Albemarle County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Draft Minutes August 11, 2026

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public meeting on Tuesday, August 11, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Luis Carrazana Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair (arrived at 6:02 p.m.); Nathan Moore; Lonnie Murray; Mary Katherine King; Catherine Brown (arrived at 6:05 p.m.).

Members absent: Corey Clayborne.

Other officials present were: Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Jenny Tevendale, Deputy County Attorney; Bart Svoboda, Director of Community Development; Francis MacCall, Deputy Zoning Administrator; Frank Pohl, County Engineer; Jered Tate, Senior Planner; J.T. Newberry, Planner; Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Carolyn Shaffer called the roll.

Luis Carrazana established a quorum.

Public Comment

There was no one wishing to speak.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Moore motioned that the Planning Commission approved the Consent Agenda. Ms. Brown seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (3-0-1). (Mr. Murray abstained; Mr. Clayborne, Ms. Firehock, Ms. King were absent)

Public Hearing

SP-2026-00005 Beaver Creek Pump Station Fill in the Floodplain

Jered Tate, Senior Planner, provided the staff report on the Beaver Creek pump station floodplain request. He said that it was located in Western Albemarle at the southern end of the Beaver Creek Reservoir. He said the surrounding area was rural and included low-density single-family residential uses, forests and open space, and agricultural uses. He said the entire property was within the Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) buffer, and a portion of the property was within the flood hazard overlay district.

Mr. Tate said that subject property and surrounding properties were designated as rural areas in AC44. He said that the area's land uses included agricultural, forestal, and open space uses, and residential uses at a density of half a unit per acre. He said the request was to permit grading activities, including placement of 450 cubic yards of fill in the flood plain.

Mr. Tate said that the applicant had proposed to replant disturbed areas in the riparian buffer to the maximum extent possible in order to maintain the forestal character of the parcel. He said that the proposed landscape plan exceeded ordinance minimums. He said that the proposed fill was

needed to allow development of the raw water facility. He said that the applicant had certified that the amount of fill would not lead to a rise in the base elevation of the floodplain.

Mr. Tate said staff found the proposal in harmony with the purpose and intent of the flood hazard overlay district. He said staff found that the request would cause no substantial detriment to adjacent parcels, would not change the character of the area, would be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the chapter, and it was consistent with AC44. He said staff recommended two conditions of approval, and the second condition was included as a landscaping plan separate from the concept plan. He said staff did not identify any concerns with the request.

Mr. Murray asked if Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) was planning to implement any mitigation or replanting strategies to accommodate the impact on the buffer that would occur as part of the request.

Mr. Tate said that no mitigation plan was required for this type of use under the standards of the water protection ordinance. He said the requirement depended on the use, and for the proposed use, it was permitted.

Frank Pohl, County Engineer, said that as a public facility, the request was exempt from the mitigation plan requirement.

Mr. Murray said he was concerned about the potential for the public to complain that the County was holding itself to a different standard.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing for a presentation from the applicant.

Victoria Fort, project manager for Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and representing the applicant, said that she was also joined by the consultant on the project, Jonathan McClure. She said that the Beaver Creek Dam and Reservoir was the only water supply for Crozet. She said that the dam was constructed in 1963, and it had approximately 500 million gallons of storage. She said that the water treatment plant was constructed in 1966 with about 1 million gallons per day of treatment capacity. She said the treatment plant was recently expanded to support 2.2 million gallons of treatment capacity and 1.6 million gallons of distribution capacity.

Ms. Fort said that they had seen increases in water demand over the last decades. She said that as a result of the increased demand and necessary safety upgrades, they had to obtain a Virginia Water Protection Permit from DEQ. She said the permit was issued in December 2024, and it established limits on daily, monthly, and yearly water withdrawals and downstream releases into Beaver Creek.

Ms. Fort said that the components of the new project included a new raw water pump station and intake. She said the site was selected because it was on the reservoir, which enabled them to better control the water intake and outflow. She said the site was also located on County property, which minimized impacts on privately owned land. She said the site was also located in short proximity to Browns Gap Turnpike, which reduced the length of raw water main and access road needed.

Ms. Fort said that the access road would require a bridge over a small stream. She said that there would be a replacement transmission main from the pump station to the treatment plant. She said it would be made of a new material with higher carrying capacity. She noted that the dam spillway reconstruction project would start after the new pump station was in service. She said the current spillway did not meet dam safety regulations, which necessitated the reconstruction.

Ms. Fort said that they had to increase the capacity of the pump station. The new pump station would have a maximum capacity of 2.8 million gallons for raw water conveyance. She said that it would also have 2 million gallons of capacity for the maximum required minimum in-stream flow. She said that this was the flow that was released into Beaver Creek downstream.

Ms. Fort said that the intake would be tunneled under the reservoir. She said that retaining walls were required to accommodate the steep slopes on the site. She said that the diffused air destratification system was being installed at the same time, and it was intended to improve the water quality of the reservoir. She said it was essentially an aerator installed along the bottom of the reservoir to prevent issues from leading to extensive algae growth and heavy nutrient accumulation.

Ms. Fort said that the site constraints required retaining walls to construct the facility within the property limits. She said the requested 450 cubic yards of fill in the flood way would result in no rise of the 100-year floodplain. She said extensive replanting was proposed around the facility to maintain the forested character of the parcel.

Mr. Murray asked what mitigation measures were being taken with regard to the stream crossing.

Ms. Fort said all the ENS measures were detailed in the WPO plan.

Ms. King asked if the majority of the fill would be behind the retaining wall.

Ms. Fort said that was correct. She said they originally had a single retaining wall, but it exceeded the maximum height permitted in County code. She said they proposed a stepped retaining wall system, which required more space.

Ms. Brown asked if the bridge would obstruct stream access for wildlife.

Ms. Fort replied that there would be no obstructions to wildlife. She noted that the Henley Hornets Trail, which ran along the edge of the reservoir, would be reestablished as part of the construction.

Jonathan McClure, Hazen and Sawyer, said that they had considered a culvert or fill to cross the stream, but the bridge would allow stream restoration. He said they were coordinating with the Army Corps of Engineers, and they had received permits for the crossing.

Mr. Murray said he was concerned about the amount of grass on the site, which attracted geese, which left waste on the site, which flowed into the reservoir. He asked if they had considered converted the grass to native plantings, which would discourage geese.

Ms. Fort said that the auxiliary spillway would be refilled to the full height of the dam after the main dam spillway reconstruction was finished. She said that the County would likely be able to revegetate the area once it was no longer a component of the dam.

Mr. Murray asked if they were doing anything to discourage geese from the site.

Ms. Fort said she was not aware if geese were a concern for water treatment purposes, so she was uncertain whether that was in the scope of the project. She said that the destratification system would help minimize the conditions leading to algae growth in a more meaningful capacity than anything that they could do to discourage geese.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing for comments from the public. He noted that there was no one wishing to speak, so the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Firehock said that filling in the floodplain impacted aquatic life and riparian health. She said that this project in particular was a project that was necessary in the specific location of what its function was. She said she supported the request because of the engineering and public facility needs.

Mr. Murray said that a reason to protect streams was to ensure a safe water supply. He said that this request was to facilitate the water supply.

Ms. Brown motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP-2026-00005 Beaver Creek Pump Station Fill in the Floodplain with the conditions stated in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Clayborne was absent)

SP-2026-00002 Camp Watermarks

JT Newberry, Senior Planner, said that the subject property was located at the far southern boundary of the County along the James River between the communities of Warren and Hatton. He said the request was seeking to expand an existing family-owned and operated boarding camp founded in 2004. He said the proposal comprised seven separate parcels totaling just over 190 acres.

Mr. Newberry said that the parcels were located in the rural areas zoning district. He said that the majority of the parcels contributed to the Hatton Agricultural and Forestal District. He said the first special use permit for the camp was approved in 2006, which allowed the camp to operate up to four weeks per year. He said this request was the third amendment to the special use permit. He said the last amendment was approved in 2008.

Mr. Newberry said the proposal sought to increase the overall number of camp sessions and the maximum number of people allowed on site, and reduce the acreage used for camp purposes.

Mr. Newberry said three parcels 9G, 9F, and 9H1 would be removed from the special use permit, and parcel 9A1 would be added. He said this would result in a net reduction of about 12 acres. He said only two of the seven parcels would be excluded from the district, 9D and 9A1.

Mr. Newberry said there were minor changes in the wording of how characteristics were treated. He said this reflected the County's efforts to update and modernize the review process. He said the existing permit, for example, had two conditions related to capacity, one for campers and one for staff, but this was consolidated into one condition in the request. He said the proposal sought to increase capacity to a maximum of 250 people on site.

Mr. Newberry said the request included increasing the number of sessions. He said in addition to the currently permitted 16 week-long sessions, the request included 35 weekend sessions. He said this resulted in a total of 51 sessions, essentially permitting year-round operations.

Mr. Newberry said that currently, there were two separate conditions for vehicle trips, one associated with campers coming to the sight and one with food deliveries. He said the request combined these conditions to limit vehicle trips to 15 round trips per camp session. He said that the facilities and parking area was about 3 3/4 acres spread over two different parcels. He said the request included increasing the area to over 4 acres. It also included a boundary line adjustment to consolidate the area into one parcel, 9D1.

Mr. Newberry said that the concept plan was included as Attachment 4 of the staff report. He said the camp facilities and parking area was the main campus, and it included structures for eating,

sleeping, sanitation, and assembly. He said there would be no new disturbance with the addition of the structures.

Mr. Newberry said the site was surrounded on three sides by water. A stream covered the eastern and western edges of the property, and the James River crossed the entire southern boundary. He said all the area south of the railroad was within the floodplain.

Mr. Newberry said that Attachment 3 highlighted the wooded areas that would remain. He said these areas would remain wooded unless used for some other agricultural purpose. He said there were about 100 acres of agricultural use across the properties, including hay, corn, and tree farming. He said the proposed expansion was focused on the areas of the site that were already disturbed, preserving the remainder of the site for agricultural uses.

Mr. Newberry said there were a couple of public meetings prior to the public hearing. He said the first was the Agricultural and Forestal District Committee review. He said the committee found that the proposal would not significantly reduce the available agricultural and forestry land, and it recommended it to be consistent with Chapter 3 of the County Code.

Mr. Newberry said that they held the required community meeting onsite in the camp's dining facilities. He said the discussion had a good turnout and positive discussion. He said there was a focus on noise and hours of operation. He said that other concerns were raised about activity levels on the river.

Mr. Newberry said that pages five through nine of the staff report included staff's analysis of the request according to County Code. He said staff determined that the updated conditions and concept plan allowed for a positive finding in each of the factors for consideration.

Mr. Newberry said the conditions were drafted and organized to be consistent with current administrative practices and modernization efforts. He said the conditions included activity areas, cabin facilities and parking areas, and the entrance onto James River Road. He said the conditions limited tree clearing to only for agricultural purposes. He said the occupancy limited onsite capacity to 250 people.

Mr. Newberry said there was the new session limits condition, and the transportation condition was consolidated. He said that condition six addressed outdoor amplified music, consistent with other uses in the rural area, such as wineries, breweries, distilleries, or religious uses. He said condition seven addressed lighting, which was a carry-over condition from the previous special use permit.

Mr. Newberry said that condition eight was stricken, which recommended an annual zoning clearance. He said it was intended to ensure the site's long-term compliance. However, after further consideration, they determined that the intent to support compliance could be satisfied through existing processes, so it did not need to be included as a separate condition.

Mr. Newberry said there were existing violations on the site, and they were being addressed by code compliance and building staff. He said that the applicant was responsive in addressing the issues, and they had applied for all the necessary permits identified. He said there were about 21 active applications under review. He said some could not be closed until after action was taken on the special use permit amendment.

Mr. Newberry said the fire marshal had informed the applicant that the site would receive an annual inspection. He noted that the health department would annually issue two separate permits for the camp and dining facility, and they would review the septic system every five years. As a

result of the additional inspections, staff did not believe a condition was necessary to ensure compliance.

Mr. Newberry said the Code Compliance Office was prepared to investigate any complaints otherwise. He said that staff found three positive aspects. He said existing agricultural and timber uses would continue, and the majority of the property would remain in agricultural use. He said that additional structures were located in already developed areas. He said staff recommended approval of the request.

Ms. Brown said that the current camp use was not codified in the conditions, and the special use permit was conveyed with the land, not ownership or a specific use. She asked if consideration was given to the fact that the use could change and how the conditions would impact unrelated uses that may occur on the site in the future.

Mr. Newberry explained that the proposed conditions were specific to a boarding camp use. He said that if a different use occurred on the property, such as an event use, it would be permitted as a new and separate use.

Ms. Tevendale explained that while the conditions did not specify the boarding camp use, the application for the permit was specific to the use of a boarding camp of over 200 attendees. She said if the application was approved by the Board, a letter was typically sent to the applicant identifying the approval to be specific to the use with the conditions of approval listed below.

Mr. Murray said that 9A2 was an activity area in the middle of the floodplain. He asked if permanent structures would be located in the floodplain.

Mr. Newberry said that none of the existing elements in the area met the building code definition of structure. For example, there was a fenced ball field. He said the elements existed as accessories to permitted recreational uses in the floodplain.

Mr. Murray said there were roads, and the water protection ordinance discouraged roads in floodplains. He asked if the road was preexisting.

Mr. Newberry said the road was preexisting, and it was intended for the safety of transporting campers across the railroad track. He said it was not a formalized or paved road, but it was more of a travel lane for site access.

Mr. Murray asked for clarification about the clearing of trees in activity areas within the stream buffer or the flood zone.

Mr. Newberry said within the four identified activity areas, there were no trees.

Ms. Firehock asked for clarification about why the additional parcel was being added to the camp area.

Mr. Newberry said the activity area encompassed 9A2 and 9A1, but currently, only 9A2 was included. He said that including the parcel would reflect the current practice, which was not included in the current permit.

Ms. Firehock asked for more information about the nature of the violations.

Mr. Newberry said that Attachment 5 of the staff report included all the public comment that they received. He said there were a number of passionate people speaking in support of the camp. He

said the previous amendments to the permit were for minor additions. He said the applicant noted that they were expanding at such a rate that requesting an amendment for each new cabin or facility would be unsustainable.

Mr. Newberry said the nature of the violations related to electrical, plumbing, and setbacks. He said that the applicant had been ready and willing to address these issues to bring the property into compliance with the County Code.

Mr. Murray said they had cases where they previously discussed combined uses, such as this camp use and agricultural use. He asked how the County negotiated the applicable regulations.

Mr. Newberry said that the application to move the property line would require a review of the land use tax assessment. He said that through coming into compliance, there would be a review of these aspects. He said there was a chain effect of applications to bring the site into compliance.

Mr. Murray said that the water protection standards for agricultural uses were different from the ones for camps. He asked what regulations applied when two uses were overlaid.

Mr. Pohl explained they reviewed it on a case-by-case basis. He said the existing uses would not require mitigation. He said these kinds of issues came up every day, but it required consideration case by case, and there was no single answer that could be applied to every situation. He said that sometimes, they would record affidavits from property owners to support their use claims.

Ms. Brown asked for clarification about the noise ordinance. She said that community feedback indicated concerns about noise along the riverbank. She asked if staff had considered or incorporated conditions which managed sound levels other than amplified music.

Mr. Newberry said that a person's voice was exempt from the noise ordinance regulations. He said that one way to address these concerns was through regulating the hours of operation and quiet hours.

Mr. Carrazana opened the public hearing for a presentation from the applicant.

Josh Critzer, President and Director of Watermarks Camp, said that the property had been in his family for generations. He said they had operated as a timber, corn, and hay farm on the majority of the property while also operating a summer camp. He said his parents started the camp to share the experience with campers. He said that through the summer camp experience, they were building the next generation of leaders who could continue to make an impact in the community, city, state, and nation.

Mr. Critzer said they worked to turn around fear, anxiety, depression, and loneliness in young people by providing a fun, joyful, rural experience. He said they had worked diligently to get the property into compliance and to be safe for campers.

Mr. Critzer said that Watermarks was a Christian summer camp that hosted youth groups, middle school students, and high school students for multi-day, overnight experiences. He said they included food, lodging, and activities, including worship. He said staff cooked the food, ran activities, and maintained the site. He said the churches provided chaperons to stay in the cabins with the students, and students remained onsite the entire session. He said that food was delivered by truck per session, and they worked to limit traffic and noise.

Mr. Critzer said activities included team building activities focused on concurring fears, communicating, and working together. He said they conducted competitive games and swim activities. He said that recent trends in reducing summer break had put their business at risk.

Mr. Critzer said that they were requesting year-round operations to address the trend of shortening summer breaks. He said that summer sessions would continue as normal, and there would be additional weekend retreats year-round, starting on Friday at 5 p.m. to Sunday morning to 11 a.m. He said that MLK Jr. Day and Presidents' Day would have sessions extend to Monday.

Mr. Critzer said they requested to increase the capacity to 250 total people onsite. He said that the septic system was rated to handle 250 people, so they wanted the ability to use the facility to its capacity. He said the well and septic were tested, and both could handle the anticipated demand. He said they sought to reuse farm buildings as cabins, meeting spaces, and bathrooms to accommodate growth. He said they had submitted the necessary permits and were working to get the buildings into compliance. He said that no new buildings were being constructed.

Mr. Critzer said that inflation and the post-COVID economy had made it difficult to thrive from farming and camp operations. He said that the request would afford them the opportunity to hold onto their land.

Mr. Carrazana opened the hearing for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Moore asked how campers arrived at the camp.

Mr. Critzer explained that campers met at their churches, and the churches transported campers to the site via charter bus. He added that the churches also handled registration.

Mr. Moore asked how they ended up with several non-compliant structures.

Mr. Critzer said that they were existing, permitted farm buildings. He said they were filing permits to allow changing the use. He said that several new construction permits were being filed because they could not find the old permits.

Mr. Moore asked how they ensured the safety of their structures and activities, such as zip lines and rope courses.

Mr. Critzer said they partnered with Vestal's Gap Ventures to inspect the activity structures annually. He said the inspections were required by their insurance. He said that the buildings had all been recently inspected under the current ordinance. He said their own staff routinely inspected the buildings, as well.

Mr. Moore asked at what rate they expected camp attendance to increase.

Mr. Critzer said they were requesting capacity well above their current expectations to avoid needing to come before the County with another request. He said he did not know if they would ever reach the maximum capacity, but he wanted the option to do so.

Mr. Moore asked for more information about the agricultural operations.

Mr. Critzer said that over 80% of the property was in agricultural uses. He said that they contracted local farmers to help process the hay and corn, and they contracted with a local forester to timber the trees. He said that these uses were not in the stream buffer.

Mr. Murray asked what the emergency weather response was to ensure campers remained safe during flood conditions.

Mr. Critzer said that the parcels in the floodplain were only used for activities. He said that campers were transported to the parcels by bus, and if there was inclement weather, than they would either pack up and leave, or they would avoid going entirely.

Mr. Critzer said that 99% of camp time was spent on parcel 9D1. He said that any time, they could have everyone inside a building within 30 seconds of an emergency whistle. He said they typically had a 30-minute lead time on storms, as they could see them coming from the campgrounds.

Mr. Murray encouraged the applicant to consider applying to programs available to the water and soil conversation district. He said there were also programs to help support wildlife habitat, and residential programs that would apply to the camp. He said the programs also had educational components that could benefit campers.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the applicant would have to return for further permits to construct additional buildings to support more campers.

Mr. Critzer said that they were currently permitted for 10 cabins and an accessory building for staff, and this provided lodging for 150 people. He said that all the other buildings would easily be able to support 250 people. He said they did not need to construct any additional cabins.

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

Mitch Carr said he owned a neighboring property to the camp. He said a stream was between their properties, and he had worked to establish a buffer alongside it. He said that his other neighbor had also established a buffer. He said he was worried about the property being sold and another use taking place on the property.

Mr. Carr said that his house was along the river, and he was able to hear the activity on the river. He said he was also able to hear the trains, gun fire, and farm activity from all around. He said that noise should not be an issue, and it had not been a problem in the past. He said the applicants were good people and cared about their work.

Connie Knight said her family had lived in the area for generations. She said she fully supported the camp. She said that the noise was not a concern, and she did not hear noise from the camp when she was inside.

Tommy Tabscott said he had lived in the area his entire life, and he neighbored the subject property on the western border. He said his house was close to one of the activity areas. While he could occasionally hear campers, it was no different from other noises in the neighborhood, such as lawn mowers or tractors. He said the camp had always been a good neighbor, and they were responsive to questions and concerns from the community.

Jesse Gibson said he lived across the street from the camp and owned property in the floodplain beside the camp property. He said he owned about 60 acres. He said he appreciated the applicant's efforts to keep the property rural. He said they occasionally heard noise from the camp, but it did not bother him, nor was it any more intrusive than other noises in the area, such as trains, farm equipment, and tourist traffic to the river.

Paul Bryant said he was able to see the camp from his house. He said he was fully in support of the application. He noted the farm traffic on the road. He said that the camp was nondescript from

the road. He said that he was not concerned about the noise from campers. He said that the camp was a good opportunity for children to experience the outdoors.

Michael Sithearth said he was speaking on behalf of himself and another neighboring property owner, Rupert Devink. He said that he and Mr. Devink were not opposed to the camp, however, he was concerned about the impacts of expanding the special use permit. He said that the camp was very active, and the level of noise was having an impact on neighboring properties. He said that increased occupancy and year-round operations would increase noise and disruptions, and it would change the character of the area.

Mr. Sithearth said he was concerned about traffic safety due to the rural nature of James River Road. He said the expansion also raised concerns about septic capacity, water usage, and potential stormwater runoff. He requested that the Commission preserve the status quo and preserve the rural character of the area.

Landon Tapscott said he supported the application. He said he was a former camper and had lived in the area his entire life. He said his time at camp was transformative, and he wanted others to share his experience. He said that he regularly ran on James River Road, and he had never seen congestion caused by traffic from the camp. He requested that the Commission approve the application.

Sarah Eck said she owned property adjoining the subject property. She said she supported the proposed expansion. She said the noise from the camp was not a concern, and she believed it was a great use of the land. She said she also did not have any concerns related to traffic. She requested that the Commission approve the application.

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

Mr. Murray said he wanted to see more uses like this throughout the County. He said that it was an appropriate use in the rural area, and he appreciated that there were no permanent structures in the floodplain. He said the applicant appeared to be a good neighbor.

Ms. King motioned that the Planning Commission approve SP-2026-00002 Camp Watermarks with conditions one through seven, as provided by staff, for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Clayborne was absent)

Committee Reports

Ms. King reported that the Places29 Community Advisory Committee (CAC) met, but there was not a quorum. She said that even without a quorum, the members present received a presentation from RWSA with updates focusing on the urban ring facilities. She said RWSA offered group tours of the facilities, and she recommended that the Commission schedule one. She said the projects in the pipeline could help enable the potential for satellite growth areas.

Ms. Brown suggested that RWSA provide a presentation to the Commission.

Mr. Barnes said a presentation to the Commission would be easier than scheduling a tour, but they could investigate scheduling a tour.

Mr. Moore said that they had relatively light sessions scheduled on the calendar, so they could schedule a work session to receive a presentation from RWSA.

Mr. Murray said the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Tech committee met to discuss SMART Scale applications. He said there were cost changes associated with the projects. He said that Fifth Street had costs reduced from $44,700,000 to $39,418,000. He said the Barracks Road project had significant cost increases, from $21,389,000 to $46,259,000.

Mr. Murray said there were concerns about the Barracks Road project, particularly with the cost increases. He said that both the City and County were starting multimodal plans, and the Commission would hear presentations on these plans in the future. He said he hoped to receive these presentations sooner, rather than later.

Review of the Board of Supervisors Meeting - August 5, 2026

Mr. Barnes said that the August 5 Board meeting was busy. He said the Consent Agenda included a resolution of intent for the form-based code. Staff would bring the item back before the Commission for a presentation during the second meeting in September. He said that the resolution of intent included amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning text amendments. He said that other items included the James River Runners public hearing, which was unanimously approved by the Board.

Mr. Barnes said the Board discussed activity center plans for AC44, and staff provided a report on three areas they recommended for further study: lower Pantops, the Rio Road area, Fashion Square Mall, Albemarle Square, and the Hollymead Town Center Area. He said that staff ultimately recommended moving forward with the Hollymead Town Center Area.

Mr. Barnes said staff presented a work program for the Community Development Department to help prioritize work. He said a lot of the work focused on zoning text amendments, which were mainly associated with state mandated changes. He said others dealt with a host of other issues, including defining animal feeding operations. He said staff would return before the Board on September 16 with a report on animal feeding operations and available regulatory authority.

Mr. Murray said that many aspects discussed regarding the animal feed operations were already part of the Chesapeake Bay Act. He suggested that the County reconsider adopting the act to address public concerns. He asked when information would be presented to the Commission regarding the Eastern Connector.

Mr. Barnes said that the County was advancing two projects as part of the design-build initiative. He said one was the Boulders Road extension project. He said that they wanted to bundle the Boulders Road project with the Eastern Avenue project, but that was dependent on how the bids came in.

Mr. Barnes said that at this point, the Eastern Connect was being managed by the Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) Department, and the plan had remained largely unchanged. He said there were design elements that could be implemented by the builder, within specific parameters.

New Business

There was none.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

There were none.

Adjournment

At 7:50 p.m., the Commission adjourned to August 25, 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: