Albemarle County Planning Commission
Work Session and Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes July 28, 2026

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

Members attending were Luis Carrazana Chair; Corey Clayborne; Nathan Moore; Mary Katherine King; Catherine Brown.

Members absent: Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Lonnie Murray.

Other officials present were Bill Fritz, Development Process Manager; Cameron Langille, Principal Planner; Lea Brumfield, Senior Planner II; Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive; Bart Svoboda, Director of Community Development; Francis MacCall, Deputy Zoning Administrator; Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Jenny Tevendale, Deputy County Attorney; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commissions.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Carrazana established a quorum.

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

There were none.

Consent Agenda (on the next sheet)

Mr. Clayborne motioned that the Planning Commission adopt the consent agenda as presented. Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (5-0). (Ms. Firehock and Mr. Murray were absent)

Public Hearing

ZMA-2026-00004 Rivanna Futures

Bill Fritz, Development Process Manager, said that this was ZMA-2026-00004 Rivanna Futures, which was an application for consideration of steep slopes. He said that for context, he provided an image taken from the rezoning application for this property. He said that the image showed in red the boundaries of the property recently purchased by the County, and the portion that was rezoned to industrial was in blue. He said that he had highlighted the approximate area of the slopes under consideration tonight. He said that they could see its relationship to the surrounding area and the zoning boundary.

Mr. Fritz said that the area highlighted was a little more extensive than the area proposed to be rezoned; this was done to make the general location easier to see. He said that the zoning boundary represented the extent of the development area in both the existing and prior ordinance.

He said that the blue area also showed where the boundary was between the Rural and Development Areas of the County. He said that this application was a proposal to change the designation of Preserved Steep Slopes to Managed Steep Slopes Overlay District.

Mr. Fritz said that the district divided slopes into two categories: preserved and managed. He said that preserved slopes were shown in green on the map and managed slopes were shown in yellow. He said that they might notice that there were some areas to the north and east of this, and east and far west, which were shown in orange. He said that those were critical slopes that were located outside of the Development Area, so there were three designations that protected slopes. He said that disturbance of preserved slopes was severely restricted.

Mr. Fritz said that to oversimplify the regulations, the permitted uses of preserved slopes were those necessary to allow some use of the property in order to prevent a taking and facilities that could not avoid the slopes, such as utilities and roads and uses identified in the Comprehensive Plan; managed slopes may be disturbed. He said that any permitted disturbance of either type of slope was subject to review to ensure that the activity met all the requirements of the zoning and water protection ordinances. He said that the area being proposed for rezoning that night was approximately a half-acre.

Mr. Fritz said that they could see the area they were talking about highlighted on the provided map, which was the northern area. He said that their geographic information system (GIS) did not allow the aerial photo to be shown with the zoning information, but he wanted to show an image that showed the extent of the industrial zoning of the area in blue. He said that designated stream buffers were shown in purple, managed slopes were shown in yellow and preserved slopes were shown in green. He said that the white areas of the map were zoned Rural Area.

Mr. Fritz said that the areas under consideration were the circled slopes, and the areas to the north and to the east were zoned Rural and owned by the County, so there were no adjacent properties up against the area they were considering. He said that another image provided was from the applicant's narrative, and there was a much more detailed plan in their packet. He said that it was one of the applicant's appendices and it showed the slopes, topography, and water courses. He said that he just wanted to make sure they were aware of this in case they wanted to look at it in a little more detail at their desk.

Mr. Fritz said that the Zoning Ordinance included very detailed characteristics for both managed and preserved slopes. He said that the exact language of the Ordinance was included in the staff report, and there was an analysis of each characteristic. He said that staff's finding was that these slopes displayed characteristics of both managed and preserved slopes; that was not unusual or uncommon. He said that however, staff's opinion was that generally these slopes appeared to have more characteristics of preserved slopes than of managed slopes. He said that one of the mixed findings staff made that led to that conclusion was the relationship of the slopes to water features.

Mr. Fritz said that this image from the staff report showed the stream buffers in purple from their GIS system, and that the slope designations were also shown. He said that during a field visit to the site, they investigated the water courses adjacent to these slopes. He said that they were very aware that they did this in a drought, and that was taken into consideration when they were looking at those streams. He said that portions of the water courses were clearly intermittent and were

not subject to a stream buffer setback. He said that water was observed at the location shown above.

Mr. Fritz said that preliminarily, it was believed that the stream may be perennial at this point from the solid blue line. He said that additional verification would be made during the site plan review process. He said that if the stream was determined to be perennial beyond the limits shown in purple above the stream, the buffer would be applied. He said that to be clear, there was no floodplain. He said that this determination would be made during the site development review process; that was normal procedure. He said that if this rezoning was approved and a determination was made that the stream was perennial, the stream protection requirements of the ordinance would be applied.

Mr. Fritz said that this rezoning did not supersede any of those protections. He said that staff's analysis of the characteristics of these slopes, based on the language included in the steep overlay district, resulted in mixed findings. He said that what was very important to note was that the content of the Steep Slopes Overlay District was not the only factor that must be considered during the review process. He said that the State Code and the County Zoning Ordinance set out specific criteria that must be considered. He said that this analysis was included in the staff report the Commission had in their packet.

Mr. Fritz said that he would not review every detail of the staff report, but he did want to highlight just a few things. He said that the County had on multiple occasions stated that the County's investment in Rivanna Futures created a generational opportunity. He said that the importance of this property to the County and its economic development strategy was contained in the Comprehensive Plan and in the County's Economic Development strategy. He said that they were very specific about this property and the opportunities of this property. He said that these were significant factors in support of a rezoning that would facilitate development of the property.

Mr. Fritz said that industrial development, particularly large-scale industrial development of the type envisioned for Rivanna Futures, required large building footprints with a single floor elevation. He said that to serve these buildings, travelways, storage areas, and loading zones were necessary. He said that these areas required limited slope and often needed large, unbroken areas to accommodate large truck traffic, large truck turning radius, and the safe operation of the loading and storage areas. He said that the location of the preserved slopes in the center of the screen impacted the ability to develop areas to the east and the west, which were highlighted in red.

Mr. Fritz said that the red areas did not have limitations on development due to slope, stream buffers, or other requirements. He said that effectively, the specific location of the steep slopes was restricting potential development of the limited industrial land that the County had. He said that the Comprehensive Plan estimated that the theoretical capacity of the Development Area contained adequate capacity to accommodate projected growth. He said that the Comprehensive Plan also stated that this was only theoretical capacity, and the Plan acknowledged that constraining factors limited the actual capacity, and this undermined the Growth Management Policy.

Mr. Fritz said that to summarize, the staff analysis had resulted in mixed findings. He said that when considering the characteristics of steep slopes as contained in the overlay district provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, staff identified characteristics that supported maintaining the existing

preserved slope designation and characteristics that supported a managed slope designation. He said that when all of the factors in Section 33 outside of the steep slopes district were be considered when drawing zoning district boundaries were incorporated into the review, the staff's conclusion was that a rezoning was appropriate.

Mr. Fritz said that particularly compelling to staff were the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and the recommendations of the Albemarle County Economic Development Strategic Plan, particularly the identified need for industrial land. He said that for the reasons included in the staff report, staff was recommending approval of this rezoning application.

Ms. Brown said that in the application, one of the reasons suggested by the site engineer was the prior use as agriculture for part of this area designated as steep slopes. She said that that was the same area that seemed a little less steep in the southern southeastern portion of the property. She said that it was also mentioned that there was a percentage of the area that might have a 25% or greater slope. She said that she wondered why the request was for this entire area rather than carving out this more restricted area that had been altered and was less deep. She said that it also seemed to be located along the intermittent stream rather than the western portion, which was steeper and had not had prior use along the perennial stream.

Mr. Fritz said that staff looked at the information that the applicant provided about the historical use of this property for agriculture and that it may have been disturbed in the past. He said that they did not find that a compelling factor for consideration. He said that they viewed the information in the Steep Slopes Overlay District content, which discussed the area which had been previously disturbed or approved for development. He said that those images were from the 1930s, so they were not particularly compelled by that issue.

Mr. Fritz said that they were not sure why the applicant made this particular request for these slopes as opposed to others. He said that their understanding was that additional information was needed to be able to utilize those red areas that they showed. He said that he would have the applicant try to answer the other parts of the question better.

Ms. King said that in the drawing where she showed the green oval, she was trying to get a general sense of how big this area was. She said that the application was for about half an acre. She asked if the green area was roughly half an acre in this drawing.

Mr. Fritz said that the slopes identified there were 0.46 acres. He said that he was guessing that it impacted or had a significant impact on anywhere around four to six acres of land when those two other bubbles were added in. He said that it was hard to give an exact acreage, but it was in that range.

Mr. Moore said that he had seen for years the layers they had in their GIS map for preserved steep slopes versus managed steep slopes. He said that he read the definitions, and there were still a few parts of the suite of six or seven things that defined a slope as one or the other that he did not totally understand in terms of where they came from. He said that one was contiguous areas of 10,000 square feet or more. He said that he was wondering why that particular cutoff point was chosen as the definition, as he did not see it as a universal definition that other Counties used.

Mr. Fritz said that the Board of Supervisors actually spent quite a bit of time discussing that when they were doing the Steep Slopes Overlay District. He said that they spent a lot of time crafting

the language for the characteristics of preserved and the characteristics of managed. He said that that came specifically from discussions with the Board of Supervisors. He said that the number came from there; it was a very specific discussion of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Moore said that in practice, it could look somewhat odd on maps and the difference between managed and steep slopes was not very intuitive.

Mr. Fritz said that it was difficult because there would be some places where an area was less than 10,000 square feet, but it may be part of a larger hillside system.

Mr. Moore said that he understood what "hillside" meant and what "system" meant, but he was unsure of what exactly a "hillside system" was.

Mr. Fritz said that it was the best term to describe the network of hills in an area.

Mr. Moore said that with regard to the water systems, he understood the intent of preventing erosion, siltation, and excessive stormwater runoff. He asked how much of modern landscaping methods could obviate the need for slope preservation.

Mr. Fritz said that that was a topic of conversation when the Steep Slopes Overlay District was discussed; they considered how much was necessary based on modern engineering techniques. He said that when the original Steep Slopes Overlay District was established, retaining wall height within the District was limited to six feet, and outside of the District, it was ten feet. He said that had since been modified; it was ten feet uniform across the board that could be done. He said that there were separations between retaining walls, and there were performance standards associated with all grading, not just steep slopes.

Mr. Moore said that, especially in the Development Areas, he had wondered how critical some of the critical slopes really were.

Mr. Fritz said that in the staff report, it was noted that one of the things identified in the Comprehensive Plan was a reevaluation of some of the environmental standards within the Development Areas in order to facilitate the utilization of the theoretical capacity. He said that it was an opportunity for the Commission tonight with this rezoning application, also.

Mr. Carrazana thanked Mr. Fritz for mentioning that they had previously discussed at length that some of the standards needed to be revisited. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Blake Abplanalp, Rivanna Futures Program Manager, said that he was involved in the development of the site itself, the County's properties, the future Boulders Road Extension grant work they were currently doing on site, and the site preparation for County and future AstraZeneca work. He said that they had been very fortunate to have Mr. Daniel Hyer there, a principal of Line + Grade Engineering Firm, who had been working with them since early 2023. He said that he had been evaluating the Rivanna Futures property and helping them through development and design related to some of the site work and utility connections that they were making.

Mr. Abplanalp said that he had worked for ten months putting together a due diligence and engineering report, which he thought would be interesting to show the thoroughness and the care that went into evaluating this site and taking a close look at every little factor that could impact the initial decision the County was going to make on purchasing the land and moving forward. He

said that Mr. Hyer was going to talk about a brief history of what transpired at the site, his due diligence efforts, some of the development that was going on, and some of the grant work that they were doing.

Mr. Abplanalp said that they had been fortunate to receive transportation partnership opportunity funding for the Boulders Road extension, Virginia Business Ready Sites funding for some of the site work and utility work that they were doing out there, and GOVirginia grants for the design work that they completed. He said that collectively, these represented about $32 million worth of funding that they had been fortunate enough to receive from other sources. He said that they would briefly discuss the AstraZeneca development area and then talk in more detail, adding to what Mr. Fritz had already communicated as it related to the application itself.

Daniel Hyer, Principal Engineer with Line + Grade, said that they had been working on this since early 2023. He said that they had gone through a very robust due diligence about the land, and there was a 600-page document of that work. He said that that due diligence led to the Board of Supervisors purchasing these 462 acres. He said that development and programming ensued, and he thought this background would be helpful to understand the context of this application. He said that without being too verbose, anything that they would want to know about this land had likely been studied, even very minute details like plant community mapping and animal community mapping, which they were still doing to this day.

Mr. Hyer said that everything from dam inspections to National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents to the fine, gritty detail, they continued to be very careful and thorough in how they thought about this land. He said that that was important to consider when they talked about changing the classification of slopes on this property; it was rooted in a thorough understanding of the landscape in general. He said that the land they were talking about was now shown in the clearer color. He said that the white overlay was beyond their property limits and within the black boundary were the 462 acres that the Board purchased in December 2023, making a $58 million investment in this piece of land and the County more generally.

Mr. Hyer said that after the purchase, his firm was also retained to begin to understand how the land could be used. He said that after a number of iterations, they landed on a nomenclature called "land bays." He said that there were a number of land parcels present at this property in varying acreages. He said that in 2024, after the land was purchased, they also assisted the County in applying for multiple grants, including the GOVirginia grant and the Virginia Economic Development Partnership's (VEDP) Site Readiness Grant. He said that in 2024, a busy year, they rezoned 172 acres of the 462 acres into light industrial. He said that they also had a special use permit for office use within those 172 acres at the same time.

Mr. Hyer said that both of those applications were approved. He said that not long thereafter, they learned of their success with the grant applications and received a successful grant with GOVirginia, which helped to pay for a lot of the early-level design work. He said that the Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) also awarded a grant of $9.7 million, so the work in 2024 leading to the grants in 2025 was intentional and specific in how they were approaching those applications. He said that not long after they were awarded the grant money, they learned that AstraZeneca announced its intention to occupy this land. He said that at first, they thought it would be a smaller portion, and then it ended up being a larger portion.

Mr. Hyer said that their land was shown in purple, which was about 82 acres in total. He said that currently, bringing them to nearly today, there were early-level construction activities happening. He said that contractors were mobilizing to begin implementing the site readiness work. He said that there was a little shape in this application, which was the 0.46 acres of slopes that they were asking to be classified as managed instead of preserved. He said that after they looked at this in a number of different ways, these slopes contained characteristics of both preserved and managed, depending on how one looked at them.

Mr. Hyer said that he wanted to clarify one thing that Mr. Fritz had mentioned. He said that he was showing them a green shape, and they were actually only asking to reclassify about half of that shape. He said that the slopes continued along what became a defined stream further to the north and west. He said that those slopes would continue down along this corridor through there. He said that the gray hatch on the map was their actual proposed slope reclassification. He said that within that shape, they would see a myriad of slope characteristics, some less than 25%, and some more than 25%. He said that it was very fluctuating within that outline.

Mr. Hyer said that this land's use and their ability to use the land as it needs to be used were supportive of broader visions and initiatives within the County, including the Comprehensive Plan and the Economic Development Strategic Plan. He said that he just wanted to add a little bit about the historic imagery briefly. He said that they had gone to relatively great lengths to accurately represent and locate the historic imagery within their digital ecosystem. He said that he reviewed it again today before he spoke tonight, and he could say with a high degree of confidence that this historic photograph was properly located within their digital ecosystem. He said they felt relatively confident that portions of this area defined as preserved slopes had been used to support agricultural activities in the past.

Mr. Hyer said that he was not here to say how heavily that weighed in. He said that he did know that they felt confident that in the past, this landscape had been materially altered by man to support man's activities. He said that to summarize, their impacts were relatively de minimis in some ways. He said that they were not impacting any floodplains, wetlands, or existing structures. He said that there were no impacts to housing, schools, playgrounds. He said that it was relatively isolated and very specific in terms of what they had identified to be reclassified.

Ms. Brown asked if that gray area was the 0.46-acre portion, not the entire area they saw previously.

Mr. Hyer said that was correct; Mr. Fritz was showing the slope system, and they were asking to reclassify a portion of the system rather than the entire area.

Mr. Fritz said that that was shown in the packet in more detail.

Ms. King asked for clarification that the area in question was on the parcel to be potentially used by AstraZeneca.

Mr. Hyer confirmed that was correct.

Ms. King asked if there was already a concept plan for that area.

Mr. Hyer said that there had been multiple concept plans. He said that AstraZeneca was working with Jacobs Engineering to do their formal concept work. He said that previously, they conducted

what they called a front-end study, which evaluated their leading edge of exploring how to use the land, and now AstraZeneca was currently in the concept phase.

Ms. King asked if there was any confirmation that this particular request either supported or did not directly support their future concept plan that they had not yet developed.

Mr. Abplanalp said that one of the things that had to be worked out from an engineering standpoint initially was the internal road system for AstraZeneca. He said that to support the large truck deliveries, there was a real challenge from a slope standpoint. He said that from a topographical standpoint, the people who were working dialed in what would be their future road system. He said that the grades were very difficult to make that work. He said that that was probably the only thing that, unless there was some major significant change, was pretty much set in stone now.

Mr. Abplanalp said that he was coordinating with them, for example, on the Boulders Road extension. He said that initially, where the truck entrance into AstraZeneca would go was identified as a potential queuing issue. He said that some changes were made at the intersection with Route 29. He said that as the new Boulders came down, that widened the intersection and added turn lanes in each direction. He said that this approach removed the queuing problem because it would have been a complex problem if they had to move that truck entrance due to the topographical challenges present in that hilly area.

Mr. Abplanalp said that this was the one thing that was etched in. He said that AstraZeneca had changed their footprints a number of times or even their concepts of how they were doing things. He said that they previously changed the footprint of some of their outbuildings. He said that they basically had wastewater, utilities, building, and other things. He said that they moved it while they were doing the tree clearing so that they could reduce the number of trees taken down by 22 acres. He said that they decided to move their buildings around to accommodate that. He said that they had been a responsible and thoughtful partner as they went through this planning process.

Ms. King said that her biggest question was what the need was for this request. She said that half an acre out of 172 acres was insignificant, so she was wondering if they could just put things in another area, considering the available acreage. She said that however, she understood there was a concept for roadways that was the driver of this request.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the significant engineering report that he presented to them was available to the public on the County website.

Mr. Abplanalp said that it was not part of the published documentation, but yes, it could be made available to the public.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing. Seeing no speakers, he closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Commission.

Ms. King said that she thought it was important to say that if a decision was to be made by the Commission, she would first direct people to the fifth and sixth pages of the staff report. She said that there was a section that specifically discussed the availability of land for development as discussed in the Comprehensive Plan. She said that it was important to understand the limitations of the analysis; the figures were estimates, and the theoretical capacity measured the maximum development potential of the Development Areas.

Ms. King said that the analysis also found that development projects often could not realize their maximum development potential due to a variety of constraining factors. She said that these factors limited the actual build-out of the Development Areas, which undermined the Growth Management Policy as well as other goals, such as the goals related to housing and economic development. She said that the report went on to say that however, the demand for the forecasts or projections based on historical trends of development indicated that constraining factors, including the availability of land and the cost of development, as well as environmental constraints, would limit the build-out potential.

Ms. King said that she expected that as a Commissioner, if this type of adjustment for the County was approved, they would continue to give this type of exception to the public as well as to private developers when they were bringing things like housing and wanted to make similar changes in order to maximize the land for housing. She said that she thought that if this precedent was set by approving it for the County, then they needed to be ready to continue doing that in the future with other types of applications. She said that she thought that was her biggest issue with the applicant. She said that with the request, she did not feel good about giving favoritism to themselves for economic development when they were not giving the same considerations to housing developments.

Mr. Carrazana said that changes to the types of slopes had been approved in other applications to enable more development. He said that to clarify, they were not setting precedents. He said that they always had to look at the merits of every single application, so regardless of what was done for one application, that did not mean that was a precedent that they had now set for another because they had to look at the merits of each one and they were each independent of each other.

Mr. Carrazana said that the other point he would make was that in AC44, there were a number of factors that they had addressed to try to maximize the development. He said that one thing was looking at gross instead of the net area of a development. He said that the other point that Mr. Fritz alluded to was that they were evaluating the critical slopes to see if there was one where they may have gone too far in their evaluation. He said that they could map better because they had better technology for mapping. He said that that was also part of what they were doing. He said that he thought they were trying to address a couple of areas where they believed would lead to more dense development and encourage that.

Mr. Clayborne said that he fully agreed with Mr. Carrazana; this was case-by-case, and his voting one way on this was not a blanket agreement across the board. He said that when he looked at what was before him today, it appeared to be a step in trying to align zoning with the Comprehensive Plan. He said that right now was a misalignment. He said that with the image that Mr. Fritz had shown of the two adjacent parcels or areas where they were colored in red and theirs was in green, it clearly limited the potential for the build-out. He said that for him, it was a no-brainer. He said that to reiterate, his voting yes on one application was not voting yes across the board and every case was on its own.

Mr. Carrazana said that in this particular application, they were still evaluating the stream. He said that if that stream was viewed to be a perennial, then they would require the buffer and the protections of that stream. He said that given the information they had, he was fine moving forward with this, but he assumed that if there was a change during the site plan review, then that would be required to buffer.

Ms. King said that she not stating that she thought their approval of this was a blanket. She said that she wanted to point out that staff had included, in her opinion, the information here about the challenges they faced with the current Growth Management plan related to environmental factors and maximum build-out. She said that she hoped that as they moved forward, this same statement would be used to support other types of applications that might do the same thing, not just those that the County was presenting.

Mr. Clayborne motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZMA-2026-00004 Rivanna Futures for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Moore seconded the motion, which carried (4-1). (Mr. Carrazana, Mr. Clayborne, Ms. King, Mr. Moore voted aye; Ms. Brown voted nay; Ms. Firehock and Mr. Murray was absent)

Work Session

ZTA202200002 Zoning Modernization Phase 2

Lea Brumfield, Senior Planner II, said that tonight staff was presenting to the Commission Articles 5, Overlay Zoning Districts, and Article 6, Use Tables, which were drafted under Phase 2 of the Zoning Modernization Project for a work session on those two articles. She said that following up on the last work session they had with the Commission, she wanted to note that on the use tables, they were using the "P" annotation, as was generally agreed upon for permitted by right and by administrative approval uses. She said that for ease of conversation, while they were talking about those uses, she would be using the term "by-right."

Ms. Brumfield said that they would start off by doing a quick project background recap and then look at Article 5, which was one of the drafted ordinances that they received. She said that staff would explain the changes there, some of the reshuffling that they did, and then they would go into Article 6, where they were looking at broad language changes and the formatting that moved all the uses into their new use tables. She said that they would then go over a couple of more specific changes. She said that uses that were consolidated, their names were changed outright, and things had been updated for clarity and current usage.

Ms. Brumfield said that they were also looking at some of the minor, more specific use permissions that staff was recommending be changed in this phase with guidance in the Comprehensive Plan for these particular changes and very low impacts for these changes. She said that staff would be asking the Commission for their feedback on their work session questions. She said that finally, they would look at the next step for the project. She said that the focus questions were: are the new use category names clear and intuitive; are the use table layouts and formatting clear and intuitive; do any terms read as ambiguous, or could any be confused with a different use; and are the changes recommended in the staff report consistent with the goals and vision of the Comprehensive Plan?

Ms. Brumfield said that as they went through the presentation, they would note the areas where staff had, as they had worked through the ordinance, noted that some regulations would need to be addressed in Phase 3. She said that they were thinking about that as they moved forward, but if the Commission had additional Phase 3 topics that arose during this presentation, they would have time allocated at the end of the presentation to receive those topics. She said that they would also ask if the Commission could email those topics to staff to ensure they had everything clear and could keep the presentation moving quickly.

Ms. Brumfield said that for anyone tuning into the Zoning Modernization project, in Phase 1, they had established the tone, language style, and ordinance format of the new drafts. She said that they had worked with the Berkeley Group to draft Articles 1, 2, 3, and 10 of the new Ordinance, which covered the administration, general processes, and non-conformities sections of the Ordinance. She said that those were things that did not require any changes or public input from staff or the general public.

Ms. Brumfield said that this phase basically laid out the framework for the rest of the project. She said that those four articles were brought before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for general approval, but they were not adopted at that time because the entire ordinance was being reformatted in a way that required the wholesale adoption of the entire thing. She said that Phase 2, which contained some of the articles that they were working on today, was focusing on rewriting the rest of the ordinance, except for sections 1,2,3 and 10.

Ms. Brumfield said that the goal was to bring those new articles in line with the articles that they had drafted in Phase 1 regarding style, formatting, tone, and language. She said that in this phase, the Zoning Modernization staff had been working with other topic-level expert staff to ensure that some of the trickier interpretations of complicated regulations, like the entrance corridor and floodplain overlay, were correctly written into this simpler, more straightforward language with the new format. She said that where possible, some regulations had been clarified or streamlined, but without any substantive change to the processes or the regulations.

Ms. Brumfield said that since Phase 2 addressed the entirety of the Zoning Ordinance, the articles were being brought to the Planning Commission a few at a time, so they would bring Article 7 and Article 8 in future work sessions. She said that today they were doing Articles 5 and 6. She said that they were also anticipating that they were going to bring in some of the things that were being written now. She said that Article 9 would be the form-based code. They did not really see a lot of changes coming forward because they were trying to keep up with writing that in the new Ordinance style.

Ms. Brumfield said that at the end of bringing all those articles to the Commission and the Board, they would conduct their public work or public hearings, and anticipated the Ordinance being adopted in full, with the new Ordinance to replace the current Ordinance. She said that they were providing the new style, the new layout, and the new format. She said that they were now moving to Phase 3, which was rewriting the regulations to bring them more in alignment with the Comprehensive Plan. She said that they did anticipate that after cleaning up the Ordinance in Phase 2, Phase 3 would be a lot more straightforward.

Ms. Brumfield said that they were going to look for both staff and public topic-level expert input on these matters that they were bringing forward. She said that they were trying to bring the goals and alignment of the Comprehensive Plan into the Zoning Ordinance, which was prioritized by the Board of Supervisors as an action that they had discussed earlier in the year. She said that the staff and public input in this phase would be focusing on the details of how they were enacting that direction from the Board. She said that they were pretty much set in their priorities and their overarching goals for phase three because they were taking the Comprehensive Plan and translating that into the Zoning Ordinance. She said that at the end of Phase 3, they did anticipate the adoption of all these Ordinance changes.

Ms. Brumfield said that provided was a brief outline of the Ordinance as it was proposed. She said that they were working on Articles 5 and 6 today, which overlaid zoning districts and use tables. She said that as a reminder for the project goals, they were looking to rewrite the Ordinance for clarity and ease of use; that was the main focus of today's work session. She said that they were looking to streamline their administrative processes where it was possible. She said that they were going to be updating their regulations for modern best practices and then also aligning their Ordinance with AC44's Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Brumfield said that the Phase 2 goals focused primarily on the first two goals, the first two parts of the overarching project goals. She said that the Ordinance was to be rewritten to bring better formatting, plain language, consolidated and clarifying uses, and a more streamlined Ordinance, removing duplicative language that was self-executing or repeated in multiple places. She said that required Code of Virginia compliance updates would be made for legality. She said that the review process was simplified where it was possible. She said that these changes were not intended to be substantive policy changes, so where Phase 2 drafts did appear to contain policy changes, those changes were required by state law.

Ms. Brumfield said that this was a clarification or a codification of something that had an established longstanding practice, or it was a minor change, which in this instance would be highlighted for the Commission's input. She said that as noted in the Commission's review of the draft articles provided, there was a lot of work to do to bring the Zoning Ordinance into compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. She said that to keep them on topic and productive today, the things that were not being looked at today were listed on the slide.

Ms. Brumfield said that use permission changes, such as adding agricultural supportive uses to the Rural Area, increasing density, reducing parking standards, or revisiting the Dark Skies Ordinance, would be revisited later in other sections of this project, and were not being reviewed today. She said that beginning with Article 5, the Overlay Zoning Districts, these regulations were currently in Article 3, Section 30 of the Zoning Ordinance. She said that these Overlay Zoning Districts essentially turned into the same with a more streamlined language format. She said that each Overlay Zoning District was separated in its own subsection, and the establishment application of each overlay was spelled out in a more consistent, clear way.

Ms. Brumfield said that the substance of all of these regulations had not changed. She said that the two things she wanted to bring to the Commission's attention were the new location of the floodplain administrator's powers and responsibilities. She said that this was moved into Article 2, which was one of the articles they had discussed earlier. She said that it was also attached in the packet, with the floodplain administrator's new language highlighted. She said that because the establishment of the floodplain administrator was not actually about the administration of the floodplain; it was how they designated who that was and what their powers and duties were, not what the regulations were if someone was applying for something in the floodplain, which was what the overlay district focused on.

Ms. Brumfield said that she wanted to highlight the reservation within the entrance corridor regulations. She said that there was a resolution of intent that the Board had approved to create a different regulation regarding outdoor sales, storage, and display in the entrance corridor, which was currently the special use permit only. She said that they were looking at writing that now. She said that they would update this section when they received more direction on how that zoning text amendment (ZTA) was going, whether it was adopted before this Ordinance, whether that

language was going to be incorporated into this change, or whether they were just going to wait and adopt it separately later. She said that it was reserved in the current draft in front of the Commission, but it would be cleaned up later.

Ms. Brumfield said that also provided was a quick listing of some of the things that they saw when going through the Article 5 language, which were things that staff noticed they would need to look at further in Phase 3. She said that this included some points along the discussion of scenic highways, which was something that they had talked about as a new ZTA. She said that they had also discussed a potential standardization of the entrance corridor depth across properties. She said that it was a little bit complicated to explain right now, but that was something that could be simplified. She said that working with the County Engineer, there was an additional floodway category that should have been in the Ordinance, but it was not.

Ms. Brumfield said that it was called Zone A, and it was not in the regulatory floodway or the floodway fringe, but it was a floodway category. She said that it should have been there, but a little more investigation into that was needed. She said that there were some points within the Flood Hazard Overlay District that were somewhat unclear and could be explained better, but that was something that would require a lot more investigation. She said that Article 6 had a lot of the focus of this work session because that was the article that consolidated all the lists of uses across all of their district sections.

Ms. Brumfield said that uses were currently listed under each district and were also spread throughout different sections of the ordinance. She said that some of it was in Section 4, which covered basic regulations and things that were accessory or applied in all districts. She said that some use permissions were actually hidden in their current Section 5 supplementary regulations. She said that it was written within the supplementary regulations, but one had to know where it was in order to access it, to know whether they could do it or could not do it, which made looking for these permissions a little tricky.

Ms. Brumfield said that their proposed table format was a much more modern, widely accepted, and user-friendly approach to these lists. She said that they made that change, which was the biggest change. She said that they also consolidated a lot of the uses and updated all of their names for consistency and clarity. She said that provided was the visualization that showed the basic change in the language brought into Article 6. She said their current Section 13.2.1 by-right uses in R-1 changed into their district tables. She said that it was a lot easier to read; it was a lot cleaner. She said that their notations there were "P" for permitted by right with administrative approval, SP for special use permit required, AC for accessory uses, and blank if the use was not permitted.

Ms. Brumfield said that other than the formatting change, the simplest changes in Article 6 were the language updates. She said that these uses were listed in Attachment 5 of the work session memo, and she had highlighted a few of them there to show the general trends and a couple of specific uses. She said that one consistent change along many uses was to divide the uses that were primarily the same but different in their permissions, which sometimes was written into the definition or supplement regulations stating that this was the use, it also required a special use permit if it was a certain way, but now it was actually in front and pulled out.

Ms. Brumfield said that one of the changes they made here that was seen was a consistency in intensity differentiation, where something that was a use that was less intense and had fewer

impacts was a minor version of that, and something that had more impacts was a major version of that use. She said that the Ordinance listed home occupations, major and minor home occupations, minor seasonal farm worker housing, major and minor renewable energy systems. She said that one thing she wanted to pull out was an example of where the language was hidden in Section 5 supplementary regulations, where their regulations in that section specified that anywhere a club or lodge was permitted, a gun club or shooting range was permitted, but required a special use permit, and that was the only place that was listed in the Ordinance.

Ms. Brumfield said that they updated that language in the table, pulling the use of clubs and lodges into the two uses listed clubs and lodges was the one. She said that gun clubs and shooting ranges were the second use. She said that this was not a change in permission. She said that this was not any kind of difference between their previous Ordinance. She said that it was much clearer now what was permitted. She said that they were very deliberate about their decisions regarding where things should be permitted. She said that this would be something that they would be able to address in Phase 3. She said that a few of the language updates also included consolidation, bringing together a lot of uses under one name.

Ms. Brumfield said that the uses were essentially the same. She said that they were focused more on regulating the impact and the nature of the use, as opposed to the individual type of musical instrument or optical goods that were being sold in individual stores. She said that the majority of these were very straightforward. She said that they had renewable energy systems, so the smaller ones had less impact and a smaller acreage size and the larger ones were those that had more acreage and a larger impact. She said that their public uses were currently listed in a large list of different uses. She said that this consolidated them all for public use of services and utilities.

Ms. Brumfield said that there was no permission change here. She said that everything was the same currently that it was allowed, and it was just given a different name or it was categorized together with other things that had the exact same permissions. She said that some other measures that shortened the Ordinance by a great deal were consolidating all of their office types. She said that there was no change in use permissions on all of those. She said that they also consolidated their light industrial uses with no impact on where those were permitted. She said that they were also consolidating heavy manufacturing and processing.

Ms. Brumfield said that some of the uses that could theoretically fit under some of these categories, like wholesale distribution and warehousing, could easily be light industrial. She said that the use permissions there were different than the overarching light industrial category, so those were pulled out separately and they were named in the table separately. She said that it was a little less efficient, but it was not changing any of the actual permissions. She said that consolidating all those would be something they could consider in Phase 3 if they found it to be appropriate.

Ms. Brumfield said that their retail and commercial uses were greatly consolidated. She said that they had over 25 different named retail uses, plus all the different variations of those retail uses, but they were all selling things to customers. She said that this was separated into three different categories: retail sales and service general, things that they would consider for a strip mall, a shopping center, or a downtown retail area. She said that they currently had a use described in the Ordinance as retail stores and shops on a single floor, compatible with the residential characteristics of the district, with a gross floor area not exceeding 4,000 square feet.

Ms. Brumfield said that the use became their neighborhood retail and services. She said that the use performance standards for this use, which was one of the things they were going to work with staff on in the next few months, would likely be a square footage limitation. She said that what they were really looking for here was retail uses that were small, had individual customers coming in, were not business-to-business type stores, and were not large format like department stores or anything storing a volatile or caustic type of chemical; something that could theoretically be located in a neighborhood.

Ms. Brumfield said that these uses were currently permitted by a special use permit in R-10 and R-15, and they were also discussed in the Downtown Crozet District. She said that these uses were also permitted in larger commercial areas. She said that they were not excluded, but they were the only retail uses that were permitted in their residential districts currently through a special use permit or through the Downtown Crozet District. She said that it was something that they had consolidated and changed a little bit, and they were looking at this perhaps in the future.

Ms. Brumfield said that maybe in Phase 3, when they were looking at diversifying some of their uses in their residential districts, it could be something that they would consider making either by right in those districts or expanding the special use permit permissions in other districts, like perhaps R-6 and R-4 as well. She said that they also created a site intensive commercial category. She said in that definition, these were uses that were generally not contained within a building. She said that these were ones that were currently only permitted in the Highway Commercial and Industrial Districts but consolidating all those did not change any of the permissions.

Ms. Brumfield said that as they looked ahead, they had something to consider for the additional research and discussion on uses, community designs, and density. She said that these were all things that came to mind as they went through these articles, but they were currently focusing only on the non-substantive uses and streamlining the administrative processes, bringing the minor changes to the forefront. She said that those that became minor changes that they had been referring to included removing a couple of uses from the Rural Areas Zoning District, such as crematoriums and outdoor drama theaters; combining agricultural museums and historical centers into a single use; and removing livestock sales from industrial districts.

Ms. Brumfield said that this was somewhat changing the use permissions. She said that these were very minor uses that did not really have any impact on the current operation of any businesses in the County and were intended to align better with the Comprehensive Plan. She said that currently, crematoriums were permitted under funeral homes in commercial districts of the County, which seemed a little more logical than the rural area district giving traffic and the necessity of proximity to urban centers. She said that looking at agricultural and historical centers, these were largely permitted the same.

Ms. Brumfield said that there were some minor differences in the residential districts; combining them did make that change. She said that their primary goals, the description of how these two uses were currently treated in the Ordinance, really focused on the history of the County. She said that it focused on the general history or it focused on the agricultural history, so it was logical that these two be treated the same. She said that regarding the use of livestock sales, it was currently explicitly listed only in industrial districts.

Ms. Brumfield said that however, it was a type of use that was permitted at agricultural operations in the Rural Area, which was more logical. She said that their industrial districts in the

Comprehensive Plan did not describe any kind of agricultural sales, which was in line with what one would expect in an agricultural district. She said that this brought that into line, and they had not received any applications for that use in a very long time.

Ms. Brumfield said that looking back at Article 6, some of the things that were noted would be looked at in Phase 3 include mixed use in multiple districts, increased density, parking regulations, the adaptive reuse potentials for commercial structures, and then looking across at village residential use permissions, and Rural Area supportive uses. She said that a couple of additional work sessions with the Commission and the Board were coming up as they continued their drafting work. She said that at the same time, they were working on scoping for the Phase 3 topics.

Ms. Brumfield said that they were looking at building their expert topic groups to have those discussions. She said that after they adopted the Phase 2 section of all the changes, they would be drafting the Phase 3 sections. She said that their next steps in brief were continuing general outreach and continuing their public education. She said that they would be drafting their new, cleaned-up language. She said that they were scheduling staff meetings right then with experts on their grading and lighting standards and then building their topic-based discussion groups and then their public hearings.

Ms. Brumfield said that returning to their work session focus questions, they were looking at their category names, table layouts, term definitions, term names, and the recommended changes for use permissions.

Mr. Carrazana said that the focus questions were interrelated, so they did not necessarily need to go through them in order. He asked Commissioners to give their comments on this phase and reminded them that the third phase was upcoming. He said that once they received that information, they may need to have some preliminary discussions before it was presented in a work session.

Mr. Clayborne asked if staff could refresh him on the expert topic groups mentioned in the presentation.

Ms. Brumfield said that they were looking at building groups of people for different topics. She said that for someone looking at lighting standards would talk to developers, builders, and dark sky experts and have a conversation with them about what was reasonable to expect for this topic and how the County could better meet their goals based on the industry. She said that it was really looking at what was doable based on what they already had as their primary aims. She said that they would be looking to define a reasonable expectation based on the opinions of industry experts. She said that these discussions would guide them to make sure anything staff was bringing in from the Comprehensive Plan was achievable in the best way possible.

Mr. Carrazana said that they had previously discussed that with regard to form-based code design standards, for example. He said that they had mentioned reaching out to individuals with a certain level of expertise and experience to inform those topics.

Mr. Clayborne said that made sense. He said that he would be glad to be a resource in terms of networking on those topics.

Ms. Brumfield said absolutely.

Ms. King said that one of the attachments was the drafted uses definitions, and Ms. Brumfield mentioned one of the minor changes was the livestock use. She said that according to the application, it was being removed from Highway Commercial, but in the notes, it was being removed from Light Industrial.

Ms. Brumfield said that to clarify, it was being removed from Highway Commercial, not Light Industrial

Ms. King said that in the definitions page, it did not list livestock sales as one of the definitions. She asked if it was grouped with animal sales.

Ms. Brumfield said that yes, that was one of the things currently listed under agricultural operation events. She said that that was not a definition that she anticipated changing and it was something that was already listed in the Ordinance that would continue. She said that it was not included in the attached definitions; it was in the current Ordinance.

Ms. King said that she liked the new chart, and from what she understood they were only listing the uses that were somehow permitted one way or the other for each category. She said that they would not list a use that had no use in agricultural; it would just be omitted.

Ms. Brumfield said that was right.

She said that it was hard to tell the total number of uses that they were proposing throughout all the categories. She asked what the total was.

Ms. Brumfield said that she had not counted them all, but it was fewer than there had been previously.

Ms. King said that it made to consolidate them, but when looking at the drafted definitions, it did not feel like a complete list of definitions. She said that this was where she was getting confused.

Ms. Brumfield said that that was a good clarification. She said that the draft of definitions included only the newly proposed ones.

Francis MacCall, Deputy Zoning Administrator, said that this was not to say that during Phase 3 there might be other revisions to definitions.

Ms. King asked if they foresaw the drafted definitions would then be included in a total list in the final draft.

Ms. Brumfield said yes. She said that staff was going to continue working on definitions throughout this entire process and then consolidate all of them into what it would become Article 11.

Ms. King said that she would be interested in learning how many they started with versus how many they ended up with.

Mr. Carrazana said that he agreed that it would be helpful to review the consolidations they had made.

Mr. Clayborne said that regarding the new language, he was assuming these terms were common language used by other localities.

Ms. Brumfield said that was how they came up with most of them, but there were some that were colloquialisms. She said that there were some things that were very particular to Albemarle. She said that the majority of the use names, and this was a truism of Planning and Zoning in general, lacked consistency. She said that when they looked at something that was used in multiple other places, or it was logical that it would make sense, something that tracked very closely with something else. She said that the first thing that came to mind was neighborhood retail, neighborhood sales, and service.

Ms. Brumfield said that that was actually quite close to something that Charlottesville had, which was neighborhood supporting sales and service. She said that it was just a little bit shorter. She said that there were multiple versions of that kind of name across Virginia: neighborhood-focused services, or local small business services. She said that they were all getting at the same idea, but there was not anything consistent. She said that for light industrial, heavy manufacturing, and processing, they always tried to use as a standard.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there was much parity between the language used by Albemarle and Charlottesville for Planning and Zoning, considering many people worked in both localities.

Ms. Brumfield said there was just because they had updated their language to the general standard. She said that they had not aimed to match Charlottesville one-to-one, but it was always in the lineup of researched locations to compare the terminology and determining the best one.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to thank staff for their work, as it was certainly an improvement over what existed now on the website and public code. He said that the table layouts and formatting were quite clear and intuitive. He said that he ran Attachment 5, Section 5 through the Hemingway Readability Calculator. He said that they came in at about grade 11 or 12, which was a little high, but they found 47 sentences that were very hard to read. He said that he thought that would be the case for any sort of policy.

Mr. Moore said that he found it was difficult to read some of these long sentences, such as those regarding grading or other land-disturbing activity, including trenching or tumbling. He said that tree wells or tree walls must not occur within the drip line of any trees or wood, except as necessary to construct them. He said that he did not know how far down the readability path they wanted to go, but there were some sentences that were still quite long and complex with many subordinate clauses.

Mr. Moore said that overall, the improvement was great. He said that he wanted to talk a little about the matrix of uses and Article 6. He said that somewhere in the preamble of Article 6, he wondered if they might include a list of what all those zoning category abbreviations were. He said that just because he was looking at it, he wondered what MHD and VR were. He said that he realized what it was once he began looking at it, but he did not see that at the start of Article 6. He said that it might just be nice to have a list somewhere.

Mr. Moore said that with regard to the removal of crematoriums from RA, while he imagined there was not a high demand for them, he was wondering if they should be explicitly disallowed considering they were sometimes attached to cemeteries.

Ms. Brumfield said that in that case, it would be permitted anywhere the cemetery was permitted because it would be an accessory use.

Mr. Moore said that made sense. He asked what "special lots" were, as they were permitted everywhere.

Ms. Brumfield said that special lots were defined in that consolidation list. She said that they were lots that did not necessarily have a primary use on them, but they do need to permit things like stormwater management as part of a site plan, or a green space as part of a residential development.

Mr. Moore said that these were specific miscellaneous uses where a permit was required.

Ms. Brumfield said yes; however, a permit may not necessarily be required.

Mr. MacCall said that it also included things that may not meet the minimum lot size for a district. He said that when creating a lot, the requirement was that all lots must meet the minimum lot size, but this could give an exemption to lots that were not those identified sizes. He said that he thought another one came up often were lots that were private streets. He said that the streets became separate lots that the homeowner association knew specifically what it was that they had to maintain along with any other open space.

Mr. Moore said that almost all the uses in the use matrix were pretty clear. He said that "special lots" was the only one that was vague to him. He said that it sounded like there was enough of a catch-all that he wondered if a short footnote might be in order on that one.

Ms. Brumfield said that she believed people applying for special lots would know what it was.

Mr. Moore said that that was probably true. He said that he did want to point out the uses that were being lost, such as typesetting, etching, engraving, pool halls, and milk dispensaries. He said that he continued to find it strange that Monticello had two zoning categories specific to Monticello. He said that he did want to give credit to staff for reducing that from a whole page in the current one. He said that he still wondered if the Monticello House Museum and Historic Site could be rolled into a historical museum and if Monticello Scholar Residences could be rolled into seasonal housing.

Ms. Brumfield said that the Monticello Scholar Residences were not actually seasonal housing; they rented them or awarded them for renting, especially to professors or for fellowships. She said that they were a weird category that was all by itself, and they did not meet density at all, which was why they were carved out. She said that Monticello itself had additional permissions that a normal agricultural museum would not be allowed to have.

Mr. Moore said that while they were not in Phase 3, he wanted to comment it was funny to see that gun clubs and shooting ranges had a special permit possibility in R-1 and R-2 zoning.

Ms. Brumfield said that she was also surprised when she discovered that.

Ms. Brown said that she thought this looked really great; it looked concise and clean. She said that she thought it was smart to change those classes into major and minor that applied across the board. She said that she liked the designation of the neighborhood category and the

consolidation of the kind of retail uses in the office space. She asked if things like dispensaries and vape shops fell into that retail space.

Ms. Brumfield said yes; their Ordinance did not differentiate between them right now.

Ms. Brown said that because there were some categories that had many things, some like Monticello were very specific, she did not know if she was missing anything. She said that she thought it was looking really good.

Mr. Clayborne said that he would make a comment regarding the table layouts. He said that he thought it looked really good; however, when he was looking at it, he thought it might make it easier on people's eyes if the "P" was just like a check mark and not permitted was an "X" instead of being blank. He said that those symbols may be more intuitive for viewers.

Mr. Carrazana said that he thought there was a tremendous amount of work that went into this, and he really appreciated that. He said that he knew the Berkley Group spent a lot of time with staff and he appreciated their work as well. He said that in general, he would answer yes to the four questions being asked, and he thought they were hitting the mark. He said that in terms of the readability that Mr. Moore brought up, when they talked about the expert groups that he was setting up for individual focused areas, he wondered if they also could do one at the larger scale, just looking at readability.

Mr. Carrazana said that if they brought in some volunteers, folks who were very engaged with the process, that might give it a review and provide some of their feedback. He said that he thought everything could always get a little bit better, and there was a tremendous amount of work here. He said he thought it was definitely heading in the right direction, but perhaps there was a little more refinement that could happen, and there might be members of the public, people who were active in the process and planning, who might be able to help as well.

Ms. Brown asked if they could consider reviewing the classification for crematoriums, considering they could be located in a variety of areas.

Ms. Brumfield said that they could look into that. She said that if there were no other comments on Phase 2, they could discuss the Commissioners' thoughts on Phase 3 work.

Mr. Carrazana said that there was a lot included in the packet, and he would encourage the Commissioners to send emails to staff with their feedback.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to make a comment that was not directed at staff. He said that he just noticed the part about individual manufactured homes. He said that there was a new state law that allowed those to be built anywhere else that a regular single-family home could be built, which was great in terms of the potential for affordable housing. He said that where local Ordinances were at play was the fact that it still did not change anything about HOA restrictions.

Mr. Moore said that there were miles and miles of HOAs where one could not build a single backyard cottage. He said that when they recommended approvals of developments at this dais, and then when the Board approved them, they required developers to establish homeowners associations. He said that those restrictions that came with many homeowners associations often completely contradicted what they wanted in their Comprehensive Plan. He said that they wanted to encourage infill development, but they could not.

Mr. Moore said that there was no one in this County who was able to build something like that. He said that he thought he was not the first person to suggest this or point out this analysis, but taken as a whole, HOA restrictions tended to be very exclusive. He said that they excluded certain kinds of people, and if one did not have the green, one could not cross the line. He said that he wanted them to do better and stop privatizing their governance of neighborhoods to, frankly, often unaccountable organizations.

Ms. King said that requiring establishment of HOAs and meeting those requirements could also increase costs to each homeowner.

Committee Reports

There were none.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting July 15, 2026

Michael Barnes, Director of Planning, said that the Board of Supervisors July 15 meeting was a fairly light agenda. He said that Ms. Shepheard from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Charlottesville Residency gave them a report on some of the work that they were doing. He said that the only matter that was of interest to the Planning Commission was that Ms. Maliszewski had worked through a zoning text amendment that would allow rooftop solar to be a Countywide Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Barnes said that that meant that it would be included as a use for which they could promulgate regulations. He said that if an applicant conformed to the regulations, the solar panels could be put onto the roof of a building without additional review by the Architectural Review Board (ARB). He said that this item was approved by the Board.

New Business

There was none.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

Mr. Clayborne said that considering they were going into the eighth month of the year, he would ask that if there were any relevant informational topics from departments or outside agencies be scheduled on their agenda.

Mr. Moore said that he thought a presentation from Weldon Cooper on their current and projected growth and commuter patterns would be very informative.

Mr. Barnes said that he thanked you for that suggestion.

Mr. Carrazana said that it had been a while since they had received a presentation from Dr. Pethia, as well.

Mr. Barnes said that Dr. Pethia had submitted her resignation this month.

Ms. King said that when she had taken the certified planning commissioner course, one of the presentations given was from an organization known as Housing Forward Virginia, and they also spoke at the Planning District Commission. She said that their information was very helpful, and they may be able to present to the Commission in lieu of Dr. Pethia.

Adjournment

At 7:50 p.m., the Commission adjourned to August 11, 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: