Albemarle County Planning Commission
Work Session and Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes June 23, 2026

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public meeting on Tuesday, June 23, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

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

Other officials present were: Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning; Bart Svoboda, Ben Loppacker; Rebecca Ragsdale; Jenny Tevendale, Deputy County Attorney; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commissions.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Carolyn Shaffer called the roll.

Luis Carrazana established a quorum.

Public Comment

There was none.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Firehock motioned that the Planning Commission adopt the Consent Agenda as presented. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

Public Hearing

SP-2025-00009 James River Runners Special Use Permit Amendment

Ben Loppacker, Planner, provided the staff presentation for SP-2025-00009. He said that the proposal for the special use permit amendment was located at the end of Hatton Ferry Road along the James River in the southern portion of the County. He said that some specifics of the proposal entailed amending the existing special use permit for the property to expand primitive camping onto a portion of TMP 13613C.

Mr. Loppacker said that the parcel was zoned rural and was designated as rural areas on the AC44 Comprehensive Plan. He said that the property was currently occupied by the boating canoe livery and recreational activities use, which had been active since the 1970s. He said that the original special use permit was approved in 1978, which allowed for up to nine primitive campsites.

Mr. Loppacker said that in 2018, an additional special use permit approved five additional campsites, bringing the total operated by James River Runners to 14 campsites. He said that with this proposal, the applicant was seeking to amend the existing special use permit to allow an additional six primitive campsites, creating a total of 20 primitive campsites on the site. He said that the applicant's conceptual plan showed the six new campsites on the eastern edge of the property.

Mr. Loppacker said that the sites shown were specifically envelopes. He said that there would not be any permanent structures proposed within these campsites. He said that it also showed three new restroom facilities, which would be portable restroom facilities that would be there on a seasonal basis when the campsites were occupied. He said that it was also located in proximity to the James River Runner staff buildings, which were located on the immediate other side of the railroad crossing from these campsites.

Mr. Loppacker said that all special use permits were evaluated with the four factors shown on screen. He said that pages three to six of the staff report contained staff's analysis on each of these individual factors. He said that staff determined, with a few recommended conditions, that a positive finding could be made for each of the factors listed.

Mr. Loppacker said that the aforementioned conditions included several elements discussed that night. He said that development must be in accord with the concept plan, which was attachment three. He said that this plan regulated the location of the proposed campsites, the number of campsites, and prohibited the disturbance of wooded and vegetated areas. He said that other factors included that accessory structures must be constructed in accordance with County code, fireworks were prohibited, and quiet hours were established and maintained.

Mr. Loppacker said that a staff member must be present on the premises at all times while individuals were using the campsites. He said that staff found three positive aspects to the proposal. He said that the proposal was consistent with the review criteria for special use permits. He said that the proposal provided expanded recreation and camping options for community members who lived in the area as well as potential tourists. He said that no detrimental impacts to adjoining properties were anticipated. He said that no staff concerns had been identified at that time.

Mr. Loppacker said that staff recommended approval of the request after finding three positive aspects and identifying no concerns. He said that staff had provided recommended motions.

Mr. Murray asked for more information about the requirements for securing structures in the floodplain.

Mr. Loppacker said that no permanent structures were proposed under the special use permit. He said that the temporary restroom facilities would have to meet all applicable building codes prior to operation and installation. He said that this included meeting the regulations listed in the building code for how those must be secured, especially within the floodplain. He said that once those were installed, the building officials would be regulating that.

Mr. Murray asked what securing the structures looked like.

Mr. Loppacker said that the applicant was present, so they might be able to provide some information on how those would be installed. He said that the applicant had mentioned that they would potentially be able to answer any questions. He said that the structures would have to be secured according to County code. He said staff had not received any plans for how the structures would be secured.

Ms. Brown said that she was wondering what the surface of the access path was. She said that she also wanted to know if they foresaw any impacts to the riparian zone around the vehicular access. She asked whether staff members were required to be onsite and suggested adding the requirement if it did not exist.

Mr. Loppacker said the concept plan showed primary access that would run directly through the campsites. He said that this would not be a permanent improvement. He said that the access way

had been reviewed by the fire department, and they had no objection to the proposal. He said that there would not be any gravel or anything laid down. He said that the ground there was largely semi-solid.

Mr. Loppacker said that the 2017 special use permit, which was approved in early 2018, already had the condition that a staff member be present from James River Runners while the campsites were occupied. He said the present application carried over that condition.

Mr. Loppacker said that he could speak to the outdoor music condition. He said that that was one that had typically been added for campsites. He said that he knew that for other campgrounds in the County, that had been a condition that had been used.

Mr. Clayborne asked if they could define outdoor music in this context. He wanted to know if it prohibited someone using a Bluetooth speaker outside.

Mr. Loppacker said it would apply to larger speakers, such as small concerts or events.

Mr. Clayborne suggested clarifying the definition.

Ms. Firehock asked how there would be no disturbance of existing vegetation, since the entire site was within the riparian buffer protection ordinance area. She said that consistent mowing and parking in the nearby field would cause disturbances to tree growth and the riparian area. She asked for clarification about staff's determination.

Mr. Loppacker said that there would be no permanent structures constructed as part of this proposal. He said that that tended to be how disturbance was defined. He said that mowing was not necessarily something that staff regulated from the planning department. He said that they did not typically regulate whether applicants were allowed to mow the site.

Ms. Firehock asked whether they would have to install pad sites.

Mr. Loppacker said that they would not install pad sites, and no trees would be removed.

Mr. Moore said he agreed with the recommendations regarding outdoor music. He said he was not sure if the condition was necessary since the County already had a comprehensive noise ordinance.

Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager, said that she thought that was something they could consider, but they were trying to be consistent in how they regulated outdoor amplified music as was defined in the ordinance for other rural area activities. She said that she thought that was a good point to see if it needed to be clarified or to make sure it was consistent.

Ms. King asked why they had to prohibit all outdoor music if the ordinance only limited it at certain hours.

Ms. Ragsdale said that when they reviewed this and saw the condition language that said quiet hours, the concern was how to standardize that and make it an enforceable condition. She said that the outdoor amplified music condition was suggested as a draft for discussion as this moved forward. She said that they could look back and see if it was being more restrictive than another use and if it was necessary to be more restrictive. She said that some homes were close by.

Mr. Moore said that he was wondering whether it was necessary to specify outdoor music when the noise ordinance applied to any noise over a certain decibel level.

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

Mr. Murray asked for clarification about the tent setups and impacts on the vegetative buffer.

Tom Paquette, James River Runner, said that the site was basically just grass fields where people came and parked their cars and set up their tents. He said that there was grass throughout the site.

Mr. Murray asked if firewood would be provided, and whether they would forage firewood from the area.

Mr. Paquette said that firewood would be provided, and they would not be foraging firewood.

Mr. Murray noted issues in the past related to Misty Mountain camp site approvals. He asked what the rescue plan was for floods, and what the plan was related to inclement weather warnings.

Mr. Paquette said that in order to camp at the site, one had to book a water activity because they were a livery and not a campground. He said that the average elevation of the James River in Scottsville was about four feet, and they deemed the river too dangerous above five feet for tubing, and six feet for boats. He said that the proposed site flooded at 17.5 feet.

Mr. Paquette said he was not sure of a weather event that could happen that would catch them off guard, given the elevation of the site. He said that in a massive rain event, he did not imagine people would be camping. He said they would monitor the weather and river level on an hourly basis, and they would notify campers if they had to evacuate.

Mr. Murray clarified whether they would notify campers before rain started. He asked if the only access point was the one across the train tracks.

Mr. Paquette said that was the only access to the field.

Mr. Murray asked what they would do if there was a train and they had to evacuate.

Mr. Paquette said they would be beholden to the train. He said that the trains typically passed in under five minutes, unless it was a double-barrel train.

Mr. Murray said he was concerned about the wear on the grass from driving on it.

Mr. Paquette said he was not expecting significant traffic. He noted that even if the campsite sold out, there would only be about 12 vehicles on the field.

Mr. Murray said that they preferred to have native vegetation in the riparian buffers, not grass, but he noted a lot of grass. He said that walking on and driving on grass compacted the soil into something that was similar to an impervious surface. He asked if the applicant had considered ways to increase best practices for management of the field, such as converting the grass to native plantings.

Mr. Paquette said he did not believe that people walking across the grass would prevent water infiltration. He said that new soil was distributed through the floodplain every season when it flooded. He said that anything planted there typically washed away.

Mr. Clayborne noted that the applicant complied with burn bans. He asked whether RVs were allowed on the site.

Mr. Paquette said that only cars and tents were allowed on the site. He said they did not want generators to cause noise disturbances.

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

Shawn Cossette, Scottsville, said that she lived on a small historic farm in Scottsville on the route to the campsite. She said that the beauty of Scottsville is what attracted her to the area, along with that fact that it felt like it had not changed. She said she supported to increasing river tourism. She said that large farms in the area had been sold recently, and they caused odor nuisances.

Ms. Cossette said that over the last three days, they had been inundated with chicken litter odors. She said she believed they should improve the regulations of these farms. She said she owned two businesses dependent on tourism, and the farms were impacting it. She said she was concerned about large vehicles coming down Langhorne Road because of traffic safety and noise. She said she was also concerned about the impacts on the water system.

Sean Rubin, 9969 Hatton Ferry Road, said he was impressed with James River Runners as a neighbor. He said that they had engaged the community and maintained contact. He said that the County needed to resume trash pickup in the area, as more people were using the area for recreation. He said that trash was accumulating on his property, and it was causing a safety hazard. He said that the project would increase traffic to the area, which would attract more waste, and the County needed to address this problem.

Mr. Carrazana closed the public hearing for public comment.

Mr. Clayborne asked for clarification about trash collection.

Mr. Paquette said that the County no longer did trash collection at Hatton Ferry, so he had become responsible for cleaning up trash on his property that washed in.

Ms. King noted that Hatton Ferry was essentially public property, and the County was no longer doing trash collection there. She said that as a result, trash from the Hatton Ferry property, and from the public, was ending up on neighboring properties.

Mr. Paquette said that the County used to weed eat and pick up trash.

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

Mr. Carrazana asked why the County stopped trash collection at Hatton Ferry.

Mr. McDermott said he was not aware as to whether the County ever performed trash collection at Hatton Ferry.

Bart Svoboda, Director of Community Development, said that he used to personally perform the trash collection when he worked in Parks and Recreation. He said that the program existed when the County managed fewer parks. He said it was not customary for the County to do trash collection on private property without some formal agreement. He said that collection was likely stopped due to resource prioritization.

Ms. King said that she was born in Nelson County, but she had spent the majority of her life in Albemarle County. She said that she had traveled the portion of the river from the Warren Ferry to the Hatton Ferry on an inner tube dozens of times, more times than she would ever be able to count. She said that she was a strong believer that the two services that ran those recreations in that part of the County were instrumental to the culture and history of the area. She said that the

recreation those services provided brought a lot of tourism. She said the application should be approved without additional restrictions on outdoor music.

Ms. King said she would suggest that the applicant consider better signage related to trash, including larger collection bins with visible signage at entrances and exits. She said that this would allow clientele to be better stewards of the environment. She said that primitive camping was a perfect use for the site.

Ms. Firehock said that James River Runners was a great company, and they did a great service and took good care of the area. She said that she voted for this the first time they wanted to have camping on the river. She said she was now concerned about the location in the floodplain and buffer protection zone, which should be reforested instead of regularly mowed. She said the buffer protection ordinance had just been adopted, so she did not see why the County should facilitate keeping the stream bank cleared in an area of high impact.

Ms. King said that the conditions were not changing.

Ms. Firehock said that it was not a change, but it was a continuation of an unhealthy state.

Ms. King said that existing uses on private property were allowed.

Ms. Firehock said she did not think they should facilitate campsites in the buffer zone. She said she initially supported the original request because she believed it would be contained, but she could not support expanding the use.

Mr. Clayborne said he supported the application. He said that he did not want to cap the business's growth. He said that he wanted clarification on the noise restrictions on outdoor music, but he was sensitive to the impacts on neighboring residents.

Mr. Murray said there was data regarding pollution from turfgrass and compacted soils, including 100 to 500 pounds of sediment per acre per year from soil compaction and slope issues. He said that if they were thinking about this as a residential use and the requirements they placed upon it, they would not allow a road to go through the stream buffer. He said that they would probably impose revegetation requirements in these areas.

Mr. Murray said that the use would objectively create impervious surfaces on the site. He said he wanted to see some mitigations for the impervious surfaces that were created, either through tree plantings, native grasses, or wildflowers. He said that the property appeared to be under land-use, so it could apply for Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) funding.

Mr. Murray said that EQIP was a federal program that helped pay people to do things like establish quail habitat or pollinator habitat or take agricultural lands out of production. He said that they received annual payments for doing that. He said that there was also a cost share for implementing the practice in the first place. He said that that was all done with assistance through other agencies.

Ms. King asked what Mr. Murray's concern was regarding runoff on the subject property. She noted that the campsite was only about 20 feet from the river bank. She said that if the site remained pervious, the water would infiltrate the soil and filter to the river, and if it was impervious, then it would runoff the bank into the river.

Mr. Murray said that he did not want to turn this into a soil science lecture.

Ms. King said that the application was for camping, not to build a road or a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Murray said he could do a demo with a lemonade jar.

Ms. King said she had a civil engineering degree, so she understood soil engineering.

Mr. Murray said that as water with sediment and contaminants went through soil, it became purified, and they did not need that much soil to purify water. He said that water flowing along the surface collected contaminants. He said that mowed areas typically attracted geese, so the runoff collected bacteria and nutrients that flowed into the waterways.

Ms. King said that the applicant did not propose any changes to the conditions of the site, which had remained the same for 50 years.

Mr. Carrazana said that they were not here to debate each other.

Ms. King said she thought this was time for deliberation.

Mr. Carrazana said that it was time for deliberation, but they should all have the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Murray said he agreed with Ms. Firehock. He said that the application would add impervious surface to the riparian area, and the County had just passed a riparian buffer ordinance. He said that approving the request would be a step in the wrong direction. He said he supported rural recreation, but he believed they needed to be sensitive to the impacts on the river, and they should find ways to mitigate the impacts.

Mr. Murray said he was remained of the Misty Mountain request, where the applicant assured them there would not be problems, but then they had problems with people washing down the river. He said that special use permits carried with the property, so they could not rely on the goodwill of the applicant. He said he would prefer that some of the tent sites be pulled away from the river, and he wanted to see the portable restrooms pulled away from the river. He said that it only took three inches of water to move a one ton vehicle.

Mr. Moore said he thought the application would have been handled by staff, and he was confused why it was presented to them. He said he did not care about the number of tents, and he was supportive of the application. He said he was concerned about a similar situation as Misty Mountain, however, since the site was a livery, campers would not be onsite when the river was above five feet. He said he had no concerns about the application.

Ms. Brown said that she was initially hesitant about supporting disturbance in the riparian zone, but she thought that primitive camping had a pretty small footprint. She said that by increasing access for the small number of people during a limited amount of the year, the upside was that it helped people access one of their best natural resources.

Ms. Brown said that this helped them increase their appreciation and maybe inspired some stewardship for the river. She said that this far outweighed the detrimental effects she thought could happen just from these primitive campsites. She said she would encourage the applicant to reduce the mowed footprint, replacing it with a conservation landscape. She said she supported the proposal.

Mr. Carrazana said valid opinions were raised. He said that every application stood on its own, so they were not creating a precedent. He said that the application was unique, and there were

differences from the Misty Mountain application. He said that he was encouraged by what he heard from the applicant and how they monitored the river and the activities. He said that while he agreed about the riparian buffer, he thought this was a unique situation where there was an activity that provided for the community. He said he supported the addition of six additional campgrounds.

Ms. Firehock said she would have liked to see the applicant propose additional tree plantings to thicken the buffer with the river. She said that this would improve the site for campers by providing more shade, as well. She said she did not want to expand the use on the site beyond what had already been approved. She said they had just adopted a riparian buffer ordinance, and they should not be expanding uses into it. She said that the Chesapeake Bay preservation goals called for a 100-foot buffer because it removed most of the nitrate, phosphorus, and sediment that ran off the land. She said that the impact included the fact that it was not vegetated and would be mowed.

Ms. King motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP-2025-00009 with the conditions provided by staff, except for Condition 5, for the reasons stated in the staff report. Ms. Brown seconded the motion.

Mr. Clayborne asked why Condition 5 was being stricken.

Ms. King said she believed the County ordinance covered it.

Ms. Ragsdale said there were noise regulations in the ordinance, and they had discussed what was applicable to outdoor campground uses. She said they had discussed outdoor music amplification regulations, which did not exist for campgrounds, and they could consider adding them to the special use permit. She said that they could either not put conditions on noise, or they could place additional regulations on noise, like they did for farm wineries, breweries, distilleries, and agricultural operations events. She said they could have no additional restrictions on noise, or they could draft a condition that addressed outdoor amplified music and clarified the intent.

Mr. Clayborne said he would support a clarified condition on outdoor amplified music, rather than striking it.

Ms. Ragsdale said she would suggest amending the motion to replace Condition 5 with an amended condition, rather than striking it entirely.

Jenny Tevendale, Deputy County Attorney, said that if Ms. King wanted to make an amendment to her original motion to clarify that the Commission would like staff to review and modify its recommendations as it related to the prohibition of outdoor music, that could work.

Ms. King withdrew her original motion.

Ms. King motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP-2025-00009 with conditions provided in the staff report, with an amendment to Condition 5, to provide clarity regarding outdoor music regulations before presentation to the Board. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which carried (7-2). (Mr. Carrazana, Mr. Clayborne, Ms. King, Mr. Moore, Ms. Brown voted aye; Ms. Firehock, Mr. Murray voted nay)

Committee Reports

Ms. Firehock said that the Historic Preservation Committee met, and they were working on a draft historic sign program for people to recommend historic signage around the County. She said the

draft program would be presented to the Board with a request for funding. She said they hoped the Board would establish an ongoing program.

Mr. Murray said that the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (CAC) met, and they received a presentation from the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority. He said one point of discussion was the water supply and the regions drought status. He said there were questions about when the water supply would run out. He said that the capacity was projected to meet demand until 2045. He said they also discussed water treatment efforts to address contaminants.

Mr. Murray said that they made the decision long ago as a County to use charcoal to treat water as opposed to increasing the amount of chemicals that they were putting into their water. He said that this turned out to be a really great decision on their part because now, with a lot of these newer classes of chemicals occurring in the water, charcoal did the best job of removing those. He said that they were already ahead of the curve in many ways in providing high-quality water.

Mr. Murray said that the other thing they discussed was the water capacity that was already lost from the South Fork Reservoir. He said that one time that reservoir had over a billion gallons of water capacity. He said that that had been reduced to about 545 million gallons.

Ms. Firehock said that the Fifth and Avon CAC met, and they received a presentation about the Southwood Development. She said that the project was progressing very well. She said the developers recently attended a national affordable housing conference where they were recognized the project for having an unusually high retention of mobile home park residents in the new development.

Ms. Firehock said that they attributed that to the fact that they did as they promised, which was to make it easy to stay on site. She said that people chose not to stay with the development for a variety of reasons, including business and family reasons. She said that the Southwood development plan was modified to add a larger storage shed zone. She said she provided an update to the CAC regarding the Board's adoption of the riparian buffer ordinance.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting from June 17, 2026

Mr. McDermott announced that Mr. Svoboda was appointed to be the Director of Community Development. He said that the Board approved a raise to the Planning Commission's pay of an additional $150 per year. He said that they had the agricultural-forestal district come before the Board for a public hearing that included the one removal and the two additions, which the Board approved. He said the Board also approved riparian buffer protection standards. He said some consent items included the Smart Scale applications. He said that they approved those eight applications that the County and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) were submitting for projects within the County.

New Business

Mr. McDermott said that the next meeting, scheduled for July 14, 2026, no longer had any business scheduled as the items were pulled, so staff requested for the Commission to approve canceling the meeting.

Ms. King motioned that the Planning Commission cancel the July 14, 2026, meeting. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

Mr. McDermott said that the next meeting would be on July 28. 2026. He asked whether any commissioners would be absent from the meeting to ensure a quorum was present.

Mr. Carrazana noted that the Planning Commissioner Training in Danville was scheduled for that day.

Ms. King asked if the conference was a single day.

Ms. Firehock said that the conference was multiple days, and there was a schedule for planning commissioners that allowed only staying for one day.

Ms. King said she had not decided whether she would attend the training, but she was interested in doing so. She said she would decide after reviewing the schedule.

Mr. Murray said he would not be present at the July 28, 2026, meeting because he would be on vacation.

Ms. King asked if she would be able to participate in the meeting remotely.

Ms. Tevendale said they would have to establish a quorum in person before allowing remote participation.

Ms. King said she would not attend to ensure a quorum.

Ms. Firehock said that if four people were present, they would have a quorum.

Mr. McDermott said that he felt assured they would have a quorum for the meeting.

Ms. Tevendale said that if for some reason there was not a quorum on July 28, 2026, they would still hold a meeting to establish a quorum, and if there was not one, they would adjourn. She said any public hearings scheduled for that day would be automatically continued, and readvertisement would not be needed.

Ms. King said she had completed the certified planning commissioner program at VCU. She said she took the course at the recommendation of former Commissioner Bivins. She said she felt that it was entirely invaluable to what they did. She said that she strongly recommended that everyone consider taking it. She said that there were probably 40 commissioners from across the state, and the next course was scheduled in July.

Ms. King said that the parts that were really eye-opening were the long presentation from Housing Forward Virginia about affordable housing. She said it provided very good insight into the details of how it worked and what did not work. She said that there were discussions about things like inclusionary zoning and how it could work. She said that there were many other discussions as well.

Ms. King said that on the second closing day, they had a presentation from a company out of Lynchburg that handled energy and worked a lot with data centers. She said that a lot of the other commissioners from around the state were dealing with data center issues much more than they were. She said that they also provided an expert related to energy usage in general in Virginia, in the context of what type of water and energy these data centers would use.

Ms. King said that there was a great deal of valuable information from the state level that she thought would be very helpful to all of them going forward when they started making decisions for the County. She said that she did a poll at the end, and more than 75% of the commissioners there were required to be there by their locality. She said that they were one of the few localities in the state that did not require it.

Ms. Brown said she was registered for one of the sessions in July.

Ms. King said that she connected with commissioners from Stafford County, northern Virginia counties, and from Roanoke. She said one of the take-home assignments was to watch another commission's meetings. She said she watched a meeting for the City of Harrisonburg, and she found it really helpful.

Mr. Moore said he had discussed how housing supply had not kept up with demand. He said he had recently reviewed some Census data to back up his claim, including the U.S. Census Bureau's Longitudinal Origin Destination Employment Statistics. He said that the population numbers essentially illustrated how many people lived and worked in the same locality, how many commuted to another locality, and how many commuted into that locality.

Mr. Moore said that Weldon Cooper had published the data for Virginia in 2014 and also in 2022, along with some articles based on those two years of data. He said that for whatever reason, the census was several years behind on this. He said that the most recent one they had was 2023 at this point.

Mr. Moore said that he reviewed data for an eight-year span from 2014 to 2022. He said that if one looked at Charlottesville and Albemarle as one housing market. He said that over that eight-year span, about 9,200 working residents were added, and 14,400 jobs were added over that period. He said that in other words, 5,200 working people were added who had to commute from outlying counties. He said that there was simply not enough housing there that they could afford. He said that this equated to a housing deficit of 650 homes per year.

Mr. Murray said he had heard about baristas commuting to the area. He said he was not sure if anything the County did was enough to make a house affordable for a barista. He said that there was nothing that they could do as a County that would actually provide housing for that level of employment. He said he was curious how the data broke out into income levels.

Mr. Moore said that this highlighted how economic development was tied to housing policy.

Mr. Murray said they had to consider what other localities were doing. He said he would question why a significant amount of the workforce commuted out of Waynesboro, for example.

Mr. Moore said he would like to receive a presentation from Weldon Cooper reviewing the data.

Ms. King said that Housing Forward representatives had presented at a recent TJPDC meeting, sharing similar data to what Mr. Moore had discussed. She said she thought the presentation on missing-middle housing was very eye-opening, and she intended to share a presentation with the Commission. She said that the current plan targeting infill development or redevelopment at higher densities only provided a very specific type of housing. She said she wanted the Commission to consider ways to provide more types of housing for the people moving to the County.

Mr. Murray said he believed the barrier was the cost of land. He said he knew an example of someone who was building tiny homes in Nelson County, but he was unable to do so in the County because of the cost of land.

Ms. King said that was because they restricted how many tiny homes could be built on a single acre. She said that if they permitted 10 tiny homes on two acres in the rural area, it would reduce costs.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

There were none.

Adjournment

At 7:30 p.m., the Commission adjourned to July 28, 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: