Recess/Reconvene at 6:00 p.m.

The Commission recessed and reconvened at 6 p.m.

Ms. Firehock joined the meeting.

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

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Moore motioned that the Planning Commission adopt the Consent Agenda. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0).

Public Hearing

ZMA-2025-00007 Windy Knoll; SUB-2025-239

Syd Shoaf, Senior Planner II, said that before the Commission this evening, they had two applications: ZMA 2025-7 and SUB-2025-239, Windy Knoll. He said that ZMA 2025-7 was a rezoning application to rezone three parcels from R1 residential to R6 residential. He said that SUB-2025-239 was a request to waive the sidewalk and planting strip requirements for a private street under Section 14-422E. He said that the subject properties were located within Crozet's development area, north of Route 250, west of the Liberty Hall subdivision, and east of Cory Farm Road.

Mr. Shoaf said that the properties consisted of three parcels, totaling 3.15 acres, with varying levels of development. He said that one parcel had an existing single-family residence, while another had its residence removed, and the third was undeveloped. He said that access to the parcels was provided through private easements, including a 20-foot easement on Windy Knoll Lane, which also served a single-family residence at 330 Windy Knoll Lane. He said that another parcel had a driveway from Colony Drive which was not in use. He said that the northern parcel did not have a driveway, but it did have frontage on Cory Farm Road.

Mr. Shoaf said that the parcels were zoned R1 residential, with one parcel within the entrance corridor and impacted by a small portion of the steep slopes managed overlay district. He said the parcel to the east was zoned R1. He said that the parcels to the north, south, and west were zoned R4 residential, containing one single-family dwelling unit. He said that the parcels to the east were zoned Neighborhood Model Development (NMD), within the Liberty Hall subdivision. He said that the subject property was also approximately 550 feet from the Blue Ridge Shopping Center, which was zoned highway commercial, and approximately 600 feet from Clover Lawn Shopping Center, a planned development mixed commercial.

Mr. Shoaf said that the proposal was reviewed under the 2015 comprehensive plan, which was in effect at the time the application was submitted. He said that the primary designation was neighborhood density residential, which allowed for a density between three to six dwelling units per acre. He said that the secondary designation was for Green Systems. He said that AC44 recommended neighborhood density for this site.

Mr. Shoaf said that there were two applications related to this development that the Planning Commission was required to take action on. He said that the first was the main rezoning application, which would rezone the three parcels from R1 residential to R6 residential to construct a maximum of 18 residential units. He said that the second application was a request to waive the sidewalk and planting strip requirements for a private street under Section 14-422E, which

only required Planning Commission action and would not be acted upon by the Board if this application moved forward.

Mr. Shoaf said that the main application for ZMA 2025-7 proposed to rezone the parcel from R1 to R6 to construct up to 18 dwelling units, with six units per acre. He said that the applicant would provide further details during their presentation. He said that at a high level, the application proposed two building envelopes: the southern envelope, featuring four single-family residences, and the northern envelope, comprising 14 multifamily or townhouse units.

Mr. Shoaf said that there were three vehicular access points for the site: one utilizing the existing Windy Knoll Lane to serve two properties and a single-family residence at 330 Windy Knoll Lane; a new 10-foot private driveway from Colony Drive to serve two single-family dwelling units; and a new 20-foot private street from Cory Farm Road to serve the northern building envelope. He said that this private street did not require Planning Commission authorization since it was for attached units. He said that this private street was also associated with the sidewalk and planting strip waiver, which would be discussed in a later slide.

Mr. Shoaf said that there was a reservation for a permanent slope and drainage easement along Corrie Farm Road, which was part of a County project to improve Corrie Farm Road on Eastern Avenue. He said that the site also featured open space areas, a stormwater management pond, and access. He said that since the staff report had been posted last week, the applicants had provided two updates to the proposal.

Mr. Shoaf said that the first update was that the applicant had revised their proffer related to affordable housing, which was now consistent with the recommendations under Housing Albemarle. He said that a later proffer summary slide reflected these revisions, which included updates to the language related to area median income, rent units, and minimum affordability periods. He said that the second update was the concept plan shown on the screen, which proposed a mowed/mulch path and connected the northern and southern building envelopes to the existing pedestrian facilities within Liberty Hall.

Mr. Shoaf said that the site was located within the development area, approximately 550 feet from both Clover Lawn and the Blue Ridge Shopping Centers. He said that existing pedestrian facilities included those in Liberty Hall to the east and along Route 250 to the south. He said that there was also an existing sidewalk on a small portion of Cory Farm Road, which concluded at the intersection with Little Fox Lane. He said that a future County project for Eastern Avenue would provide sidewalks on both sides of Cory Farm Road, although no timeline for construction had been established.

Mr. Shoaf said that the applicants had also provided a draft proffer statement with three proffers, which were outlined in the packet. He said that the first proffer was to develop in general accord with the concept plan provided. He said that the major elements identified were the location of building envelopes, internal roads, and the location of a permanent slope and drainage easement for the construction of Eastern Avenue. He said that the second proffer was a 4,570 square foot reservation for the slope and drainage easement.

Mr. Shoaf said that the third proffer was related to affordable housing, with the applicant offering 20% of the units to be affordable. He said that if the 18 units were developed, this would include four affordable units. He said that the applicant had revised their proffer to align with the Housing Albemarle guidelines, including language for rental and sale AMI.

Mr. Shoaf said that since the staff report had been completed, staff's positive and negative aspects had changed due to the revised materials provided by the applicant. He said that staff still believed the request was consistent with the Crozet Master Plan's land use recommendations and the growth management policy's strategies for density and infill. He said that staff also agreed

that the request met Housing Albemarle's recommendations for providing 20% affordable units, AMI for rent units, and minimum affordability periods.

Mr. Shoaf said that staff had two concerns: existing overcapacity issues at Western Albemarle High School and inadequate interconnected streets or bicycle and pedestrian connections. He said that the proposed mowed/mulch path provided a connection to existing and proposed sidewalks, but staff were concerned about its durability. He said that despite these concerns, staff recommended approval of the zoning map amendment request ZMA 2025-7, pending revisions to provide necessary interconnections throughout the development.

Mr. Shoaf said that regarding SUB-2025-239, the applicant requested to waive sidewalk and planting strip requirements for a private street under 14-422E. He said that this required action from the Commission. He said that staff were concerned that the request did not provide adequate connection to an existing or future pedestrian system. He said that staff recommended denial of both the sidewalk and planting strip requests due to the lack of detail.

Mr. Moore asked how many students were expected to enroll in Western Albemarle from this development.

Mr. Shoaf said that the information was located on page nine of the packet. He said that according to the Albemarle County Public Schools Long Range Planning Advisory Committee report, it estimated approximately two and a half students would be generated by the development.

Mr. Moore said that he did not find the addition of three students to be concerning.

Mr. Clayborne asked what would happen if staff could not reach an agreement with the developer regarding interconnections.

Mr. Barnes said that they would present a stronger rationale for denial to the Board.

Mr. Murray asked what the nature of the objection was to providing interconnectivity.

Mr. Shoaf said that the applicant could provide more information. He said that based on his observations of the site, he suspected that the steep grades may be a factor.

Mr. Moore said that he was also curious about private road A, where they were seeking a waiver. He said that this area was outside the parcel. He asked if that portion would be within an easement or if it would be owned by someone else.

He said that if construction were to take place, he was curious about how that process would work.

Mr. Shoaf said that there was an existing access easement, so they would need to obtain approval from the easement holder to make the road improvements.

Mr. Barnes said that the remaining portion of the private road connection was currently on public right-of-way.

Ms. King said that she agreed with Mr. Moore. She said that she did not consider the addition of two and a half students to the high school to be a major concern in this particular application. She said that feedback from the community had expressed uncertainty with accuracy of the enrollment calculations. She said she agreed with the sentiment. She said that Crozet was one of the development areas, so they needed to continue developing it. She said that student enrollment was not a reason to deny the application.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the intention for the private road was to extend it all the way to Cory Farms.

Mr. Shoaf said that the County's goal was to have Colony Drive as a public right-of-way. He said that their comprehensive plan aimed for public, interconnected streets. He said that when they first reviewed this application, one of their comments was to extend Colony Drive to connect to Cory Farm Road.

Mr. Barnes said that they acknowledged through the review that the drop in grade was a significant amount. He said that as they worked through the review of the applicant, he believed that they came to agree that extending Colony Drive in that area would be a challenging task due to the topography. He said that the easement for parcel 330 added another layer of complexity to the situation.

Mr. Shoaf said that there was an existing easement, located at the bottom of the screen. He said that the easement holders would need to sign off on it. He said that there was a small triangle to the left of the screen, which was owned by the Cory Farm HOA, representing another property in between.

Ms. King asked if there would be an opportunity to discuss the path in the updated application. She said that the current design appeared to be a grassy path. She said that one potential option could be to increase the design to create a shared-use path that could accommodate bicycles.

Mr. Barnes said that he wanted to clarify that, during the process, they had worked closely with the applicant. He said that there were several issues that needed to be addressed. He said that this particular issue was not responded to by the applicant. He said that as a result, they had initially recommended denial. He said that the fact that the applicant was willing to work in this direction made staff willing to work with the applicant.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing for presentations from the applicant.

Justin Shimp, Shimp Engineering, said that he was joined by Polina Andreeva from his office and Mr. Carrington, the property owner. He said that as a company that specialized in infill development, they often found themselves working in Charlottesville City, but they were increasingly being called upon to develop projects in this area. He said that without expanding the development areas, the remaining land was likely to be infill projects like this one. He said that this location was particularly well suited due to its proximity to the existing center and accessibility on foot or by bicycle to commercial uses.

Mr. Shimp said that their approach to this project was to zone the property as R6, which was just under six units per acre. He said that 20% of the units would meet the affordable housing policy. He said that he would like to address a point of confusion regarding the relationship between the affordable housing policy and the developer incentive package that the Board passed. He said that they had worked with the staff to ensure compliance and were confident that they met the requirements.

Mr. Shimp said that the in-fill development offered excellent opportunities for residents to access local amenities without relying on cars. He said that the proposed project added a diverse product mix to an area that was predominantly single-family homes. He said that the property was currently zoned R1. He said that the diagram showed adjacent neighborhoods that had developed in the three to six dwelling units per acre range.

Mr. Shimp said that the current development in this area was approximately 119 units on 52.6 acres, resulting in a net density of 2.26 units per acre. He said that this was below the minimum recommended density in the comprehensive plan for this area. He said that the proposal would still be below the minimum recommended net density.

Mr. Shimp said that they proposed the mulch and grass path after considering what would happen if the Eastern Connector did not come through. He said that he disagreed with staff on the

materials choice, because he preferred a grass and mulch path over asphalt, if the slopes allowed. He said that maintenance and usability were to be considered. He said that the path would connect the townhome section and the existing single families to the public road, Colony Drive, which had sidewalks. He said that this would allow pedestrians to safely access the restaurants and other attractions in the area.

Mr. Shimp said that one aspect of the interconnectivity that they did not address was the grading required for Colony Drive, which would be significant. He said that there was a wedge of land where they did not have enough property to dedicate a right-of-way, and they did not own the land in that area. He said that these complexities made it impossible to proceed without the adjoining property owners' approval.

Mr. Shimp said that he believed a mulch path connecting the two sides was a suitable solution for this type of development. He said that the staff report also raised concerns about schools and affordable housing, which they would not address further. He said that he would like to highlight the potential benefits of a path like the one at Nelson, which was part of the Rockfish Trail system.

Mr. Shimp said that the 10-minute walking shed map clearly illustrated that everything within this area was within walking distance. He said that there were also existing grass trails in Crozet maintained by HOAs.

Mr. Moore said that he had a question regarding the private road A that would serve the townhouses. He was curious as to why that road was being approached as a private road rather than being turned over to a VDOT road.

Mr. Shimp said that for townhomes, it was challenging to meet VDOT standards. He said that as a result, the County allowed private roads for townhomes by-right, due to the difficulties in meeting these standards. He said that this made it highly prohibitive for dense development or townhome-type developments to meet the public road criteria.

Mr. Moore said that one of the reasons he brought this up was the recent news about the HOA where the bridge collapsed, and now the residents were being held responsible for the bridge. He said that he did not see a bridge in this development.

Mr. Shimp said it was basically a parking lot. He said that it was a common scenario.

Mr. Murray said that one of the concerns that had been heard was regarding the part of the property behind the townhomes, specifically the northeast area. He said that there was a steep ravine in that area. He said that currently, there were significant issues with stormwater management. He said that the adjoining neighborhood had also experienced problems with stormwater, including costly issues. He said that he was wondering how they planned to address this particular issue. He said that he was curious about any discussions with the adjoining neighborhood about potentially working together to find a solution to mitigate the stormwater problems.

Mr. Shimp said that from a stormwater management perspective, they would need to significantly reduce any runoff that flowed in that direction. He said that as their site's runoff must be directed away to the pond, they would need to engineer the drainage system to achieve this during the construction phase or establish a stormwater facility in that direction. He said that they had always intended to direct the water in the opposite direction.

Mr. Shimp said that this was not a previously discussed issue, but it would likely be addressed during the submission of a stormwater management plan. He said that if there was a known issue downstream, such as an outfall, the County would typically notify them and inform them that they could not proceed with this plan due to the condition.

Mr. Murray said that he was only asking because he wanted to know if they had heard any concerns from the adjoining neighbors. He asked if they had considered a crushed gravel path instead of mulch.

Mr. Shimp said that crushed gravel would be fine. He said that he would prefer anything over asphalt.

Mr. Murray said that regarding the wildflower meadow, he would like to mention that they did have local standards for wildflower meadows. He said that many of these meadows had been installed through the Soil and Water Conservation District, and there were contractors who specialized in those projects. He said that he would hope that they would prioritize using mostly native plants in these installations.

Mr. Murray asked how they would characterize the units behind the townhomes.

Mr. Shoaf said that they were single-family detached units.

Mr. Murray asked if they had considered a building type closer to that form that served the same purpose.

Mr. Shimp said that they had always envisioned this development as a mix of townhomes and single-family homes. He said that due to certain constraints, particularly with access in this area, it made sense to include these types of homes. He said that in this neighborhood, there were already townhomes located across the street and behind another residence. He said that they did not consider an alternative structure.

Ms. Firehock said that the natural land cover in the Piedmont was trees, so meadows required artificial maintenance and tree removal. She said that meadows also required periodic burnings to regenerate. She asked if the HOA would be required to maintain the meadow.

Mr. Shimp said that he believed so. He said that there should be some specifications or details regarding what the meadow would look like in the final plan. He said that typically, the meadow needed to be cut generally once or twice a year, depending on the season. He said that maintaining the grass was also a consideration.

Ms. Firehock said that she wanted to ensure they had considered the maintenance costs. She asked if they intended to include select tree plantings along the meadow.

Mr. Shimp said that was correct. He said that there were existing trees along the property line that they did not need to disturb, but they could plant additional trees to create a separation. He said that this area would then become a distinct, open space that was separate from the yard. He said that the trees would provide shade and help define the boundary of the open space path as one approached the single-family houses.

Ms. Firehock said that she would like to ask one final question regarding the top section of the property, where the townhomes were located and the parking lot was situated. She said that the buffer between the property and unit 330 was narrow. She asked if they had considered plantings within the buffer.

Mr. Shimp said that they were not opposed to any kind of added landscaping that could fit within the existing space. He said that it was indeed a tight fit, particularly on the residential side, which had a side lot setback consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. He said that what was unusual was the juxtaposition of this development next to an existing single-family house.

Mr. Shimp said that there was already a significant setback on this side. He said that the question was whether to separate a townhome from a single-family house with more buffer, a decision that

could be argued both ways. He said that personally, he believed it was a matter of residential use versus residential use. He said that the use of a townhome did not necessarily detract from the use of a single-family house next door. He said that from a zoning standpoint, they would not require a separation. He said that if that was a concern for the community, it could be addressed through additional screening or other measures.

Ms. Firehock said that she had one final question for him, which he had briefly mentioned in his comments. She said that he had mentioned that they had not given as much thought to the recreational aspect, but now that there was a trail, it was possible that kids could play there and enjoy the trail. She said that she was wondering if there were designated spaces for children to play or gather.

Mr. Shimp said that this fell under the County's requirement for amenity space, specifically for 30 units. He said that the units in this area already had their own yard space, and while they may be able to access this space, they may not necessarily need it. He said that this space could be repurposed as a gathering area. He said that they did not formally plan any structures in the space. He said that the HOA may want to consider picnic tables or benches. He said he believed it was a good idea; they just had not gone into that level of detail.

Ms. King said that she had a couple of questions regarding the path. She said that she would like to start with the material choice, as she believed it would make some people happier to have a way to walk or bike from the townhome community to the commercial space. She said that a green and sustainable path material would be a welcome improvement. She said that she was not aware of the cost, but she thought a permeable paver might be too expensive for that length. She said that she thought that a permeable paver could be a visually appealing option that also allowed for biking or strolling. She said that she thought this was an area that could be improved.

Ms. King said that she thought it would be beneficial to have a more direct route between Colony Drive and the private road. She said that the Cory Farm residents likely did not walk to the commercial space because of a lack of access. She said that the shared use path could also be used by Cory Farm residents, providing access to the commercial space.

Mr. Clayborne asked if they had an understanding of the appetite for a wildflower meadow.

Mr. Shimp said that he personally did it as often as he could, but he understood that some people may be averse to the potential exposure to wildlife. He said that what he personally thought was that many people would find a meadow more attractive to walk through.

Mr. Clayborne said that he believed there may be another way to re-imagine that space, making it more functional and usable.

Ms. King said that she was thinking of something similar to the parkway path. She said that this would add to the whole community, and they should consider making a public dedication.

Mr. Shimp said that this was a discussion that they would need to have at some point. He said that there were issues with liability, among other things, but they could work through the details at another point.

Mr. Carrazana said that he had a question regarding the density on the northern leg of the property, as he was having difficulty understanding it. He said that he was wondering what limitations had been in place for putting that density on the southern section of the property.

Mr. Shimp said that there were two main considerations. He said that there was an existing private road with an easement that had historically served three homes. He said that maintaining this road was a straightforward process. He said that because this was an existing public road stub,

they could connect the driveway to it. He said that however, they would need to install some form of extension or public turnaround to accommodate townhomes in this area.

Mr. Shimp said that extending a public road to accommodate four townhomes was a more complex issue from a zoning perspective than simply connecting a shared driveway, which was already present. He said that the service capacity of the roads led them to the four units.

Mr. Carrazana asked what the limiting factors were by creating a private road for the townhomes.

Mr. Shimp said that it was easier to develop the north side compared to the south side because they were placing a standard VDOT commercial entrance onto an existing road on the north side. He said that in contrast, on the south side, they were having discussions about extending a public road all the way through or to a point with a cul-de-sac, which required a significant amount of land and was a much more complicated process than a private road. He said that the way this road terminated was a cleaner process for accessing a townhome section compared to extending it with a cul-de-sac and then a private road.

Mr. Shimp said that they could not extend the right-of-way for a public road without acquiring a corner from the neighbor at 330. He said that when the road was built, there was a 10- to 12-foot gap, which was insufficient to achieve a full right-of-way. He said that the Colony Drive right-of-way could not continue straight through without encroaching on the neighbor's property.

Ms. Firehock asked for clarification whether Colony Drive could become a private road.

Mr. Shimp said that it could, but normally speaking, VDOT did not allow them to essentially stop a public road and make it a private one. He said that, typically, if they were to stop a public road, they would need to continue it for a certain distance and then terminate it with a VDOT-approved endpoint and then bring in a private street. He said that this added complexity. He said that the nature of this land allowed for a more subtle approach, where houses could be built with minimal grading and disturbance, preserving the existing mature trees and lawn.

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

Leonard Ozar said that he lived at 5302 Little Fox Lane. He said that as a developer himself, he had had the opportunity to work on both sides of these discussions. He said that he had developed over 100 million square feet of space across the country. He said that he had made several comments to Mr. Shoaf, and he was surprised staff recommended approval.

Mr. Ozar said that this was not a suitable location for a development like this, especially next to single-family homes. He said that there were significant issues with storm drainage and infrastructure. He said that he was not aware if anyone had driven around the area between three and five; it was difficult to navigate. He said that the City and County had yet to address these issues, making it an unsuitable location.

Mr. Ozar said that he had spoken to three neighbors on his block who had already moved out, citing concerns about the project. He said that if this decision went forward, he would consider relocating to Miller School Road. He said that the developer had promised a resident that they would only do single-family homes, and now, here they were. He said that he was deeply concerned about the potential loss of value. He said that it was not just about the financial impact; it was about the community and the homes that people had built their lives around.

Julianne Price said that she lived with her family at 330 Windy Knoll Lane. She said that she would like to acknowledge the time and effort the County staff had put into reviewing this proposal. She said that they had submitted lengthy comments, which she said she would like to bring to their attention. She said that she understood that the Commission had multiple interests to consider,

but she would like to highlight a frequently cited justification for this application that she believed was not accurate.

Ms. Price said that the proposal claimed to be consistent with the master plan, but she disagreed. She said that when viewed on a two-dimensional map, it may seem compatible, but when standing on the property itself, it was clear that the design and scale were not in line with the surrounding neighborhood. She said that the 2021 Crozet master plan land use guiding principles emphasized the importance of ensuring new and infill development was compatible in design and scale with existing neighborhood fabric. She said that in her opinion, 12 to 14 townhomes on less than an acre of buildable land could not be considered consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Price said that Liberty Hall homes, which abutted the property, were single-family homes, and the proposed units would be accessed through the surrounding Cory Farm neighborhood, which was actually built to a density of R1. She said that in her view, R6 was not compatible in design or scale with the existing neighborhood fabric, and the actual density of the northern section was significantly higher. She said that this was a unique parcel, and her lot was situated in the midst of it, with many constraints related to topography, including steep slopes that made it difficult to build a sidewalk from one side to the other.

Ms. Price said that the proposal's justification relied on mathematical gymnastics, and she did not believe that you could in good faith claim that the 14 townhomes on this parcel constituted a density of six units per acre and created a cohesive neighborhood that would benefit the surrounding community. She said that the County needed more housing, but she did not think this was an appropriate location for it.

Ms. Price said that in a previous conversation with Mr. Carrington in June, and they had asked him not to develop townhouses in front of her house. She said that he had suggested that they discuss options to preserve what was important to them without compromising his profits. She said that she did not think this required creative thinking. She said that it was straightforward: they should build fewer units. She said that R3 was consistent with the Crozet Master Plan and consistent with the surrounding neighborhood.

Michael Crenshaw said that he lived near Claudius Crozet Park. He said that the County did need more housing, and they needed more affordable housing options. He said that this project would bring a type of housing that was inherently more affordable. He said that he and his wife could not have moved into Crozet if there were not new townhomes available to them. He said that this was a style of housing that they needed if they were not going to expand the development area. He said that if they were working within the existing development area, there was limited land available, so projects would be imperfect. He said that they needed to make the most of the proposals.

Mr. Crenshaw said that he had spoken to numerous workers in Crozet who commuted from Waynesboro and Staunton. He said that one person had said how lucky they were to live in Staunton, where it was walkable, because she was now able to afford gas to commute to Crozet. He said he would love for people to be able to live and work within Crozet. He said that one person who worked at a coffee shop in Crozet moved to Waynesboro and now spent about $17,000 more on commuting, not to mention the hours and hours of their life. He said that the units would make Crozet a better place.

Mr. Crenshaw said that the proposal was consistent with the area. He said that this was one of the few places where they could build density close to commercial. He said there were other townhomes within 300 feet of the parcel, and it fit into the general area. He said that as for the path, he would love to see a public connection from Colony Drive to Cory Drive. He said that this would benefit residents connected by Eastern Avenue.

Nadia Anderson said that she was the board president of the Liberty Hall HOA. She said that from the perspective of Liberty Hall, the proposed plan introduced significant stormwater risks, incompatible massing near existing homes, and a lack of connectivity, issues that were also identified in the staff report. She said that these concerns were fundamental rather than minor technicalities. She said that the biggest concern she had was with the proximity of a block of townhomes to existing homes.

Ms. Anderson said that the concept plan placed the northern townhouse block extremely close to the rear property lines of Liberty Hall, which was incompatible with the Crozet master plan's call for infill that was compatible in scale and design with the existing neighborhood fabric. She said that the layout compressed 14 attached units into a narrow band directly behind existing single-family homes with minimal buffering or transition, resulting in an abrupt density shift rather than a gradual one. She said that the C-shaped configuration around 330 Windy Knoll Lane suggested that the design was being forced onto a site that could not comfortably accommodate it.

Ms. Anderson said that the proposal also failed to provide necessary connectivity, including a lack of interconnected streets and pedestrian bike connections. She said that for Liberty Hall, this resulted in more vehicle trips funneled onto Colony Drive without offsetting improvements. She said that new developments should not be designed to discourage walking.

Ms. Anderson said that although the proposal did not explicitly state that Windy Knoll would utilize Liberty Hall infrastructure, the current design grading and layout made it the practical outcome. She said that because the property sloped downhill towards Liberty Hill, the development effectively used their neighborhood as its stormwater outlet without providing a downstream analysis or demonstrating that peak flows would not increase.

Ms. Anderson said that by placing dense units behind their homes without meaningful buffering, their backyards became the de facto buffer zone for this project. She said that without clear plans for how runoff would be tamed or slowed, the project relied on their yards and existing drainage infrastructure. She asked the Commission to deny the rezoning as proposed and asked the applicant to return with a plan that truly served their community.

Amanda Young said that she had been a resident of Crozet for about seven years and lived in Cory Farm. She said that before she proceeded, she would like to note and ask that the Commission acknowledge that the signs advertising this meeting were specifically placed at the top of the Windy Knoll Lane driveway.

Ms. Young said that unfortunately, many residents of Cory Farm, including herself, were not aware that this meeting was taking place, as she only found out from neighbors who texted her personally. She said that one of the signs was not even located near the relevant property. She said that none of the signs were visible from the public roads in Liberty Hall or Cory Farm, which she believed was a requirement by County regulation.

Ms. Young said that she was worried that many neighbors may have missed this meeting altogether. She said that setting aside that issue, they had already discussed the concerns about inadequate infrastructure, particularly in relation to accommodating significant growth. She said that she was aware that this was a topic of discussion, and she believed that most people who moved to Crozet were aware of the area's growth potential, with the exception of those who had been there for many decades. She said that the master plan's goal for infill developments, as stated in section B, required that they be walkable to schools and appropriately scaled to the surrounding neighborhood. She said that this proposal did not meet those criteria.

Ms. Young said that she understood that the addition of three students to Western Albemarle may not seem like a significant concern, but it was about more than just that. She said that it was about the lack of infrastructure in place to support the level of development they were considering. She

said that they did not have the necessary sidewalks, traffic lights, or roads to accommodate the additional families and individuals who wanted to walk.

Ms. Young said that finally, she would like to address the mowed path. She said that while the map may not show the grade of the slope, she could attest that it was quite steep. She said that she had spoken to her neighbors, and they had all agreed that it was not feasible to create a mowed path of that grade without it becoming a significant issue, particularly with stormwater drainage.

Steve Walsworth said that he was a resident of Crozet and Cory Farm for over 23 years. He said that he had witnessed many changes in the Crozet area. He said that as a native of Southern California, where he was born and raised, he had seen similar transformations in his hometown. He said that there had been a significant housing boom, and many orange groves had been converted into housing areas, complete with shopping centers and streets. He said that a notable example was the town of Irvine, which had once been Irvine Cattle Ranch with 100,000 acres of cattle and grasslands.

Mr. Walsworth said that within two decades, it had been transformed into an award-winning town, renowned for its excellent transportation systems, emergency response systems, and harmonious balance between residents and natural settings. He said that the key to their success had been a well-planned approach, with standards and a clear vision. He said that unfortunately, many other towns that had failed to follow a similar plan had struggled with the consequences.

Mr. Walsworth said that as someone with a background in real estate and land development, he had a deep understanding of how these types of projects worked. He said that he had seen firsthand how a lack of planning and adherence to standards could lead to problems. He said that the proposal did not match the surrounding development. He said that the 12 units at the northern portion had inadequate access and parking, and it lacked open space for children to play.

Bill O'Malley said that he was the board president for the West Lake Hills HOA. He said that he would like to highlight several planning concerns identified in the County staff report that raised questions about whether this proposal worked as responsible infill development. He said that to him, it appeared that the developer had done the bare minimum to assemble this development.

Mr. O'Malley said that he would like to focus on connectivity. He said that one of the County's core planning goals was to have interconnected streets and safe pedestrian and bike access. He said that staff had made it clear that the proposal did not provide these connections. He said that it relied on separate private access points that did not integrate well with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. O'Malley said that true infill development should be held to a higher standard. He said that even if street connections were not possible, the opportunity for better walkability existed on the site, particularly to nearby centers, but it was not being realized in this plan. He said that the developer had added a minimal mowed path at the last minute, which was not a solution.

Mr. O'Malley said that another concern was school capacity. He said that the Crozet school buses had three kids to a seat. He said that Henley Middle School was nearing capacity, while Western Albemarle High School was over capacity. He said that the proposal contributed to an already strained system. He said that this should be considered when evaluating growth decisions. He said that the proffer for future road improvements expired in 10 years, which created uncertainty as to whether meaningful connectivity would ever happen. He said there was currently no construction timeline for the connector.

Michael Monaco said that he resided in the White Hall District in a neighborhood that was built within the last seven years. He said that this neighborhood currently featured four single-family detached homes and 16 attached townhomes. He said that it spanned approximately three acres

of land. He said that he lived alongside his neighbors, a diverse group of working families, retired locals, and active community members.

Mr. Monaco said that his neighborhood was home to about a half dozen elementary school-age children, half a dozen middle school-age children, and one high school student. He said that they were connected to downtown Crozet by a patchwork of intermittent sidewalks, shared use paths, and a rough, muddy meadow trail through a neighboring property. He said that this allowed them to walk or bike to the grocery store, approximately half a mile away.

Mr. Monaco said that their infrastructure was not perfect, but he believed they were fortunate to live in Crozet. He said that Goal 3B of the Crozet Master Plan discussed infill development within downtown neighborhoods and other areas that were walkable to centers or schools. He said that the applicant should continue to improve the site plan to create more defined non-car infrastructure, enabling people to move around without relying on cars.

Mr. Monaco said that he acknowledged the challenges posed by slopes and other natural features. He said that he believed that formally and intentionally tying a bike and pedestrian network, at least to Colony Drive, from the northern townhomes, would greatly enhance connectivity to the village center. He said that he would like to conclude by stating that they were currently experiencing a crisis of housing affordability in Albemarle County. He said that more than half of households who rented in the County were currently cost burdened. He said that while various factors drove housing prices, he urged them to consider the impact of their decisions on the supply of housing.

Paul Sheeran said that he was a resident of Liberty Hall. He said that when he purchased his house, he did not anticipate that the wooded lot behind his property would remain a wooded lot forever. He said that it was generally understood that there would be development. He said that he must be candid and say that he did not expect to have the opportunity to explore four sets of bedrooms and living rooms in the future.

Mr. Sheeran said that he would like to echo what some of his neighbors had said. He said that as an engineer, he spent a lot of time thinking about requirements and how they could meet them and still fail. He said that he saw in this plan what he had seen in other projects - a lack of functional connectivity. He said that the townhomes were not connected to where people would travel. He said that high density development should be located with the other high density developed and connected to make it more functional.

Feng Kuo said that many people had already presented her questions, so she did not have any more comments to make.

Janie Holbrook said that she had one question: Where would people park when they were invited to social gatherings like the Super Bowl, Fourth of July, Mother's Day, or Thanksgiving? She said that the current density of those 12 units, with few buffers, no public streets, no on-street parking, and no spillover if Eastern Avenue was built. She said that otherwise, this would burden the neighbors until a solution was found.

Ms. Holbrook said that she believed it was essential to consider how people lived and wanted to live when building and infilling with townhomes, taking into account their desire for social connections and hosting guests. She said that, as someone who had lived in a similar townhome, she could attest to the limitations of not being able to host important events. She said that she would like to know if a lottery system had been implemented for the folks who would be buying the townhomes.

Mark Esplin, Little Fox Lane, said that given the area's topography, he was concerned about the potential impact on residents, especially children or elderly individuals who may be more vulnerable. He said that his in-laws lived with him, and they had a relatively flat topography. He

said that the recent ice storm had highlighted the challenges of navigating these types of areas. He said that in the event of an ice storm, residents in this area may be stuck for weeks or longer, and the inability to remove the ice could be a significant issue. He said that as a private road, it was not connected to VDOT, which raised concerns about who would provide services in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Esplin said that it was a relief to have VDOT to respond quickly to Cory Farm after the ice storm, allowing residents to access their homes and continue with their lives. He said that however, for private roads like this proposed one, it was unclear who would provide those services. He said that in terms of children, the steep grading required for the driveway from these homes may be a deterrent for some families.

Mr. Esplin said that concerns about runoff and infrastructure were valid, as he recalled experiencing flooding in Houston during a previous event. He said that if flooding were to occur in this area, it could have serious consequences for residents, particularly those with topography that was not conducive to drainage. He said that he would like to see safety concerns addressed in any future development plans.

Mr. Esplin said that finally, he was concerned about the connectivity between communities. He said that in Cory Farm, children were able to easily access various areas, and there were definitely more children than just three per 18 houses. He said that however, if there was inadequate space or grading to facilitate interconnectivity, it may be difficult for children to play and for the communities to interact with one another.

Kiersey Ide, Cory Farms, said that their neighborhood was truly incredible. She said that it was full of people who genuinely cared for one another and looked out for each other's well-being. She said that based on the design of this development; it was clear that the developers were waiting for the perfect moment to swoop in and buy the neighboring house so they could add more buildings. She said that this was unneighborly and they needed to respect people's property and the time and effort they had invested in their beautiful homes.

Ms. Ide said that they needed to respect that and ensure their property was not going to look trashy with inappropriate buildings surrounding it. She said that while it may be one house, it was also the home of a family that meant a lot to her. She said that they needed to care for their existing neighbors as well as provide homes for new ones. She said that this one family and their one house mattered.

Ms. Ide said that additionally, their neighborhood had a sidewalk now that allowed them to walk to Harris Teeter, and that allowed for a strong connection between Liberty Hall and Cory Farm because they all walked this sidewalk and met each other’s dogs. She said that it was a great walking community in that respect, and she did not feel this development was adding much to that with their proposal.

Ms. Ide said that furthermore, the runoff from this area was a major concern. She said that the area where it would collect was extremely close to homes and the street, and unfortunately, they must consider the potential that someone may drown. She said that in her own neighborhood, they had flooding issues around the stormwater grates. She said that she would prefer that the developer re-does this proposal, but ultimately, she thought they should only build three homes here like it should have been originally.

Lori Schweller, 5303 Little Fox Lane, said that her residence was directly south of the development. She said that she had not intended to speak, but she wanted to bring up a planning issue that she had been wanting to address for a long time, and this was the perfect opportunity to do so. She said that when they discussed the buffers or lack thereof between townhomes and single-family homes, it was not the contiguity of townhomes and single-family homes that was the issue, but rather the parking lot.

Ms. Schweller said that some of the residents had lived on this street for 22, 23 years and had seen the development of Liberty Hall, with all its phases. She said that suddenly, she found a parking lot in her backyard. She said that a parking lot had a significant impact, with noise, light, and disruption to daily life. She said that the lights from the parking lot also shone directly into homes, with no buffering to speak of. She said that she wanted to raise the issue that significant buffers were essential to install between townhome parking lots and single-family homes.

Ms. Schweller said that there had been a few bushes planted along the Liberty Hall buffer, but pickup trucks backed into them and destroyed them, leaving them with nothing. She said that now they had single-family home yards and parking lots, with little to no separation. She said it was an important planning issue for the Commission to consider. She said that the townhomes in this proposal were wedged into that 1-acre lot, with very little setback. She said that she did not even know if there was room for buffering, and understanding the Zoning Ordinance was what it was, the Planning Commission should stay aware of this issue.

Taryn Price, said that she lived at 3330 Windy Knoll, the other adult in the middle of the C-shape. She said that she wanted to reiterate a couple of key points. She said that she hoped that they would not actually need to buffer from 14 units, which kept coming up as a concern. She said that the main issue was not the four units on the southern half, but rather the northern part, which was inconsistent with the surrounding area and located next to her house. She said that it appeared that her yard was being used as a playground for the new community, which was situated in the middle of the development.

Ms. Price said that she believed that it was possible to meet the master plan's goals by reducing that, and that was the main issue. She said that she was completely sympathetic to the need for more housing and understood the need to up-zone these areas, but she thought R6 zoning with 14 units on less than an acre was excessive. She said that this made no sense to her. She said that it sounded like the response to this developer providing buffering was that the neighbors should provide their own buffers, but that seemed like an unnecessary burden on neighbors. She said that her main concern was that 14 units on less than an acre did not seem reasonable at all.

She said that as a minority, she understood the importance of affordable housing. She said that however, she felt that this project fell short in providing a safe and suitable environment for the children who would be living there. She said that by clustering so many houses on a single acre, the project did not provide enough space for kids to run around and play. She said that the project did not offer a designated playground area for the children, which was essential for their physical and emotional well-being.

She said that furthermore, the area was also home to various wildlife, including bears, foxes, and owls, and while her cat enjoyed the snakes, she personally did not and thought it would become a safety risk if things were not kept extremely clean at all times. She said that she understood this was private property, but these would become her neighbors, and she wanted her neighbors' kids to have a green area and backyard to play in.

She said that the townhouses did not provide that. She said that she was concerned about the potential dangers of the pond, especially during heavy rainfall, which could flood and create a hazardous environment for children. She said that she believed that their community deserved a safe and green space for kids to play and explore, which was not provided by this project.

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

Mr. Shimp said that he would like to reiterate a couple of points he previously mentioned. He said that when there was a comment about the density being higher than in the Comprehensive Plan, but it was not. He said that the Plan did discuss going above a six-unit density, but they did not. He said that furthermore, integrating this project into the neighborhood, with a density of 2.6 units per acre, it was not significantly changing the overall neighborhood's density.

Mr. Shimp said that instead, it provided housing opportunities for those who wanted to live in Crozet. He said that he appreciated the comments about how townhomes could serve as an entry point into these neighborhoods, allowing residents to walk their dogs, play with their kids, and enjoy the community. He said that the intent of this project was to provide opportunities for a range of incomes to become part of that. He said that this aligned with the County's goal of targeting higher densities through infill projects.

Mr. Shimp said that Albemarle County had followed its Comprehensive Plan well, and he believed it was essential to establish opportunities for a variety of housing types to ensure that the community remained inclusive. He said that a project like this allowed people to live in Crozet, working in the community they served, rather than being priced out; this was the core of this endeavor. He said that he acknowledged that infill sites would be imperfect, but he believed they could work through the challenges. He said that they could explore screening the parking lots, as the County had an Ordinance in place for that.

Mr. Shimp said that the more technical details, such as runoff and private road maintenance, were site-specific and could be addressed through existing County ordinances during the site plan process. He said that the real challenge was navigating infill development, which would inevitably lead to conflicts between neighbors who had been there for 30 years and those who were new to the area. He said that he understood the concerns of those who had lived in the area for decades, but he also believed that their planning should evolve to accommodate these changes.

Mr. Shimp said that they needed to find a balance between preserving the character of the neighborhood and allowing for growth and development. He said that they needed to ensure that their projects included provisions such as trails that were meaningful for kids to run back and forth on, and screening features that could be implemented. He said that, however, at the end of the day, these projects must have sufficient density to be successful.

Mr. Shimp said that this was because there was always a counterargument that could be made, such as the example of a single house being built, which may not significantly advance the Comprehensive Plan's goal of enhancing housing opportunities in the County. That concluded the items he wanted to add. He said that he appreciated the time that had been taken tonight and was happy to answer any further questions.

Mr. Shimp said that his hope was that what they presented was reasonable and could move forward with some guidance on how to handle the trail system and connectivity. He said that there had been some valuable comments made about public connections, and he imagined that children would run from one place to another; that was a positive aspect, and they should be able to handle that in an appropriate manner. He said that he appreciated the Commission's time and looked forward to their deliberations.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the Commissioners had any other questions for the applicant.

Mr. Murray said that one of the concerns that was raised by several people was where families would park when there were events or parties. He said that he had experienced this firsthand, as he recalled his own daughter driving to a neighborhood in Charlottesville, where they would try to drop off kids at one house. He said that he was curious to know how the applicant envisioned this situation being addressed in this development, and how they could accommodate activities like these, given the available space.

Mr. Shimp said that they provided guest parking, which was a ratio of one per four units required by the County, and every unit must have two parking spaces. He said that for the interim, he imagined people would park along the Cory Farm as a public road, which may become a common practice. He said that if Eastern Avenue was built, this could potentially compromise the existing parking arrangement.

Mr. Shimp said that a connection to the public street network at Colony Drive would alleviate this issue. He said that when choosing to live in this neighborhood, residents may have to sacrifice some parking flexibility. He said that this was what some people had expressed: that they would love to have a townhome with four parking spaces, but if they had to choose between that and nothing, some compromises may be necessary.

Mr. Shimp said that they did not want to create more impervious areas just to have excess parking. He said that the balance was important, and the County aimed to achieve this with two parking spaces per unit and one per four for guests, which had been the standard for a long time. He said that he was not sure if this was enough for every circumstance, as there would be times when it was inconvenient.

Mr. Shimp said that on the other hand, having too much parking would be environmentally detrimental. He said that the answer was that it was not perfect, but they had been working in these neighborhoods for a long time, and residents had an expectation of how to deal with parking.

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

Mr. Murray said that he did not think that more single-family homes were what he wanted here, and some amount of density was appropriate. He said that however, it did seem inconsistent with the neighboring properties. He said that it was very abrupt, so if they had a bit less density, it could provide some room for buffering and accommodations for families. He said that at the scale proposed, it was too dense, particularly all of it crammed into that northern section.

Mr. Clayborne said that he fully supported infill development. He said that however, infill should not come at the price of quality of life. He said that he believed there were aspects of the proposal that were not immediately apparent in the application that became apparent when actually visiting the site. He said that on a positive note, he appreciated the emphasis on design and the multiple solutions that could be employed to address design challenges. He said that unfortunately, the plan presented tonight was not developed to its full potential.

Mr. Clayborne said that he felt they deserved to see a plan that was fully cooked. He said that they talked a lot about poor interconnectivity, and he felt that was addressed at the last minute. He said that he had not had the opportunity to review the new plan before this meeting. He said that the location of the density on the site seemed a bit inappropriate, so they either needed to consider less density in the northern end or more in the southern end, as Mr. Carrazana had mentioned earlier. He said that the green space seemed underutilized, especially for family recreation. He said that there was a whole laundry list of things, so he felt that was indicative that the plan was not fully developed. He said that at this time he was not in a position to support this application.

Mr. Moore said that he had been jotting down some thoughts on this, and he wanted to clarify that this was not intended to be any kind of criticism. He said that as someone who also lived in the Development Area, he understood that things could change around him. He said that that was just the way it was in their growing County, where they had made a decision to concentrate growth in certain areas, and there was a strong need for more housing supply. He said that it was a complex ecosystem and when homes were built, even if they were high-priced, it meant that people moved in, and that opened up lower-priced options elsewhere.

Mr. Moore said that he appreciated that the applicant had met compliance Albemarle's affordable housing plan requirements, although the numbers were not huge since it was a 3-acre site, but it could still benefit three or four families who might not have otherwise had access to a home. He said that their Development Areas had good infrastructure, which was the point; however, this particular parcel was challenging. He said that it was C-shaped, with multiple entrances, and it was not a straightforward plat. He said that he kept asking himself why this parcel had been left in this state as a result of past development patterns and private ownership.

Mr. Moore said that he was having trouble understanding why this parcel could have been shaped in such a way. He said that while the units per acre may be acceptable, the layout and how people would live there, especially in the northern part, was difficult for him to grasp. He said that this was unusual for him, as he usually supported densely designed developments. He said that the trail interconnection was half-baked and seemed rushed, but it did not bother him greatly. He said that most people would still use their cars to go grocery shopping irregardless.

Mr. Moore said that in his mind, if they could have six or seven townhomes in the southern part and six or seven in the northern part, that would feel more balanced. He said that he was struggling to figure out how this development would thrive and feel comfortable for residents. He said that it was not all about inconsistency; there were other six, seven, eight-unit townhomes nearby, but what bothered him was the concentration of everything in this one zone, which was hard for him to support.

Ms. King said that she would like to express her appreciation for the community members who spoke tonight on behalf of affordable housing. She said that it was worth noting that one comment expressed concern about their property value. She said that as a reminder, since 2020, specifically 2023, property values in western Albemarle County had increased by 13.7%, followed by another 7.8% in 2025, and then 10% this year.

Ms. King said that this exponential value increase was a reality, and it would help address the issue of affordability for the community at large. She said that this would help with taxes if they did not move, but the value gained over the last five years due to the severe housing inventory crisis counteracted any decrease in property values. She said that the median home value in Albemarle County was currently $530,000, making it unaffordable for many. She said that one reason for this was the lack of available land for development. She said that to address this, they needed to potentially expand the Development Area, which most people did not want.

Ms. King said that the argument she heard constantly was that they must infill and do so at maximum capacity. She said that in general, she strongly supported the density of this proposal and believed it was consistent with the types of housing in the surrounding areas. She said that as pointed out by Mr. Moore, there were already four blocks of townhouses less than 500 feet away. She said that furthermore, the developer had made the four single-family units located behind larger single-family lots in Corey Farm. She said that it may have been due to the road structure, but it was not fair to 3330. She said that it would be challenging to come up with a solution that made it feel fair to that person, regardless of the approach.

Ms. King said that she was in favor of the proposal and would like to see the path connect the communities. She said that she believed the sidewalk and planting strip on one side of the street were suitable for the size of development. She said that she was not concerned about the schools, as the situation in the greater Crozet Development Area made this a very minor consideration in this regard.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to add that he did not have an issue with the waiver for the planting and sidewalk because it was relatively small, but it was secondary when so much was crammed into a small space up there. He said that he welcomed more density in this location, but this particular proposal was difficult to picture.

Ms. Firehock said that she did not want to repeat what her colleagues had already said. She said that she agreed with some of the points Ms. King had made about infill development, they needed to do infill to prevent expansion of the growth area. She said that however, she also believed it was their job as Planning Commissioners to ensure that infill was done thoughtfully. She said that they only had a lot of weirdly shaped lots left because the more accommodating parcels had already been developed, but they should still ensure the infill was done thoughtfully. She said that she was not opposed to townhomes or duplexes, but she did think the current proposal was overly dense, particularly in the back corner of the property.

Ms. Firehock said that she was concerned about the lack of community gathering spaces or playground, which would be essential for families with small children. She said that this proposal was not ripe for approval this evening, in her opinion, due to the layout of the northern lot. She said that notwithstanding that the current road easements allowed the developer to fit the three houses down on the south, she still thought they could find a way to get more houses in that area to balance the development out more. She also said that she had not heard any concerns from the neighbors about the development in general, but the layout was just not well-done in the northern part. She said that she did think they needed to prioritize community gathering spaces and make sure that development was done in a way that benefited the community as a whole. She said that she was not in favor of this development as currently laid out, but she was in favor of more density there.

Ms. King said that with respect to where the density of the neighborhood was located on the property, she believed it was important to note that townhouses were inherently dense. She said that considering the Avinity neighborhood, where she had friends and family who resided, she had observed that parking was limited but people loved living there. She said that currently, townhouses in the Avinity neighborhood were selling for $530,000, so they were not sitting vacant. She said that this suggested that removing units from this development would not only eliminate an affordable option but also diminish the overall development. She said that townhouses would be right next to each other regardless, so spreading them out would not solve any issue. She said that she was aware that the community faced stormwater management constraints, so that she thought it would be more effective to focus on stormwater management and keep the houses dense, which she believed they had the opportunity to do. She said that it appeared they might be able to address stormwater issues across the entire parcel during development.

Ms. Firehock said that they had not done any site engineering yet.

Ms. King said that they did not have to until they did the site plan.

Ms. Firehock said that the Commission had to make some judgement calls at their level.

Mr. Murray said that one of his major concerns was the connectivity. He said that if this was a dense property with lots of townhomes and a clear, walkable route to get somewhere, or easy access to mass transit or something else, he would feel differently about it. He said that the way it was contained in the block there made it different for him. He said that there was a big difference between something that was walkable and something that was somewhat isolated.

Mr. Carrazana said that he would try to summarize what he had heard so far and provide his own thoughts on this proposal. He said that the Commission had consistently advocated for increased density, and he believed they had asked for it in several previous proposals. He said that they recognized the need for affordable housing and increasing their housing stock in Albemarle. He said that they agreed with the public's comments on this matter; however, he thought it was a qualitative versus quantitative issue.

Mr. Carrazana said that quantitatively, this proposal offered six units per acre across the entire parcel, but qualitatively, it was more like 14 units in a very tight location, which had little consideration for the neighbors. He said that this was part of what they were struggling with. He said that he would encourage the applicant and staff to explore ways to free up the southern half of the parcel, as this would be more conducive to higher density. He said that it was adjacent to the townhomes along Colonial, and he thought it was a more palatable approach. He said that whether they divided the parcel or placed the density in single-family homes elsewhere, he did not think this one-acre parcel to the north was suitable for the proposed level of density.

Mr. Shimp said that he appreciated the thoughtful comments he had heard from the Commission. He said that he would like to request a deferral for this application in order to attempt to make some changes before the Commission voted on the proposal. He said that while he could not

promise he would bring back something the Commission would unanimously support, he would be happy to take another stab at addressing the concerns raised at tonight's meeting. He said that he wanted to provide an infill project that addressed those concerns, so he would like to work with staff to find some mutually beneficial tweaks to the plan.

Ms. Tevendale asked if it would be a deferral to a date specific or a non-specific date.

Mr. Shimp said that he thought it would likely be an indefinite date. He said that there were a few questions he would need to have answered, including special approval from VDOT. He said that once staff and he reached a solution, they could come back.

Mr. Barnes said that that would be staff's preference, too.

Ms. Tevendale said that one final point of clarification for the record was whether the applicant also requested a deferral of the two waivers that were part of the rezoning proposal.

Mr. Shimp said yes.

Mr. Murray motioned that the Planning Commission defer the application ZMA2025-00007 and SUB2025-239 to an indefinite date. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0).

Recess

The Commission took a five-minute recess.

Public Hearing

ZTA202300006, WPTA202300003, STA202300003, OTA202400002 Riparian Buffer Protection Standards

Scott Clark, Conservation Program Manager, said that he was joined by Frank Pohl, County Engineer, and other staff members present to answer questions as they proceeded with this public hearing. He said that this was a public hearing on an item that arose from the County's Stream Health Initiative, a Countywide project to develop strategies for improving local stream health.

Mr. Clark said that as a reminder, this initiative began with an extensive community outreach project that involved multiple stakeholder work groups, vision setting, and the development of 14 recommendations. He said that the project they were seeing tonight was recommendation number one, which focused on better protection of riparian buffers in the Zoning Ordinance. He said that riparian buffers were areas of vegetation adjacent to a stream, wetland reservoir, or pond, and the Board had adopted a Resolution of Intent to amend the Zoning Ordinance on this topic in 2022.

Mr. Clark said that the scope of this project was to move the current extent of regulations from the Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) to the Zoning Ordinance, with the aim of implementing standards that protected buffer vegetation Countywide, rather than just in certain land disturbance projects. He said that this would also require buffer retention, whether or not a site had regulated land disturbance. He said that exemptions for agriculture and forestry would remain, with best management practices required for forestry.

Mr. Clark said that the current WPO buffers and proposed Riparian Buffer Protection Standards (RBPS) locations were the same; they would move to the Zoning Ordinance without major changes made. He said that the provided table explained how the buffers applied in Development Areas, public water supply impoundments, and all other locations, which were generally in the