many people.

Michael Crenshaw, White Hall District, said that he was a resident of Crozet. He said that he was there to ask the Commission to support this addition of affordable housing in Crozet. He said that he was fortunate to be able to live in Crozet because of the relatively affordable housing that had been recently built. He said that as a result, he got to enjoy the views that the Master Plan talked about, and he also appreciated the community that lived there.

Mr. Crenshaw said that he had heard from people who worked in Crozet, including baristas and restaurant staff, that they were driving from Waynesboro, Staunton, and other areas to get to work, often taking a treacherous route that involved driving over the mountain. He said that this not only posed a danger to them but also wasted their time, money, and contributed to environmental pollution. He said that given the nationwide housing affordability crisis, particularly in Albemarle County, he found it unconscionable to reject this proposal solely to protect the Rural Area.

Mr. Crenshaw said that this development was adjacent to an existing manufactured park and single-family homes, and it was already close to other affordable housing options. He said that the views from this site were not unique, as there were already homes within that sight. He said that what he appreciated was that this development would provide affordable housing options for the people who worked in Crozet. He said that they had a ton of townhomes and McMansions; this type of housing was scarce in Crozet, and it would be a valuable asset to their community.

Mr. Crenshaw said that their housing supply was not resilient to demand from Northern Virginia retirees, so this development would be a unique opportunity to provide affordable housing in a location with existing utilities and sewer services. He said that it would be a significant benefit to the workers of Crozet. He said that he would like to address some of the concerns about the environmental impact of this project.

Mr. Crenshaw said that while he was not an expert in riparian buffers, he had heard generic concerns about the potential effects on the environment. He said that he would like to hear specifics about how much this project would impact his water quality and whether it would be within acceptable limits.

Michael Monaco, White Hall District, said that he lived in Crozet, approximately a mile down Route 240 from this site. He said that he was here tonight on behalf of Livable Cville to request that the Commission consider recommending approval of this rezoning. He said that Albemarle County

was currently experiencing a crisis of affordability, where residents were unable to live where they work and retire in the communities they have called home for decades.

Mr. Monaco said that they urgently needed affordable housing, specifically housing that did not impose a significant cost burden on individuals at or below 80% of the area median income. He said that manufactured housing was a rare and unsubsidized form of affordable housing, often referred to as naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH). He said that however, these homes required proactive action from the County government to be permitted and built.

Mr. Monaco said that he wanted to alleviate any concerns about precedent-setting. He said that this site was unique and specific, and it presented an opportunity to create manufactured housing as an expansion and improvement upon an existing neighborhood. He said that this site was also conveniently located, approximately a mile and a half from the Crozet Great Value. He said that in 2021, the Virginia State Legislature passed SB1327, requiring localities to include strategies to promote manufactured housing as a source of affordable housing.

Mr. Monaco said that their revised Comprehensive Plan became effective in 2026, although this application was being reviewed under the 2015 comp plan, which did not provide adequate consideration for manufactured homes. He said that he was impatient to see this project move forward. He said that they had already waited for the implementation of AC44, and now they must wait for the Zoning Modernization and the Rural Area Plan. Delaying this project would mean delaying 50 badly needed affordable homes.

Mr. Monaco said that he believed that if their plans did not allow this project, it was more an indictment of their plans than the project itself. He said that he worried that if the County could not approve this rezoning, they would be effectively closing the Rural Area to anyone who did not have $200,000 for a 20% down payment on a home. He said that he hoped that they would consider his comments as they made their decisions.

Leonora Crane, White Hall District, said that she was a resident of the Crozet area. She said that she would like to discuss two aspects of this project. Firstly, she would like to address affordable housing. She said that this County was facing a severe housing deficit, particularly for lower-income individuals. She said that according to the area median income, which is $60,000, she calculated that she could afford a house priced no more than $250,000. She said that however, the available houses in Crozet range from $500,000 to $1 million, making it impossible for a median income to afford any housing in Crozet.

Ms. Crane said that they had heard discussions about the Development Area and not building out into the Rural Area. She said that most of the lots in Crozet were already filled, which meant that any potential for affordable housing in the area was rapidly disappearing. She said that given that this area was adjacent to the Development Area, she believed the Planning Commission should consider making an exception to expand the housing just outside the Development Area.

Ms. Crane said that she would also like to discuss water quality. She said that as someone with a background in this issue, she was concerned about the existing runoff in the area. She said that upon visiting the lot, she observed that it was mostly mowed turf, which was likely to produce a significant amount of water volume that would flow into the watershed. Additionally, the use of herbicides and pesticides on the lawn will further exacerbate the problem.

Ms. Crane he said that they should prioritize repairing the riparian buffer in the area and introducing native species that would help prevent excess water runoff and reduce the amount of pesticides and herbicides entering Beaver Creek.

Chuck Bergenbright, White Hall District, said that he had lived on Three Notch'd Road for 30 years and he was speaking in opposition to this project. He said that he would like to clarify some points that had not been addressed in the meeting so far. He said that the property currently had cattle on it. He said that the native vegetation that once existed along the stream bed within the proposed area had been removed by the current property owners, approximately a year ago, and had not been replaced.

Mr. Bergenbright said that regarding septic systems, to connect the new pump station to the existing one, wastewater would need to be pumped across the stream that fed into the Rivanna Reservoir. He said that the current septic system had a history of failure in the current park. He said that in light of this, he strongly believed that this proposal should be denied. He said that the County's own staff, policies, and applicants' plans all pointed in the same direction.

Mr. Bergenbright said that this rezoning was not a close call. He said that this application was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan, as the property was designated as a Rural Area where new residential development was not desired. He said that staff had already determined that this proposal was not supported by Rural Area policy and was not recommended for approval.

Mr. Bergenbright said that secondly, this proposal introduced suburban density, specifically 90 units on 23 acres in a Rural Area. He said that this was not compatible with the character of the area and directly undermined the County's Growth Management strategy. He said that furthermore, the site was located within a public water supply watershed less than 1,000 feet from Beaver Creek Reservoir. He said that the applicant's own plans showed roads crossing stream buffers, stormwater directed towards those buffers, and wastewater infrastructure, including a sewer pump station adjacent to the drainage pathways.

Mr. Bergenbright said that these were not theoretical risks, but rather shown in the plans. He said that the applicant had declined full buffer restoration and continued to defer critical environmental protections to the site plan phase, which was contrary to the standard process. He said that rezoning granted permanent development rights, so it should not be approved first and then figure out the risk later. He said that finally, the infrastructure was inadequate, with rural road standards, limited access, and unresolved fire and traffic concerns.

Bill O'Malley, White Hall District, said that he was president of the Westlake Hills Homeowners Association (HOA), said that he wanted to acknowledge that staff had reached the correct conclusion, and this application should be denied. He said that the proposal was fundamentally inconsistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and clearly defined growth area boundaries. He said that he had six concerns regarding this application. He said that firstly, precedent mattered, and nothing was more important in these types of decisions.

Mr. O'Malley said that approving this request would create a slippery slope, making it increasingly difficult to uphold the integrity of the growth area. He said that water resources were irreplaceable, and this watershed was particularly beautiful. He said he loved Beaver Creek, and they did not get a second chance with water. As noted during the Planning Commission discussions, native vegetation and proper stream buffer protections were critical.

Mr. O'Malley said that also, school capacity was already overextended, and this was well-documented. He said that Crozet-area schools were operating under strain, and advancing additional development without aligned infrastructure would only stress the system further. He said that infrastructure commitments remained unmet, and residents in Crozet were still waiting on key infrastructure promised under the Comprehensive Plan. It was premature and inappropriate to expand beyond the growth area, even by one unit.

Mr. O'Malley said that community opposition was clear, and public input had been consistent against this proposal. He said that the applicant's track record with water resource management and stream buffers should raise concerns. He said that the issues observed in the Montclair development were well-documented and should not be overlooked when evaluating this request. He said that if any new Planning Commissioners needed information on this, he suggested they Google the Crozet Gazette and Montclair, where they would find a wealth of information.

Mr. O'Malley said that in closing, approving this application would set a damaging precedent, undermining planning principles, straining infrastructure, and putting critical environmental resources at risk. He respectfully urged the Commission to support staff's recommendation and deny this application.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the applicant had any responses to public comments.

Mr. Shimp said that he wanted to reiterate that this property was unique, predating even the Comprehensive Plan in 1966. He said that it was situated directly adjacent to the growth area, and its exclusion from the plan was unclear. He said that a comment made earlier had highlighted the importance of considering affordable housing options, particularly in areas with limited space. He said that in this case, they were zoning 23 acres, with approximately 10 acres available for development to house 50 families.

Mr. Shimp said that while it was a limited amount of land, it was not insignificant. He said that the impact of development was inevitable, but it could be mitigated with engineering solutions and regulations, such as stream buffer restoration and erosion control measures. He said that he believed that by considering these factors, they could ensure that the development was done in a way that protected the environment and the community.

Mr. Shimp said that the purpose of zoning was to protect public health, safety, and welfare, and he thought they had overlooked a crucial segment of the public in the past - those who needed affordable housing. He said that this proposal, while outside the growth area boundary, offered a unique opportunity to expand the boundary and provide more affordable housing options in Crozet. He said that he believed the overall benefits outweighed the drawbacks, and he hoped the Commission would support this proposal.

Ms. Firehock asked if the applicant could address the comments made by the public regarding the cutting of trees that were previously located along the water's edge or at the edge of this development. She said that the public had testified to the fact that trees were cut approximately a year ago. She said that she would like to know if the trees that were cut were part of a forestry operation or if they were cut in advance of this application, specifically to avoid having to remain.

Mr. Shimp said that the property had changed ownership within the family approximately two years ago. He said that they had taken on various property maintenance tasks, which they were entitled to in their RA zone. He said that he had not been discussing specific issues with particular trees or other items. He said that since the change in ownership, there had been some activities

on the property, but they had been permitted under the existing use. He said that it was true that these activities had occurred since the property change, and he could confirm that.

Mr. Murray said that the rezoned area appeared to exclude several streams that could be potentially buffered. He said that he was curious about the decision-making process behind this exclusion. He said that many concerns seemed to center around the direct impact on the water supply. He said that it also seemed that the rezoned area was strategically chosen to exclude areas that could or should be buffered, particularly in terms of parcels that were affected. He asked whether the applicant would consider including all parcels that were affected and buffer all the streams.

Mr. Shimp said that the zoning boundary, as evident from the alignment, was based on the existing conditions and the area. He said that it was also based on the requirement of a certain number of units in specific areas. He said that they essentially drew a straight line across the area. He said that the Sprouse families lived on adjacent parcels and they planned to use that land for agriculture and manage the expansion of the park themselves.

Mr. Shimp said that the primary concern was not to impose development restrictions on an area they may still wish to farm. He said that he believed there had been comments regarding an area and whether it could include native grasses and not mowed turf. He said that they were not trying to zone the entire property R4, so the buffers were reflective of the development area and the impacts.

Mr. Murray said that they had had ongoing discussions during the AC44 process about the expansion of the Development Area. He said that there was also a pending discussion about the Rural Area Plan, which was scheduled to take place in the near future. He said that it had been mentioned that there may be consideration for mobile homes and their potential appropriate locations. He said that this was going to be developed within the next year, so he wondered if the applicant may consider waiting until the community had had the opportunity to engage in discussions about the appropriate locations for mobile home parks before presenting this application.

Mr. Shimp said that the current owners had asked to pursue this project, so that was why they submitted it to the County. He said that he also did not want to make this development contingent on completion of a new plan, which may take a long time. He said that he would like to see them provide housing, and this seemed like the right time.

Ms. King said that staff's comments had included suggestions for improving the plan, including expanding the water protection area. She asked how long ago there were livestock in the pasture to the north.

Mr. Shimp said that there were currently cows there.

Ms. King said that she thought that was important as they considered the improvements this project would provide with native plantings. She said that they could potentially resolve a long-standing issue with runoff into the stream.

Mr. Moore asked if the cows were the main source of runoff.

Ms. Brown said that historic imagery showed that there was once a woodland canopy along that area, up until 2024. She said that unfortunately, this suggested that the spirit of the commitment to the buffer was not very strong, which was concerning.

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

Ms. Brown said that in the context of the existing use in proximity to the growth area and the need for affordable housing, she wanted to be persuaded by the application. She said that unfortunately, it fell short in any commitment to protecting water quality, preserving the rural character, and addressing the potential disturbance during construction and ongoing use. She said that she believed there was a way to make it more compelling.

Ms. Brown said that this site was particularly challenging to make work, but the commitment was not there based on what they had seen with the trees and the removal of a buffer. She said that the spirit of the proposal, which prioritized the view of the lake or pond, needed to shift to prioritize their ecology in order to make this work and turn it around.

Ms. King said that for many of the reasons Ms. Brown mentioned, she was in favor of this application in general. She said that the current use as a mobile home park was a significant opportunity for them to add affordable units that were permanently affordable without subsidy. She said that she believed this was an important consideration.

Ms. King said that although these units were not permanent homes, they would serve a low-income population that average housing often could not. She said that one of the objectives in building residential units in Rural Areas was to promote equity. She said that she thought this was a good reason, and it also related to expanding the water and sewer utility to that location, which she believed was important.

She said that the fact that the site was already zoned for this use was a no-brainer. She said that she understood that it may not align directly with prior recommendations, but the existing limited use permit was a mitigating factor. She said that in general, she thought the applicant could improve the application by providing more protection for the water buffer, more plantings, and more refurbishment. She said that the watershed was her only concern at this point.

Ms. Firehock had three reasons why she was not supportive of this proposal. She said that to preface, she wanted to emphasize that she was very supportive of affordable housing. She said that throughout her career, she had worked in the affordable housing field and had benefited from affordable housing in this County. She said that during the Comprehensive Plan process, they had the opportunity to consider whether this tract should be added.

Ms. Firehock said that she did not want to be seen as contradicting the long process they had gone through to adopt the Comprehensive Plan, only to say that they would redraw the lines for a particular project. She said that if that was the County's policy and the Board of Supervisors wanted to adopt that approach, she just needed to be informed. She said that at this time, that was not the process they followed.

Ms. Firehock said that the second reason she was opposed to this proposal was the fallacy of saying that because something was impactful they should be allowed to continue to do it. She said that she was specifically referring to the mention of this being a cattle farm. She said that she was disturbed to hear that the woodland had been removed along the waterway. She said that several people had acknowledged they were not watershed experts, but she in fact was a watershed expert 35 years of experience.

Ms. Firehock said that she had written a book on riparian buffer construction and completed a habitat restoration project on Lickinghole Creek. She said that she was very familiar with this area. She said that a 100-foot wooded buffer could remove over 85% of the nitrates, phosphorus, and

sediment runoff. She said that lawns, which may seem beautiful, were actually full of these contaminants, which were the primary contaminants of concern for the Chesapeake Bay.

Ms. Firehock said that their County had good drinking water quality, and this was due to their efforts to protect their watersheds. She said that she had worked in multiple counties in Virginia, including those where the water quality had been compromised due to excessive development around the perimeter. She said that much of this was caused by lawn runoff, particularly at a very important recreational lake in Virginia. She said that she believed they needed to consider the watershed and the protection of their watersheds.

Ms. Firehock said that she also noted in the application that driveways would be gravel, making them pervious; however, this was not entirely true. She said that when gravel was driven over repeatedly, it became as impervious as asphalt, rendering it ineffective as a pervious surface. She said that she would like to see mobile home parks allowed in Albemarle County and tiny houses and tiny lots embraced, but she was not willing to sacrifice the health of their watershed.

Ms. Firehock said that if the landowner or anyone was concerned about restoring the health of that reservoir to keep it healthy, the James River Association offered a free tree planting program, where they not only planted the trees, but also maintained them for the landowner. She said that the Virginia Department of Forestry had the Virginia Trees for Clean Water program, which provided free trees, funding for labor, and watering assistance if needed.

Ms. Firehock said that finally, the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) offered a program which involved fencing cattle away from the stream, restoring the buffer, and receiving payment per acre for doing so. She said that the government paid landowners annually for this conservation effort. She said that there were numerous opportunities to improve upon the current landowners' efforts.

Ms. Firehock said that some may argue that affordable housing was a concern, so they should redraw the boundary to allow it, but she would like to reiterate that they went through a very long process to reaffirm the boundaries that were currently in place. She said that the County had discussed creating a process for expanding the boundary, but they still had yet to do so. She said that she would be willing to entertain that consideration under that type of process.

Mr. Carrazana said that he would not focus on the stream buffer, as he knew two of his colleagues were experts on that matter and could speak better to it than he. He said that he did not support the application because he did not see the effort in trying to work with the County to come up with a better plan. He said that in his experience with the Planning Commission, they had been supportive of mobile homes and had actually observed a trend of getting rid of mobile homes in favor of higher density.

Mr. Carrazana said that he completely acknowledged the mobile homes were affordable, and that was why he was so confused about why they did not follow the Housing Albemarle policy for affordable housing. He said that the entire parcel was part of the amendment request, so it should all be considered under their Housing Albemarle policy. He said that he did not understand why they would create that limitation, and Mr. Shimp's answer did not satisfy his question.

Mr. Carrazana said that he agreed that the commitment to resolving the issues with the stream buffer and the affordable housing was not present in the application, and they should change and follow the policy. He said that he thought there was an opportunity to make this work, but it required additional conversation and dialogue with staff.

Mr. Murray said that he wanted to share a tale of two trailer parks. Not long ago, the Crozet Mobile Home Community had come before this Commission to request an expansion, with strong support from residents in Crozet for that mobile home park. He said that this comparison was particularly interesting, as one application was consistent with the Crozet Master Plan, while the other was decidedly not. He said that similarly, one was consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan, while the other was not.

Mr. Murray said that he had observed that Crozet was very supportive of affordable housing, including mobile homes, where it made sense; he agreed with this stance. He said that this proposal was a Development Area expansion, and it was essential to be clear about that. He said that if a Rural Area parcel was granted growth area density and public water and sewer, it was a Development Area expansion.

Mr. Murray said that the question of growth area expansion had been a significant topic of discussion during AC44, with many public comments and the expansion being rejected multiple times. He said that he believed that going back on this decision would erode public trust in the process. He said that there was certainly a reasonable conversation about suitable locations for trailer parks, including in Rural Areas.

Mr. Murray said that however, the right approach was to have that conversation with the public first, rather than making ad hoc decisions that created winners and losers. He said that when considering whether to add mobile homes or expand the Development Area, they should have that conversation. He said that the Rural Area Plan might be a suitable place to discuss how to accommodate manufactured homes.

Mr. Murray said that manufactured homes were currently allowed in the Rural Area; it was an allowed use. He said that the Growth Management Policy of AC44 outlined how and where Development Area expansions could occur, specifically avoiding areas with sensitive natural resources and those that could impact their water supply. He said that they had been informed that the Crozet area already had a limited water supply that could only accommodate a limited amount of growth, and it was projected to run out by 2040.

Mr. Murray said that if they allowed the reservoir to fill with sediment, they would harm their ability to build out existing development or in Crozet. He said that the Rural Area had been created to address concerns about water supply impacts from development. He said that looking at the South Fork Reservoir, which was one of the main concerns, it was now full of sediment; the prediction came true.

Mr. Murray said that even if this expansion were a good use and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, it did not meet their existing standards, with 14 different exceptions. As the Planning Commission, their purpose was to ensure that every locality created a local Planning Commission to provide for the orderly development of the locality and its environs. He said that if they believed that planning was a crucial part of their mission, then the Commission should deny this request because this proposal did not align with the County's plans; it was the antithesis of planning.

Mr. Moore said that he thought this project was making a relatively minor adjustment to a larger Comprehensive Plan, as it was expanding an existing mobile home park in a way that was sorely needed. He said that this aligned with their previous discussions on affordable housing, and he did not see the same conflicts that some of his colleagues did. He said that adding another 48 mobile homes, while still a significant change, felt acceptable in this context.

Mr. Moore said that it was providing homes for people, and that was his primary guiding principle. He said that the site was adjacent to the Development Area, across the street, and it was already supplied with water and sewer. He said that they had stream buffers in place to maintain a clean and high-quality water supply. He said that he believed this project complied with these buffers. He said that in his view, this was an acceptable exception to the norm.

Mr. Moore said that he agreed with Mr. Murray that they needed to ensure they had good, orderly planning, but he was concerned about the future families that would not get to live here and would have to commute from other counties to get to work in Albemarle. He said that this was what he was thinking about when this type of proposal came before them. He said that he echoed Mr. Carrazana's concerns about the Housing Albemarle policy compliance. He said that he thought that needed to be clarified when they presented this item to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Moore said that they should comply with the policy from the start, rather than agreeing to it after being questioned. He said that they also needed to clarify that they would be providing strong riparian buffers and native plantings. He said that he was in favor of this proposal in general and encouraged those improvements. He said that he also wanted to note that some of the Comprehensive Plan and service area boundary lines were drawn with limited information and may not be entirely logical.

Mr. Moore said that when he was previously on the ACSA Board, he saw firsthand the importance of a clean water supply, and he believed it was essential to consider the long-term implications of their decisions. He said that in the early 1980s, the County's developable land was reduced from 48,000 acres to 24,000 acres. He said that they were now down to just 5% of the County's land, and they were confined to this small space, which was putting a significant burden on the housing supply, as it was not keeping up with demand.

Mr. Moore said that as a result, housing costs continued to rise, and people who needed to work to live were being priced out. They were forced to commute or live elsewhere, which was not a community; they were being priced out of the area. He said that he firmly believed they needed to work towards a Development Area that was closer to 10% of the County's land. He said that he encouraged this body to start exploring parts of the County that were well-served by transportation routes, could be served by water and sewer, and did not directly feed into their reservoirs

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to see them begin drafting possibilities for consideration and working towards creating space for people to live flourishing and dignified lives in the County where they worked. He said that if they were doing good, orderly planning, they should start looking at specific areas for that. He said that additionally, he wanted to add that a housing market with a mix of market-rate housing was an important part of the solution; however, it was not the only solution.

Mr. Moore said that they also needed a robust social housing sector, including public housing for various income levels, limited equity housing co-ops, and land trusts, to make affordable housing available across the County. He said that furthermore, they needed jobs that paid well. He said that he wanted to transmit to Richmond the consideration of eliminating the right-to-work law, which would allow them to establish unions that could help address the income side of housing affordability.

Mr. Moore said that he knew this was an economic development issue as well, and he wanted them to think about economic development in a way that brought in jobs that paid well, so people could afford houses on both the price point and income side.

Mr. Murray said that they had some tools they currently had in place that were not perfect, such as rural preservation developments, which allowed for clustering and other benefits. He said that they also had the ability to implement bonus density, which opened up possibilities for creating reasonable mobile home park locations. He said that it was worth noting that the Development Area boundary had an impact on home prices; when they expanded the development area, even a small increment, they could dramatically increase the value of a property by adding new uses and changing its zoning designation from R4 to something else.

Mr. Murray said that for instance, if they designated an area for conservation, they may be able to downzone it, which could be met with resistance from property owners. He said that this was a double-edged sword, as the government had the power to both add and take away property rights. He said that if they created new development rights without a clear source, they risked giving monetary value to one property owner at the expense of others. He said that he believed they needed to consider the broader economic implications of expanding development areas or increasing density in Rural Areas.

Ms. King said that what was actually happening was that they had created a belt around the waste of their development, resulting in false scarcity. She said that currently, the reason for the high cost of parcels within the Development Area was due to the limited availability of land, specifically 5% of the total area. She said that when scarcity existed, it led to a lack of supply.

Ms. King said that in 25 years, they may not have the necessary infrastructure to support the growth they were expecting. She said that it would take another 25 years to build the first house, and when that happened, those individuals would likely see an increase in property value. She said that they needed that property to build homes, as people continued to move to the area. She said that restricting the market in this way would not be effective in making it affordable for people.

Mr. Carrazana said that one point that he found particularly interesting during their AC44 process was that they actually underbuilt, meaning they did not take full advantage of their density potential since 2015. He said that this was partly due to the income levels in this area, which would continue to change over time. He said that they had significant companies, such as biotech firms, investing billions of dollars in this area, which would attract thousands of high-paying employees.

Mr. Carrazana said that this would increase the demand for housing as well as the AMI, making it even less affordable for most people. He said that currently, even 80% or 60% AMI affordability levels were not sufficient. He said that they needed to think beyond just adding more development and relying on 20% of homes as pseudo-affordable housing, because these units were not truly affordable.

Mr. Carrazana said that to address this, they must consider public-private partnerships (P3) initiatives that partnered with industry and government to create affordable housing. He said that currently, they were not doing this effectively, and they may be losing more affordable housing than they were building. He said that in his opinion, their policy must change, as they continued to follow the same approach and expected different results.

Mr. Carrazana said that this was a conversation they had had before, and it was clear that their current approach was not working. He said that they were not just restricting the Development

Area; they were not building out what they could, and they had not been doing so for a while. He said that therefore, they must think differently and consider alternative approaches. He said that affordability levels for those 20% of units were not actually affordable due to the high AMI.

Ms. King said that having more homes would make homes more affordable.

Mr. Murray said that he questioned that assumption. He said that if they were discussing local supply and demand, that was not the case in Albemarle County. He said that they were experiencing a statewide supply and demand issue, driven by retirees from northern Virginia who were drawn to Albemarle's relatively affordable housing options. He said that these discretionary individuals could significantly impact neighborhood prices.

Mr. Murray said that the traditional supply and demand model was flawed in their context, as they were not addressing a local market, but rather a statewide one. He said that he was concerned that simply building more homes would not be enough to satisfy the statewide demand. He said that he thought they needed to consider alternative strategies, such as the County purchasing or repurposing existing properties, as Mr. Moore had previously suggested.

Mr. Murray said that he wholeheartedly agreed with that concept of social housing. He said that even if they were to consider expanding the Development Area, he thought it would be more efficient if the County were to purchase the land itself and build the houses on that area. He said that this approach would create some truly affordable housing options.

Ms. King said that it required taxpayer dollars to do that.

Mr. Carrazana said that that was why he suggested public-private partnerships. He said that it was not a new concept and had been implemented successfully in other locations. He said that they would not solve that issue today, however. He said that regarding this application, this site was sensitive but the proposal had merit, and it could be worked out with staff to determine the best path forward.

Mr. Murray motioned that the Planning Commission recommend denial of ZMA202400007 Beaver Hill Mobile Home Park, for the reasons stated in the staff report and discussed by the Planning Commission. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried (4-2). (Brown, Firehock, Carrazana, and Murray voted aye; King, and Moore voted nay; Mr. Clayborne was absent)

Mr. Murray motioned that the Planning Commission denial of SP202400002 Beaver Hill Mobile Home Park, for the reasons stated in the staff report. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried (4-2). (Brown, Firehock, Carrazana, and Murray voted aye; King, and Moore voted nay; Mr. Clayborne was absent)

Recess

The Commission took a five-minute recess.

Committee Reports

Ms. Brown said that on April 16, they had a meeting with the Fifth Street and Avon Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and one of the interesting presentations was about the connection under Interstate 64 to Azalea Park, located along Lynchburg Road. She said that the project was set to be completed by October of this year. She said that during the meeting, two concerns were raised

by participants, including the need for improved mobility from the Food Lion and Mill Creek area north to town, an issue that had been expressed for some time.

Ms. Brown said that there was also a concern about the lack of safe crossings in town across Interstate 64. She said that Allison Wrabel also spoke about civic access, providing a helpful presentation on how to search using property IDs to find information about activities. She said that furthermore, Ms. Swartzendruber mentioned that the development dashboard app was returning soon. She said that Ms. Firehock also presented an update on the stream buffer protection working session, specifically focusing on the removal of invasive species without requiring permits.

Ms. Firehock said that the Historic Preservation Committee had a meeting recently, which was very productive. She said that the majority of the meeting was spent on a presentation about the Rivanna community and Pleasant Grove Baptist Church. This presentation was in relation to the County's Historic Preservation Committee's desire to expand the historic marker program, which she had previously mentioned.

Ms. Firehock said that they had been discussing this for some time, but were told to wait until the Comprehensive Plan was adopted and the goals for historic preservation were finalized. She said that the Committee was moving forward with the marker program proposal. She said that they planned to present it to the Board of Supervisors, requesting funding. She said that the County had a marker program that had already placed several local historic markers, primarily through an earlier allocation for underrepresented communities and untold stories.

Ms. Firehock said that at this time, most of that fund had been used, so the new proposal aimed to create a marker program that allowed everyone in the County to learn about its history and for communities to apply and make a compelling case, and those applications would be ranked and voted on by the Committee. She said that they had discussed this idea before, and this group wanted to get ahead of the game, so they made a compelling presentation, but they did not make a decision on the proposal since they still needed to finalize their marker program and budget.

Ms. Firehock said that Pleasant Grove Baptist Church, founded in 1874, less than 10 years after emancipation. She said that Tinsley Woodfolk started the church, initially appearing in the 1870 census as a farm laborer who could not write but could read. She said that by 1880, he had become fully literate and began his career as a preacher, following in his grandfather's footsteps. She said that the church eventually became a school for African American children, teaching them to read and write.

Ms. Firehock said that later, they built a more substantial church in the same location, and a community of freed African Americans developed around it, creating their own farm or homestead. She said that however, when the airport was built, the story was similar to others such as Vinegar Hill, where the County wanted the land and intended to get it through an outright sale or through eminent domain, and most people lost their property.

Ms. Firehock said that the church building was saved, but the steeple had to be removed due to Federal Aviation Authority (FAA) regulations, and the church was subsequently sold, and they subsequently acquired another property and created a new church in the area, but now they had a mortgage, whereas previously they were debt-free. She said that it appeared that they had been promised a marker to commemorate the community and church on multiple occasions, but this promise was never fulfilled.

Ms. Firehock said that this had been the case for a very long time, as the community no longer existed. She said that they also discussed the fact that many of their relatives were buried under the runways, which seemed like a significant injustice. She said that the marker program would eventually be established, and they had made significant efforts to gather documentation and materials. She said that they would need to work with the airport and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to determine a suitable location for the markers, and they would need to compete in the program like everyone else.

Ms. Firehock said that she hoped that the marker program would have sufficient funds to create five or six markers, and that this process would not take too long to establish. She said that this would likely be brought back to the Committee. She said that the individuals involved had done an excellent job of documenting their history, and it occurred to her that this could be a remarkable oral history project to document other lost communities in Albemarle. She said that however, that was a separate project from their current work on historic markers.

Mr. Carrazana asked Mr. Barnes if he had information on the current status of the historic marker program.

Mr. Barnes said that staff was working on a marker program.

Ms. Firehock said that the current funding for the program was finished, so they needed a new program with a new budget.

Mr. Barnes said that he thought there was available funding.

Ms. Firehock said that staff informed the Historic Preservation Committee that there was funding available for one, final marker., and that was currently under production. She said that they needed more money from the Board of Supervisors. She said that those original programs, led by Mr. Brookins, had already been implemented and had been successful with five markers. She said that the idea was to establish an ongoing program to recognize and celebrate important places and cultures. She said that to that end, they had developed a variety of categories to help facilitate this recognition, including a landscape category for historic landscapes.

Mr. Carrazana said that he appreciated the information, as he was not aware of that history there either.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: April 15, 2026, and April 22, 2026

Mr. Barnes said that the April 15, 2026, meeting had two items of interest to the Commission: an increased fee schedule for Community Development Department (CDD) and five work projects for AC44 implementation. He said that those projects would be brought back to the Commission during May. He said that the five work projects were the Zoning Modernization, activity center plans, a multimodal transportation plan, the Rural Area Plan, and administration of AC44. He said that the administration project was intended to tie the Comp Plan to the Board's Strategic Plan and provide metrics for tracking those actions.

Mr. Barnes said that the April 22, 2026, Board of Supervisors meeting was focused on the FY2027 Budget.

Mr. Murray said that Ms. Brown had mentioned the development dashboard would be returning to the website, and this made him think about the building reports that used to be available. He said that this had provided a wealth of information about total numbers of units, placement, and

whether or not they were meeting Comprehensive Plan goals. He asked staff why those were no longer available and whether they would be produced again in the future.

Mr. Barnes said that they were being reconstituted. He said that when they switched over systems, they had to reconfigure some things, but they would be providing those reports again. He said that the development dashboard was more about tracking new developments, and staff was working on establishing the mapping portion of that tool.

New Business

Ms. King said that it was important that they improve how they measured data related to how well they were developing. She said that the last two Buildout Analyses included theoretical maximum assumptions that she thought were inaccurate. She said that under new business, she had attended the first two days of the Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU) Commissioner Certification Course, which was a wonderful opportunity.

Ms. King said that she wanted to encourage her colleagues to take this course because it allowed them to collaborate with planning commissioners from many different jurisdictions, sharing ideas and discussing current planning and zoning issues. She said that she had found it a very helpful class.

Ms. Brown said that she had received an email stating that the course was fully booked, but there were some future dates later in the year.

Ms. Firehock said that she wanted to encourage everyone to attend the American Planning Association Virginia Chapter meeting, which was scheduled for the end of July. She said that the meeting offered a track specifically for planning commissioners, allowing attendees to engage with their colleagues. She said that sessions were held throughout the event, providing ample opportunities to participate and interact with other commissions.

Ms. Firehock said that she thoroughly enjoyed the event, as it was enlightening to hear about the organizational structures and challenges faced by other commissions. She said that the experience was also cathartic, and it was a valuable reminder of the importance of their work.

Mr. Barnes asked that Commissioners let him know if they would be attending that meeting so they could schedule around it.

Old Business

Mr. Murray said that there was a Fill Ordinance that was pulled from the agenda at a previous meeting, and he was wondering why it needed to be pulled and when it would be coming back to the Planning Commission for review.

Bart Svoboda, Deputy Director of Community Development and Zoning Administrator, said that they received feedback from their stakeholders regarding the clarity of the Ordinance. He said that some rearrangements and clarifications were made, and the plan moving forward was to hold a single, large meeting with all stakeholder groups to gather feedback, which would then be brought back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Svoboda said that he was uncertain about the exact dates for this meeting. He said that currently, they were working on identifying legislative mandate changes and integrating them into

their work program. He said that they aimed to present this information to the Planning Commission sooner rather than later, with the goal of completing it by the end of summer.

Items for follow-up

There were none.

Adjournment

At 8:30 p.m., the Commission adjourned to May 12, 2026, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m.

_____
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: