Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 28, 2000

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, November 28, 2000 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building – Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were: Mr. William Finley, Chairman; Mr. Dennis Rooker, Vice-Chairman; Mr. Pete Craddock; Ms. Tracey Hopper, Mr. Rodney Thomas; Mr. Jared Loewenstein and Mr. William Rieley. Other officials present were: Mr. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning and Community Development; Mr. Greg Kamptner, County Attorney; Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning & Community Development and Stephen Waller, Planner.

A quorum was established and the meeting called to order.

Matters not listed on the agenda from the Public
None were offered, and the meeting proceeded.

ZMA-2000-007 Mill Creek North – Village Homes II (Sign #71) – Request to rezone 7.1 acres to amend the existing Mill Creek PUD to increase the allowed number of dwelling units. The property, described as Tax Map 90C Parcels D&E, is located in the Scottsville Magisterial District on Stony Ridge Road on the south side of the Southern Parkway. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Density, recommended for 3 - 6 dwelling units per acre in Neighborhood 4. *Deferred from the November 14, 2000 planning commission meeting. Applicant requests deferral to December 19, 2000.*

Public Comment was invited.

There being no public comment, the matter was placed before the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker motioned and Ms. Hopper seconded to accept the applicant's request for deferral to December 19, 2000.

SP-2000-44 Moyer (Triton PCS CVR 361A) (Sign #59) - Request for special use permit to allow a communication facility, including a 74 foot high wood pole communication tower, a flush mount antenna, and ground equipment on a 30' by 30' leased area of a 8.982 acre parcel with an access road on a 9.25 acre adjacent parcel (Tax Map 92 Parcel 56B1), in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for micro-wave and radio-wave transmission and relay towers. The property, described as Tax Map 92 Parcel 56B3, is located in the Scottsville Magisterial District at 1863 Thomas Jefferson Parkway (State Route # 53) between Gobblers Ridge and Mountain Brook Drive. The property is zoned Rural Area and is within an Entrance Corridor Overlay District. The Comprehensive Plan designates this

property as Rural Area. *Deferred From The October 17, 2000 Planning Commission Meeting. Applicant requests deferral to December 12, 2000 due to changes in the application.*

Public Comment was invited.

There being no public comment, the matter was placed before the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Loewenstein motioned and Mr. Rooker seconded to accept the applicant's request for deferral to December 12, 2000.

SP-2000-52 John Adams (Triton PCS) (Sign #61, 62 & 63) - Request for special use permit to allow a personal wireless facility, including a 91 foot high wooden pole, antennas, and ground equipment on a 30' by 30' lease area, in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for microwave and radio-wave transmission and relay towers. The property, described as Tax Map 59 Parcel 20, contains 140.982 acres, and is located in the Samuel Miller Magisterial District 785 Verdant Lawn Lane, west of Rt. 250 and Rt. 677. The property is zoned RA Rural Area. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area. *Deferred from the October 17, 2000 Planning Commission Meeting. Applicant requests deferral to December 12, 2000 due to changes in the application.*

Mr. Benish noted that staff is requesting indefinite deferral.

Public Comment was invited.

There being no public comment, the matter was placed before the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker motioned and Mr. Craddock seconded to accept the applicant's request for indefinite deferral.

ZMA-2000-008 Dunlora Phase 4B Rivercreek (Sign # 50) - Request to rezone 5.279 acres from RA to R-4. The property, described as Tax Map 62 Parcel 12 is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District between Dunlora Drive and Free State Road approximately 1/2 mile from the intersection of the railroad tracks and Free State Road. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Density Residential for 3 - 6 dwelling units per acre in Neighborhood 2. *Deferred from the November 14, 2000 Planning Commission meeting. Applicant requests deferral to December 19, 2000.*

Public Comment was invited.

There being no public comment, the matter was placed before the Commission.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker motioned and Mr. Rieley seconded to accept the applicant's request for deferral to December 19, 2000.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the deferral of SP-2000-52 should be by applicant's request because the information is not going to be available. The applicant is aware and agreeable.

Mr. Kamptner stated that the motion should be at least with the consent of the applicant.

MOTION: SP-2000-52 Adams – Mr. Rooker moved for reconsideration. Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

MOTION: Mr. Rooker moved for indefinite deferral. Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Rieley asked if the order of the agenda could be switched.

Mr. Finley questioned the number of people present to speak on the CPA-2000-05 Rt. 29 – Hollymead

The Commission unanimously decided to switch the order of the agenda, hearing the Home Depot application before the Rt. 29 – Hollymead application.

Public Hearing Items:

SDP 00-119 The Home Depot at Northtown Center Preliminary Site Plan - Request for preliminary site plan approval to allow construction of a 130,184 square feet building for retail sales, on approximately 15.9 acres, zoned HC (Highway Commercial) and EC (Entrance Corridor). The property, described as Tax Map 45-Parcels 110, 110A, 111, 111A and 111B is located on the east side of Route 29 North, approximately 1/2 mile north of the Rio Road intersection. This site is located in the Rio Magisterial District and is designated as Regional Service in Urban Neighborhood 2.

Mr. Waller presented the staff report. He stated that the request is for approval of a site plan to allow construction of a 130,184 square foot retail sales store on approximately 15.9 wooded acres, zoned Highway Commercial. The applicant is also requesting Planning Commission approval to waive or modify certain provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. This includes a critical slope waiver which would allow fill and construction activity in areas containing critical slopes; a waiver of the 20 foot residential buffer which would allow construction of a screening fence within some areas of the buffer and a modification allowing reduction in the number of required loading spaces.

Mr. Waller stated that staff recommends approval of these items with the conditions that are listed in the Staff Report. He also suggested that because the property owner has been sited in violation of several dump sites that are scattered throughout the property

and because the clearing of some of those materials would require some additional disturbance in the buffer, should the Commission choose to approve the waiver to allow disturbance within the buffer that it also include an additional condition that requires that if any trees of more than six inches (stet) in caliber are required to be removed in order to remove some of the larger debris and materials from the buffer area that those trees be replaced with evergreen trees of at least 6 feet tall in height.

Mr. Waller went on to state that the Site Review Committee has reviewed the preliminary site plan for compliance with the minimum requirements of the Ordinance and recommends approval of this proposal if the Commission finds it appropriate to approve the required waivers and modifications. He noted that additional information is provided in the staff report and that representatives from the Site Review Committee are also present to help answer any further questions.

Mr. Finley noted that this is a review of site plan and questioned whether or not the Commission would be sticking to the issues of the waivers noting that letters are receiving addressing many different issues.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the staff report spells out what is under consideration. He also noted that the staff report notes other things that have been raised but the matters that are under the ordinance for site plan review are in the staff report, the waivers and the site plan itself.

Mr. Rooker questioned information on page 4 of the staff report and read the following *The Site Review Committee has attempted to address the concerns of the neighbors by utilizing the requirements that are available through the site review process. In certain instances where existing regulations do not provide staff with the authority to require the desired changes, staff comments included s recommendations that were made with consideration for the concerns expressed by neighbors. However, Section 32.4.2.3, states that a developer is not obligated to revise a site plan to include recommendations of the Site Review committee, provided that they submit the reasons. in writing, as to why the recommended changes were not made.* He asked if the developer submitted a response in writing that explained why they were not meeting Site Review Committee recommendations.

Mr. Waller answered that the developer had submitted a response in writing and noted that some concerns dealt with neighborhoods, transit, those they choose not to incorporate they explained why. Some might be added at a later point.

Ms. Hopper asked if the lawsuit brought by the homeowners association involved any of the parcels before the Commission.

Mr. Waller answered no. He stated that VDOT has required that the applicant provide a possibility for future access to the parcel in question that reduces the number of points of access to Route 29. He believes that the lawsuit is still before the courts. Staff has

determined that the property is zoned currently but the covenants say that the property can only be used residentially.

Mr. Rooker noted that this is not before the Commission at this time. He asked if there is a depiction of the site with the critical slope areas. He asked if the streams were apparent. He asked that staff point out where the streams run in relationship to the critical slopes.

Mr. Rieley stated that the streams were not shown on the plans.

Mr. Rooker stated that it appeared to him that the streams go through the critical slope area on the NW side of the property and continue through the proposed parking lot and that the corner of the building is over the most active stream. Mr. Rooker stated that the streams as he understands the proposal would be covered over, the streambeds would be eliminated and the areas around the streams would be filled in and the water would be piped.

Mr. Waller answered yes.

Mr. Finley asked where the pond would discharge.

Mr. Jeff Thomas, Engineering Department, stated that it discharges to the natural stream that runs off of the property. He noted that the stream that goes across the property itself will be piped and that the pipe outfalls into a stilling basin, which outfalls into the natural stream off the property.

Mr. Rooker asked where the water goes once it enters the natural stream.

Mr. Thomas stated that he believed it headed northward to Carrsbrook and towards the South Fork

Mr. Craddock clarified that the stream would be piped on the entire property.

Mr. Jeff Thomas confirmed this.

Mr. Finley asked if the minimum slope would be 2.5, the slope of any fill slopes.

Mr. Jeff Thomas stated that the steepest slope allowed is 2:1.

Ms Hopper stated that in Section 32.5, sub 32.65(f) it states that on a site plan there should be designated the name and location of all the watercourses and other bodies of water adjacent to or on the site. She stated that she did not see this on the site plan.

Mr. Waller stated that as far as showing that, in the site plan regulations it speaks to all topographic features within 50' of the property line.

Mr. Rieley noted that the streams that converge into one stream and run through the middle of the site are mentioned numerous times in this application. The staff report, the applicant mentions the two streams. He asked which of the sheets in the package shows the stream and why this should be regarded as a complete application if it does not show something as fundamental as the stream that runs through the middle of the site.

Mr. Rooker noted that he didn't see the stream either and that there are wetlands on the property that are not identified.

Mr. Waller stated that the wetlands are not identified on the national inventory and the applicant has been required by Army Corp of Engineers and the State Department of Environmental Quality to inventory those streams. They had been inventoried before and had received a permit in 1994 to disturb those wetlands. Because some regulations have change a new inventory is required.

Ms Hopper stated that it seemed to her that to get the criteria that she mentioned in the preliminary site plan requirement that the inventory would have to happen before the site plan requirements could be met.

Mr. Rooker said that he could not imagine the preliminary site plan without any designation of streams and wetlands existing on the property as being a complete preliminary site plan.

Mr. Waller noted that this is how it was carried before, where staff went with the knowledge of the inventory of the wetlands and without the permit being approved that staff cannot approve the final site plan. Both processes, the inventorying of the wetlands and the review of the site plan have gone together because there is no mention of the wetlands in review of the site plan ordinance.

Mr. Rooker stated that what happened before, with respect to this property is irrelevant. A new application is before the Commission for an entirely new proposed development. The Commission wants to make certain that the requirements are being met today, at this time.

Mr. Waller stated that he understood Mr. Rooker's position and that this was mainly a policy decision on staff's behalf to be consistent.

Mr. Rieley summed up that everyone acknowledges that the streams are not shown on the plan. And that everyone also acknowledges the wetlands on the site are not shown on the site plan.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that he felt that there is not a complete preliminary site plan before the Commission.

Mr. Waller stated that the wetlands are not inventoried on the Department of Interiors maps or our maps.

Ms. Hopper stated that the preliminary site plan is prematurely before the Commission because that requirement is not done.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that the streams, may not be on the plan, but the topography does indicate the stream.

Mr. Rieley noted that the topography shows the landform, not the location of the stream. Indicates the type of form.

Mr. Jeff Thomas stated that the topography should indicate the streams.

Mr. Rieley stated that topography indicates landform not a water feature.

Mr. Jeff Thomas noted that it does indicate the low spots.

Mr. Rieley asked Mr. Thomas if he was suggesting that this shows the plans showed the stream.

Mr. Thomas said that he was just pointing out that you can approximate where the streams are for your own information.

Mr. Finley stated that he understood that the developer can not get an approved site plan until they have approval from the Corp of Engineers and DEQ.

Mr. Waller stated that staff has gone on site with Jim Brogden, US Army Corps of Engineers. However, as far as the permitting process, the applicant must approach the Corp of Engineers and DEQ. This is a case where without the permit in hand the applicant cannot get the site plan approved.

Mr. Rooker noted that the County has its own requirements that are independent of the requirements of the Corp of Engineers and DEQ and the Commission needs to make sure that the preliminary site plan meets those requirements regardless of what may happen later with the Corp of Engineers and DEQ.

Mr. Finley noted that he noticed that in the legend there is no indicator of a stream.

Mr. Rieley noted that you can determine a ravine or a place where you might find a stream, but if there is no stream labeled and no stream shown on the plan. He stated that this is a serious omission.

Ms. Hopper noted that every ravine does not have a stream in it.

Mr. Finley asked whether the Commission felt that it should proceed or not.

Mr. Thomas stated that with respect to Mr. Waller's earlier statements about a road cut into the property north of the site, it was a recommendation by VDOT, not a requirement.

Mr. Waller agreed that it was a recommendation and that the purpose was to show that it could be done. Mr. Waller went on to note that this is a road coming off of the entrance at the light to the Home Depot site and provides access to the north.

Mr. Finley clarified that VDOT said that it would be desirable but not required.

Mr. Waller confirmed that VDOT is not requiring them to construct the road cut, however, they won't provide a permit to enter onto Rt. 29 directly from this site and they would not provide a permit to enter onto Carrsbrook Drive. This is a way of managing the points of access to Route 29 and to Carrsbrook Drive.

Mr. Rieley noted that there is a statement on page 6 of the staff report that is echoed in some of the correspondence from the ARB that says that the critical slopes that are proposed for disturbance cannot be seen without having access to the interior portions of the site. He asked how Mr. Waller reconciles this with the drawing that shows the critical slopes coming right up to the edge of Route 29 and in fact the trees on those critical slopes are the only thing that obscure the views completely into the site so that you can see the rest of the critical slopes.

Mr. Waller answered that the closer critical slopes are the ones associated with the VDOT basin.

Mr. Thomas refers to the plans to show that the basin is between the shaded areas. The 'U" shape is a knoll that goes up and then back down.

Mr. Finley noted that the contour out to Rt. 29 is 460 and the critical slope is down about 450. There is about a 10' difference.

Mr. Rieley noted that one would be looking straight at the trees.

Mr. Rooker stated that a good part of the critical slopes are in the entrance corridor and can be seen from the entrance corridor and might provide an aesthetic resource with respect to the entrance corridor.

Mr. Waller requested this go back to the ARB and staff spoke to Marcia Joseph who is on the ARB and none of the critical slopes will be visible from the EC. This will be presented to the ARB on December 4th to make sure that they are aware of the Commission's concerns.

Mr. Rooker read the following from the staff report "Staff recognizes that a development of the size proposed with this preliminary site plan would result in the clearing of a large area containing many mature trees. It is the staff's opinion that the wooded site clearly provides an amenity. However, none of the critical slopes proposed for disturbance are located in the buffer area, and in order to see these critical slopes, one must have access to the interior portions of the site." He noted that this seems to speak to the site as though you were looking at it from the east side. That the only way you would view the critical slopes from the east side is if they were disturbing slopes within the buffer area. If one were on the Entrance Corridor, Route 29 looking east toward the property, there is a perfect view of the critical slope area in front of the proposed building site.

Mr. Waller noted that the direction taken by staff is that the guiding tool for the loss of aesthetic appeal is the Open Space Plan Composite Map, which was approved to identify critical resources in the Growth Areas as far as open space resources.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there is the provision for judging critical slope waiver based on engineering considerations, environmental considerations and aesthetics. In trying to determine whether or not a critical slope is an aesthetic resource staff identifies: (1) whether or not it has been identified in the Open Space Plan; (2) if in an Entrance Corridor has it been identified as an aesthetic resource by the ARB. Having visibility in and of itself has not been a determining factor, but the fact of whether that visibility is of a resource that has been identified by the Open Space Plan or the ARB. The Commission needs to make the judgement as to whether or not that visible critical slope is an aesthetic resource.

Mr. Thomas stated that the aesthetic resource would be lost when all of the trees were removed and expose the two residential sections. He asked if when reviewing critical slopes, did staff take into consideration the environmental impact and questioned the reduction of runoff.

Mr. Jeff Thomas, stated that during construction an Erosion Control Plan that meets state erosion control standards would be required. The state erosion control manual stated that even the best measures, which would be a siltation basin, are only 60% effective. He noted that the applicant is proposing a detention basin and storm scepters.

Mr. Thomas asked who is responsible for runoff once the project is complete.

Mr. Finley stated that the owner would be responsible for maintaining the detention pond on-site.

Mr. Rooker noted concerns with runoff downstream, pointing out that it is not the responsibility of the developer to take care of the problem that may occur downstream.

Ms. Hopper stated that on a site that is going to disturb critical slopes, 60% erosion control measures is not sufficient and, hence increases the problems of siltation and runoff.

Mr. Jeff Thomas stated there will be impacts from this development, which may be mitigated. He pointed out that state standards will be enforced.

Mr. Rieley asked Mr. Thomas what would be used as a runoff factor for the site, noting that the site is wooded with rolling terran.

Mr. Jeff Thomas stated that .35 would be used as a runoff factor for this site.

Mr. Rieley and Mr. Thomas agreed that a runoff co-efficient of .95 would be appropriate for post-development state.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that this land will become 76% impervious surface and 24% non-impervious surface. He pointed out that in response to the neighbors concerns, the applicant stated that because of compliance with the County's ordinance, the runoff would be no greater than in predevelopment state and, in fact, the water quality would be improved. He coefficient of runoff is a better indicator of water leaving the site.. The ordinance deals only with peak runoff and velocity, it does not deal with the total amount of water. More than double the amount of water will come off this site in a post development state than a pre-development state.

Mr. Finley pointed out that the runoff from this site would go into the detention pond.

Mr. Rieley explained that the detention pond takes the peak flow and spreads it out a little bit. There are a lot of hydrologists that think the stormwater detention ponds sometimes do more harm than good because they ignore the fact that there is more water. He felt the Commission should look at this long term for development in the development areas. It is important on this site because of the concerns of the neighbors that they will get more water downstream is well founded.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that there are two roads below the stream that are inundated with periodic flooding.

Mr. Finley ascertained that the stormwater control regulations means that there will be double the volume from this development. He also pointed out that the Commission must review this proposal according to ordinance requirements.

Mr. Finley ascertained that there will be a fence around the development, either on the property line or on the buffer. It will be up to the property owner to decide whether the fence goes on the property line.

Mr. Waller stated that a condition for approval of this proposal requires documentation that the consent of the abutting property owner has been obtained in any of the areas where the fence will be located on an adjacent residential property line.

Mr. Finley noted that there is a limitation on the size of trees that could be cut in order to put in the fence.

Mr. Thomas questioned the difference in the elevation at the right rear corner of the building to the top of the hill behind the Carrsbrook residence.

Mr. Waller replied that the elevation is approximately 25' from the ground up.

Mr. Thomas stated that the fence would be more effective at the top of the hill. He also questioned the distance from the property line to the door of the houses in the corner

Mr. Waller pointed out that this information has been requested from the applicant. The applicant has been requested to show the approximate location of the houses using an aerial map. The applicant indicated that they would provide this with the final site plan as well as the landscaping plan

Mr. Thomas stated that the landscape plan for the undisturbed buffer area has not been provided.

Mr. Waller pointed out that the landscape plan is a condition of approval for the final site plan. He pointed out that when a site plan is in the Entrance Corridor, the ARB has stringent requirements.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were any requirements, which would require landscaping along the fencing area that would help screen the houses from the site.

Mr. Waller stated that the location of the existing trees in the buffer would have to be identified, noting that these are the main landscaping materials.

Ms Hopper pointed out that one requirement of Section 32.5(p) states that in order to have the requirements met of a preliminary site plan, a landscape plan is required. .

Mr. Waller replied that a landscape plan is required for preliminary plan approval if more than 80% of the site is impervious area. Because the site plan does not show that there will be more than 80% impervious area, the landscape plan will be required for final site plan approval. He also noted that the ARB will review this plan on December 4th.

Mr. Rooker ascertained that this plan includes recommendations noted by the ARB. He asked for information on the retaining wall on the north side of the property, i.e. – height, proposed materials.

Mr. Waller stated that during the ARB's review of this it was pointed out that the retaining wall may be terraced

Mr. Loewenstein ascertained that the retailing wall will not be visible from Carrsbrook Drive.

Mr. Finley pointed out that there are two fences, one fence will be on the outside of the retaining wall and between the residential properties.

Mr. Rooker asked if the fence would obscure the view of the retaining wall from the adjacent properties.

Mr. Rieley stated that the fence is only 6' tall, pointing out that the road goes down at a substantial gradient. This is a huge wall and there is no way a 6' fence would obscure this wall

Mr. Rooker asked if this particular wall was within the ambient of the ARB. Is this wall being given the same treatment as a wall that is subject to the ARB jurisdiction?

Mr. Waller stated that the Engineering Department reviews the retaining walls and ensures that the retaining wall is effective.

Mr. Rooker stated that the limitation of the Engineering Departments review of the retaining wall is whether or not it performs an engineering function, not the aesthetics of the wall.

Ms. Hopper questioned the height of the wall at the rear of the property and asked if it will be terraced.

Mr. Waller replied that the wall is now shown as being terraced.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the finished floor elevation is 465'

Mr. Waller stated that the building height is 35'.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that the top of the building would be about 500'.

Ms. Hopper pointed out that the retaining wall and the stormwater basins are safety issues. She noted that it is the charge of this Commission to look at the safety issues. She asked how the safety around a 20' retaining wall is being addressed.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that this would be handled by the Department of Building Codes & Zoning Services. At this height railings would be required.

Mr. Waller pointed out that the Engineering Department comments note that safety issues around the detention pond will be part of the final site plan review.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be a fence along the top of the retaining wall, on the northeast corner.

Mr. Waller stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires screening of outdoor storage areas. A storage area is proposed along the top of the retaining wall. Fencing of these areas has been required.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that there is a natural fall going back toward the residential area; which will be replaced by the retaining wall

Mr. Waller pointed out that property to the south of Woodbrook is at a higher elevation than this site edge, but homes at Carrsbrook will be on a lower elevation than this site. He noted that the 480' contours are to the south of the property as you look at Rt. 29.

Mr. Rieley stated that the site plan is disconcerting, noting that the grades are shown incorrectly on the retaining walls. An accurate depiction of the wall configuration has not been provided.

Mr. Waller stated that this was a comment of the Design Planner as well. He pointed out that the applicant provided spot elevations, which allowed the engineering department to determine the height of the retaining walls

Ms. Hopper asked if a traffic study would be undertaken.

Mr. Waller stated that a traffic study will not be undertaken. He pointed out that VDOT gave the applicant two options (1) provide a traffic study to show why they were justified In providing a right in right out on the southern most entrance; or (2) close the entrance to allow the right in only. The applicant decided to close the entrance to allow the right in only.

Mr. Hopper noted that that according to letters provided by residents, this site will generate 8,000 vehicle trips per day. She asked if any projection regarding the number of vehicle trips per day had provided.

Mr. Waller stated that VDOT has not provided any projections regarding the amount of traffic that would be generated.

Ms Hopper asked if there were any proposals to create traffic calming throughout the Carrsbrook neighborhood.

Mr. Waller stated that he was not sure if any proposals have been made. One of the residents indicated that he has tried to get VDOT out to the site several times. He stated that he was unsure if there is any way VDOT can restrict through traffic.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that in consideration of possible areas for traffic calming, Carrsbrook was an included area. It does not qualify under VDOT's traffic calming program requirements. This would be a separate issue from this site plan because this site plan can't require off-site improvements or off-site alterations to roads.

Mr. Thomas ascertained that the road has to be a certain width, noting the curve and speed limit .

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that the speed limit is a factor where you can do traffic calming or where you can take certain measures to deal with cut through traffic which is a separate program of VDOT.

Mr. Waller stated that VDOT has pointed out that there is no indication that this road will increase the cut through traffic.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that in consideration of a site plan, from a transportation improvement aspect, you can only deal with what is generated directly at the site and improvements at the site on the public transportation network. VDOT would not get into off site cut through possibilities, because it is not a matter than can be considered as part of this review.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that staff is recommending that the applicant increase the width of the buffer in order to provide additional screening from the adjoining residential properties. He noted that the buffer is the minimum required by law. He asked if there was some latitude in the degree to which the County can insist on wider than the absolute buffer.

Mr. Waller stated that in reviewing the landscape plan, a taller fence could be required, but the 6' minimum fence was shown on the site plan

Mr. Rieley asked if staff felt they could insist on more than the absolute minimum buffer.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that staff could require changes in the height of the fence, material used, landscaping material, but the widening of the buffer is not possible.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the Commission would like a fence that is aesthetically pleasing and is tall enough to provide screening for the homes that back up to this property.

Mr. Cilimberg stated the fence is subject to ARB approval, which will require a fence that is aesthetically pleasing and consistent throughout the site. If the Commission felt a higher fence is necessary due to visibility and buffering considerations, this should be specified.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that this will be a tall fence and questioned how this could be made visually appealing.

Mr. Thomas stated that perhaps this should be a combination of the trees and fence. He would rather more trees be added to screen these residential sites.

Mr. Rooker stated that with respect to buffer areas, even though the minimum is 20', it is important to prevent disturbance within a reasonable distance of the buffered area in order to make certain that the roots of the trees providing the buffers are not excavated. He suggested that the agent make certain that excavation in the areas adjacent to the buffer area does not result in killing the trees that provide the buffer.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that this is a waiver for disturbance so disturbance will be occurring.

Mr. Rooker stated that the disturbance is only for the fence. He noted his concern for excavation immediately outside the buffer area.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that the trees in area are close to the buffer.

Mr. Waller pointed out that the first site plan received on this proposal had the building so that the side was facing Rt. 29 and the larger part of the rear of the building was close to the Woodbrook property line.

Mr. Finley ascertained that most of the trees in the buffer area are existing trees.

Mr. Waller suggested the following language for disturbance outside the buffer area "any trees within 10' of the buffer line were to die within five years, they would have to be replaced with red cedar or white pine."

Ms. Hopper stated that according to the buffer waiver, each neighbor could choose whether he or she wanted the screening fence in or out of the buffer area.

Mr. Waller stated that the applicant met with some of the neighbors and there seemed to be different ideas for the location of the fence. Some wanted the buffer on the other side of the fence and away from their property. He noted that the applicant has the option of building the fence outside the buffer and not requesting a waiver.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that this will be left to the adjacent property owners to work with the developer to locate the fence.

Mr. Rieley stated that the location of the fence and its configuration is important to approval of this site plan.

Mr. Craddock questioned the designation of the outparcel.

Mr. Waller stated that the applicant has indicated that they want to separate this parcel as an outparcel unto itself. A separate site plan would be required for the outparcel.

Mr. Thomas questioned the number of parking spaces provided.

Mr. Waller replied that 514 parking spaces are provided.

Ms. Hopper stated that the Engineering Department's review of the preliminary site plan,had many suggestions for improvements.

Mr. Waller replied that with the preliminary site plan requirements the applicant is only required to meet the minimum standards. Further review of landscaping, stormwater detention system is part of the final site plan process

Mr. Loewenstein stated that he felt the Commission should see the final site plan

Public comment was invited.

Randy Royal stated that the retaining wall is cut in on the south side adjacent to the neighborhood and goes up 25' using the fence and trees for buffer. The fence is 6; 31' above the floor of the building. Regarding the proximity to Carrsbrook, the closest neighbor is 500' from the site; others are at least 900' away.

Bill Oswald stated that 40' is an average height to the top of the parapet. A site line study would need to be undertaken to determine how this varies with each house.

Mr. Royal stated that trees on site range from 24" oaks to 30-40' trees. The issue of critical slopes has been discussed. He noted that this site was previously approved for critical slopes waiver. Erosion control and engineering measures have been addressed. Runoff can not be 100% controlled, but the effectiveness of the measures on the site can be addressed. As far as drainage, the volume will increase. The only way to stop the volume of water from increasing is to completely stop development. The ponds would not be doubled, but physical measures such as silt fence, etc. would be addressed. There will be a fence on top of the retaining wall and around the detention pond. If there is a concern about the location of the fence, we will withdraw the waiver request. He noted that only 4 loading spaces are required. He pointed out that they have met with staff, civic leagues, and the ARB. The stream can be shown on the preliminary site plan. They have met with the Corps of Engineers who have established a mitigation site. Delineation of the wetlands can be shown on the plan. He asked that the Commission provide a complete list of their requirements.

Mr. Thomas asked why the applicant was opposed to a bus stop.

Mr. Royal stated that he had no objection to a bus top in front of the property, but to put a bus stop within the site and encourage buses to go through the property, they could not agree with this. He pointed out that the loading area is limited to the back of the property.

Mr. Finley asked if there was any public comment.

Glenda Forest, a resident of Carrsbrook Drive, stated that it is her understanding that this body has the discretion to deny the critical slopes waiver. The site is hilly, with ravines and hardwood trees. She asked where the water would go from this site. She noted that the proposal to pipe the stream to the lower area of the site. She noted that the area between the two sides of the lake often floods. The road is slippery and there is nothing to absorb it. This land was not designated as open area or an aesthetic treasure, but it is the only wooded area south of the bridge. It would be advantageous aesthetically and for the quality of life in Albemarle County to forego this variance and say no to this development.

Lois Rochester stated that she would like to address the water issue. It is apparent that our streams and ponds will be negatively impacted by this development both during construction and subsequently. There will be additional silt, which will be a permanent addition to the neighborhood. No one is responsible for taking care of this. Another issue is the increased volume of water, nobody has addressed the question of what is in the water coming into our streams and ponds. She asked for denial of the critical slopes waiver. If the Commission feels they can not deny this waiver, at least postpone discussion until the survey of the wetlands and other information can be provided.

Buck Sigavore stated that the Planning Commission is at a historical moment—whether they will approve the site plan with minor adjustments or the Commission will raise the basic fundamental question of human rights. Mainly whether a property owner has the right to make a project such that it generates consequences for which they will not take responsibility. He stated that it is abundantly clear that water runoff will be a problem.

Edie Turner noted her concern with the critical slopes and possible harm to the environment, ponds and wetlands. She noted that the previously approved request for critical slopes was for a smaller building. Therefore, she did not feel that argument applies. This building is much larger. She felt a meeting with VDOT is necessary to address the traffic lanes. Residents of the area do not want more traffic on Carrsbrook Drive.

Dennis Mills, member of the Woodbrook Community Association, stated that they do not want Home depot on this site. They are using a maximum number of parking spaces and no more buffer can be given due to the size of the building. He asked the Commission to deny the critical slope waiver request because it will destroy the streams, ponds in Woodbrook and will effect the quality of life for the people of Woodbrook and Carrsbrook.

Tom Bancroft stated that he lives above the right retaining pond and will be looking down on Home Depot. Mr. Wood has the right to make money on his property, but this proposal does not fit the site. He pointed out that Lowe's built one building and then replaced it with one that accommodates the community. He noted the number of

parking space, the type of business that is being proposed by Home Depot. When it is time for Home Depot to expand, they will relocate, leaving another empty building.

Sid Wood stated that he met with Mr. Wood and several homeowners in the area. They walked the buffer zone, talked about the fencing and trees, Some of the homeowners wanted the fence to be put on their property and others wanted it on the other side of the buffer zone. At the last meeting Home Depot was reluctant to take care of the maintenance of fence if the fence was located on adjacent property and they preferred that the fence not be built on adjacent property. There is concern with the 6' fence; a 6' fence will not provide any screening. An 8' fence would be acceptable. He asked that the Commission take steps to protect the oaks located in the buffer zone.

Peter Croft stated his concern with the scale of this development. The community does not need to support profit mode. There is concern regarding approval of the critical slope waiver. He questioned the need for the outlot. A 100' buffer as a development requirement and take care of the water problems would down sized this to an appropriate scale.

Mr. Royal stated that they are before the Commission for Code compliance, pointing out that they have asked for three waivers. All the necessary engineering items and impacts for the critical waiver has been addressed. He asked that the Commission provide a complete list of their requirements.

Public hearing closed.

Mr. Loewenstein questioned the timetable for this project.

Mr. Waller stated that the schedule was suspended at the request of the applicant. He did not feel that the Commission was restricted by a timetable at this point.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that once the proposal was reinstated the time clock started again. He pointed out that the applicant has stated that they would accept deferral if the Commission outlined particular points that they could address. If the applicant agrees to a deferral, the time clock is not a factor.

Mr. Finley pointed out that Rt. 29 drains on this property now. He noted that there would be a considerable amount of runoff from this site. He did not know if the net runoff increase would be serious.

Mr. Loewenstein noted that the engineering representative (Mr. Thomas) stated that runoff post construction could double from this site into the drainage areas.

Ms. Hopper pointed out that there is 76% impervious surface.

Mr. Rooker noted that there are two concerns (1) offsite water going through the site and (2) water generated at this site

Mr. Rieley felt that both concerns are important. Because of the degradation upstream and the damage done to the downstream neighborhood it is important to treat this site carefully. He noted the importance of understanding the upstream areas and small branches and how vital they are too the health of the entire water system. The fundamental environmental issues relative to this project hinge on the critical slope waiver. It is clearly an aesthetic resource. This is last wooded section south of the bridge; it is highly visibly. There is a correlation between the protection of the stream and the critical slopes. He read the following description of the importance of smaller streams: "riparian areas along smaller streams need and deserve at least as much protection as those along large rivers. It is equally, if not more important, from a scientific perspective to preserve corridors of natural vegetation along the small brooks and streams as it is to maintain them along the larger rivers. The water quantity and quality of mainstream rivers is largely determined by what they receive from the many smaller tributaries. Many of the degrading impacts of development encroachment on riparian areas along these tributaries are carried downstream and often amplified once they drain into the larger mainstream rivers. On the other hand tributaries with relatively undisturbed riparian vegetation contribute steadily amounts of cool clean water to the main streams and provide organic matter needed by aquatic organisms downstream. In addition, the fragility of riparian areas is often accentuated in small headwater stream regions. These small streams are the most vulnerable to human disturbance because they respond dramatically and rapidly to alterations on adjacent lands and are the most sensitive to changes in riparian vegetation in the surrounding watershed." He stated that he would feel terrible about degrading the watershed and adding to problems downstream, running through an established neighborhood, when it is within our discretionary power to do something about this. . This site has been zoned HC for a long time and is an appropriate use. Businesses in the scale of the others businesses between Seminole Square and the bridge can fit onto this site and provide a reasonable use of the property without negatively affecting the watershed and without disturbing critical slopes. He stated that the felt the Commission could not grant the critical slopes because of its connection to the streams and its loss of aesthetic resource. He noted that it would be silly to approve a site plan that can't be built without the critical slopes waiver.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that it is clear that planning in this general area did not result in conservation of appropriate water resources and the problems that exist now are, in a large part, directly connected. He felt the Commission has an obligation to prevent it from being worse. He agreed with Mr. Rieley that the Commission should not grant the critical slopes waiver.

Mr. Finley stated that the applicant should be allowed to use the site.

Mr. Rieley stated that the only use that you could not put on this site and make it work with the streams and slopes is a big box development

Ms. Hopper noted that the owner could still make use of the highway commercial zoning in some other way.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that the highway commercial designation does really lend itself to numerous smaller-scale uses. He felt there is no way to get something of this scale onto this particular site without creating damage.

Mr. Rooker stated that he felt the site was properly zoned and can be use within that zoning in a way that does not require the significant disturbance of critical slopes. There is an aesthetic resource being impacted--the stream—water quality treatment attributes. The wooded hillside, the only wooded area south of the bridge is an aesthetic resource. He noted the Water Quality Ordinance speaks to the management of stream buffers and perennial steams, etc. Stream buffer is defined as "an area of land at or near a tributary stream bank and/or a non-tidal wetland that has a water quality value due to the ecological and biological process that it performs or is otherwise sensitive to changes that which may result to significant degradation to the quality of state waters." He felt this stream and buffer meets this definition. He felt varying this stream and destroying the buffer area around the stream may be a violation of the Water Quality Protection Ordinance. At a minimum it is a destruction of an aesthetic resource for purposes of looking at the critical slopes waiver.

Greg Kamptner stated that this stream may be, in fact, a perennial stream. The Water Protection Ordinance does not define perennial streams this way. It has to be shown as a blue line on the USGS map to qualify. With respect to 3.17 which deals with retaining and establishing stream buffers, development areas, perennial streams and the non-tidal wetlands that are adjacent to those perennial streams that are protected for 100'. These particular streams do not meet that definition. It does not mean that they are not resources for purposes of considering critical slope waivers. Our office perspective is that it does not apply in this case. The question as to whether or not Subsection E overrides all the other provisions. It states that each buffer shall be maintained and incorporated into the design that the land development to the fullest extent possible. The problem is that "A" requires that stream buffers either be retained or established if they are perennial streams. If it's not perennial streams you do not have to retain it or establish it. There is no reason why the obligation in "E" to maintain it would apply under the circumstances. Looking at the ordinance as it is currently written, I would prefer that you rely on the other things that you articulated for basis of your decision.

David Hirschman stated that this is a perennial stream. The erosion control inspector has walked this watershed numerous times. He presented a map, which showed the drainage area. He noted that there is substantial piping in the drainage area. The County owns a regional detention basin upstream from this site.

Mr. Rooker noted that his point was that this is functionally a perennial stream

Ms. Hopper noted the siltation factor in the critical slopes ordinance.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that it is the intent of the ordinance to provide for perennial streams.

Mr. Hirschman stated that the Water Protection Ordinance addresses erosion control, stormwater management and stream buffers.

Mr. Finely noted that the stream is piped under Rt. 29.

Mr. Hirschman noted that it is the outfall from the Keglers basin and goes into the existing VDOT basin.

Mr. Finely asked if the upstream basin is being used as a stormwater control basin.

Mr. Hirschman stated that it has been in use as an erosion control basin since the development of Lowes.

Mr. Rooker stated that the plan results in complete destruction of the stream.

Ms. Hopper noted that the siltation problems would be compounded.

Mr. Rooker stated that the wooded areas on Rt. 29 are an aesthetic resource.

Ms. Hopper stated that it was specifically stated by the Architectural Review Board that the critical slopes issues and the aesthetic impacts would be left to the discretion of this Commission. The ARB didn't address this issue.

Mr. Finley stated that he has a problem denying a by-right use because the steam will be covered.

Mr. Rooker stated that this is an appropriate site for a commercial development that is done in a way that won't do as much damage to aesthetic resource. This is not appropriate for a commercial development that reeks as much havoc on the site and destroys the aesthetic resources of the site.

Mr. Rooker moved for denial of the critical slopes waiver request for the following reasons:

- Under Section 4.2.5.2(a), the Commission found that waiver of this critical slopes section of the ordinance would not forward the purposes of the ordinance or otherwise serve the public interest. The critical slopes waiver does not provide alternatives that would satisfy the purposes of Section 4.2 to at least an equivalent degree. This is based on the Commission's conclusions that the volume of the runoff, the siltation, and the desire to protect the streams in proximity to the critical slopes and downstream water quality would not be satisfied by this critical slope waiver. The importance of protecting water quality is identified in the purposes section (section 17-102) of the Water Protection Ordinance.
- Under Section 4.2.5.2(b), which deals with the size, topography, shape of the property or location of the property, the Commission found that there is no unreasonable restriction, because as noted in the staff report, critical slopes

comprise approximately 2.41 acres of a 15+ acre lot. There are other uses that can be made of the property given the location of the critical slopes without disturbing the critical slopes.

- Under Section 4.2.5.2(c), which allows a waiver to be granted if it is found that it would serve a public purpose of greater import than would be served by a strict application of Section 4.2, the Commission found that the waiver would not serve a greater public purpose for all the reasons set forth above.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 6-1.

Mr. Rooker moved for approval of the request for a waiver to allow a reduction in the number of loading spaces:

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Hopper moved for approval of the waiver to allow a fence within the 20-foot undisturbed buffer subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to final site plan approval, the applicant must provide documentation that the consent of the abutting property owner has been obtained in any of the areas where the fence will be located on an adjacent residential property line;
2. No trees of 6" or greater in caliper shall be removed for the purpose of constructing the fence; and,
3. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining the fence in a safe and suitable condition.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Rooker moved for denial of the preliminary site plan for the following reasons:

1. The project would disturb critical slopes and the critical slopes waiver was denied.
2. Failure to comply with Section 32.5.6(f) which requires that the name and location of all watercourses and other bodies of water be identified on the preliminary site plan.
3. Failure to comply with Section 32.5.6(d). The proposed grading to 5-foot contours was inaccurately shown around the retaining walls.
4. Failure to comply with Section 32.5.6(n) which requires that the location and dimensions of proposed fences and other structures be shown (in this case, the fences) on the preliminary site plan.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 6-1.

CPA-2000-05 Rt. 29—Hollymead - Proposal to amend Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan. The proposal is to amend the recommendations for transportation improvements for the Hollymead Community (Development Area).

Mr. Cilimberg stated that before the Commission is the set of recommendations for the Hollymead area; which was also part of the Towne Center proposal. One of the modifications include: (1) ending the western road at Hollymead drive rather than

carrying it thorough Ashwood Boulevard; (2) the addition of references to Profit Road improvements. This has been provided, in draft form, to the Board of Supervisors for their review of the Towne Center.

Mr. Loewenstein clarified that when the Commission is speaking to this comprehensive plan amendment they are speaking not to the Hollymead Town Center definition; instead this amendment applies to the Hollymead Growth Area. This comprehensive plan amendment, therefore, relates to the infrastructure anywhere in this growth area.

Mr. Cilimberg explained that this is additional guidance for the way the transportation system should be developed in this area.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that he would like to see a map of this proposal, pointing out that one was not provided with the staff report. He noted that when considering the new school site, a variety of infrastructure needs was discussed. One issue that was discussed was the possibility of improving the prospect for interconnectivity between the school site and other adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that language regarding interconnectivity exists in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that the Commission has discussed various ideas related to the transportation network. With the expansion of Forest Lakes, there was discussion about reopening the dam road. To what extent will the Commission, in review of this comprehensive plan amendment, be overlooking some of these discussions?

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that with the Springridge rezoning one thing that was cited as support for the interconnection of Hollymead and Forest Lakes was the Comprehensive Plan language that already existed. This was used, in fact proffered by the developer, and approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Benish that a network map of proposed interconnectivity has not been done. Staff relies on the language an individual may use. If there are specific connections the Commission wants considered, staff can continue to look at the transportation sections and identify the connections.

Mr. Cilimberg that there used to be a number of small interconnections in the Comprehensive Plan; these were removed as they were not done.

Mr. Loewenstein noted that this is in the Comprehensive Plan, but it does not often occur. There is the opportunity here to articulate the concept.

Mr. Rooker suggested the following language:

- …Improvements related to upgrading Route 29 should be consistent with an overall interconnectivity network of roads that balance the need to serve both the local and regional transportation needs.

Ms. Hopper stated that she felt interconnectivity was an important issue and should be incorporated into this transportation plan.

Mr. Rooker suggested the following language change:

- The southern end of any western parallel road system shall terminate at a connection with Hollymead Drive extended.

Mr. Rooker also noted that the Commission had discussed a grade separated crossing of Route 29 at some point between Hollymead Drive and Kendalwood Parkway to serve the Towne Center.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it was staff's understanding that this was only if the grade separator at Timberwood and Hollymead Drive could not be accomplished. He noted that the ramps would be substituted with mid point access to get into the parallel road system rather than having ramps at each interchange.

Mr. Rieley suggested deleting the language in the staff report, bullet # 10 on page 2, that speaks to grade separation.

Mr. Rooker made the following recommendations for changes/addition:

- parallel roads to augment Route 29 shall be constructed as an urban cross-section design (curb/gutter) with sidewalks and bike lanes.
- Provide a grade-separated crossing without ramps at Airport Road to accommodate east west vehicular and pedestrian/bike movements.

Mr. Benish noted that the road beside the Post Office Annex could be a small block, but because of the topography it will hit the same road as this intersection.

Mr. Finley asked how park and ride facilities were addressed.

Mr. Benish pointed out that park and ride facilities are shared parking concept

Public comment was invited.

Robert Walters, resident of Hollymead asked the Commission to stop development in this area. He felt that interconnectivity was a bad idea. The road system is inaccurate, but traffic increases in the subdivisions. He noted that the aesthetics of the neighborhoods should be addressed. Traffic belongs on the roads, not on Hollymead Drive. He pointed out that there is less than 50' of visibility on Ravens Road. He noted the following issues: (1) aesthetics is an issue—look at the amount of land remaining in Hollymead that is not developed; (2) traffic should be on Rt. 29, not in the

neighborhoods; (3) safety factors. He again asked the Commission to stop building any access roads in Hollymead.

David Bush, resident of Hollymead, enforced the points made by Mr. Walters. The proposed road forces Hollymead to become a thoroughfare, but brings no benefit to Hollymead. He noted that there is no clear definition of interconnectivity. He felt this was being used by developers as a means to cut through one neighborhood to get access to their property.
Mr. Rooker pointed out that in the Springridge development, the developer owned land at the end of the public road and the Commission could not deny access to his property.

Mr. Bush stated that he understood the Commission could not deny access to the property, however, there was potential access to the property from Proffit Road. He noted that there was the time that Powell Creek and Powell Creek Drive did not connect. Interconnectivity opened the road for the access to Springridge.

Ms. Hopper pointed out that the purpose of interconnectivity is not to let traffic that would not normally travel through the neighborhood have a quicker access somewhere else. Perhaps the Board could address the function/purpose of interconnectivity.

Bruce Appleyard, Transportation and Land Use Planner for the Southern Environmental Law Center, stated that they strongly support many of the recommended transportation improvements for the Hollymead Community as well as the purpose to create vibrant pedestrian friendly improvements. They also support the Neighborhood Model. It is important to view this amendment within the context of VDOT's plan to widen Route 29 and construct frontage roads. If not properly coordinated with the County's Comprehensive Plan, VDOT's proposal threatens to overwhelm this part of the county with underlining development and traffic. For the most part the comprehensive plan amendment goes along way in supporting walkable community supported environment envisioned by DISC. They noted the following concerns: (1) grade separator crossing on Route 29. There is the need for an additional grade separator crossing between Timberwood Boulevard and Hollymead Drive in order to allow access to the proposed Towne Center without impacting Route 29 with additional traffic; (2) location and extent of additional north south roads on the north side of Route 29. The placement and frequency of the distance between intersections will be a major factor in determining the walkability and success of this Towne Center proposal; (3) placing additional frontage roads west of the one proposed by VDOT will lead to a superblock pattern that will encourage sprawling big box development contrary to the stated purpose of this comprehensive plan amendment. Therefore, we recommend removing any reference to a road to the west of the US Post Office and instead specify that any additional north-south roads be placed between the one currently proposed by VDOT and Route 29; (4) the comprehensive plan amendment should clearly state the southern limits of all roads on the western side of Route 29N to prevent them from becoming a high speed off ramp to the proposed 29 bypass or encouraging development outside the designated growth area.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out the location of the proposed crossovers - Airport Road; Timberwood Boulevard and Hollymead Drive.

Mr. Rieley questioned the distance from Timberwood to Hollymead along Rt. 29.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that this was approximately ¾ of a mile. He noted that on the east side of Rt. 29, the frontage owned by the cemetery, which presents limitations for pedestrian/bicycle crossings.

Mr. Appleyard stated that it would be a good idea to put two additional lanes on both sides of the cemetery.

Mr. Rooker stated that based upon the development patterns along the road, consider a grade separator crossing to Route 29 at some point between Hollymead Drive and Timberwood.

Mr. Appleyard perhaps this could be a condition for the widening of Rt. 29 that VDOT is proposing.

Public comment closed.

Mr. Benish read the interconnectivity language that is in the plan: "connections between developments with appropriate scale transportation networks, should be provided to maximize a sense of community and provide for additional transportation links. Connections of multiple developments may be provided through additional recreational facilities, increased public areas, bicycle pedestrian links, and improved public transit. Emergency access and access to schools, parks and other public facilities."

Mr. Hopper stated that the purpose of interconnectivity is not to create a short cut or thoroughfare off of the main highway.

Mr. Rooker moved for approval of the transportation recommendations of the Hollymead Community Profile, as follows:

- Road design and alignment improvements to Route 29 shall be in keeping with the emerging community consisting of a mix of residential neighborhoods, and commercial and employment centers. Improvements related to upgrading Route 29 should be consistent with an overall network of interconnecting roads that balance the need to serve both the local and regional transportation demands.
- Any system of parallel roads to augment Route 29 shall be constructed as an urban cross-section design (curb/gutter) with sidewalks and bike lanes. This creates a system of roads more in keeping with a neighborhood street system and more consistent with the character of the adjacent neighborhoods.
- Recommendations for road design/classification for the parallel roads are taken from the Albemarle County Neighborhood Model as recommended by the Development

Area Initiatives Study Committee (DISC) Report. Road design should be an "Avenue/Residential Blvd," or "Neighborhood Street" design on the eastern parallel road from Polo Grounds Road to Hollymead Drive; a "Main Street" design on the eastern parallel road from the cemetery to Proffit Road; a "Boulevard" or "Main Street" design on the western parallel road system in the proposed Town Center transitioning to "Avenue/Residential Boulevard" or "Main Street" south to Hollymead Drive extended.

- The eastern parallel road system should extend to Polo Grounds Road (Route 643).
- Parallel roads on the western side of Route 29 shall coincide with the road network and design proposed for the Hollymead Town Center area.
- The southern end of any western parallel road system shall terminate at a connection with Hollymead Drive Extended.
- Hollymead Drive and Timberwood Parkway should be designed with grade-separated crossings of Route 29, without ramps, to connect with the road system on the western side of Route 29 and accommodate east-west vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle movements.
- Provide a grade-separated crossing without ramps at Airport Road to accommodate east-west vehicular and pedestrian/bike movements. Pedestrian and bike facilities should be provided on the crossing.
- Based on development patterns east of Route 29, provide grade separated bicycle/pedestrian overpasses/underpasses to accommodate east-west movement.
- East-west connecting roads should be curb/gutter design (sidewalks/ bike lanes) and the design should be "Avenue/Residential Boulevard" or "Main Street" design.
- In the long term, consider establishing an east-west connection from Route 29 to Earlysville Road (Route 743) as recommended in the Charlottesville Area Transportation Study (CATS) by extending Hollymead Drive to Earlysville Road. This road location and design should be coordinated with the relocation of Dickerson Road (Route 606).
- Intermediate accesses, without crossovers, from the parallel roads to the Route 29 should be provided on the east and west sides between Ashwood Boulevard and Timberwood Boulevard.
- Stop east parallel road at Hollymead Drive and access undeveloped land north of Hollymead directly from Route 29, without a crossover. This will avoid significant impact to existing homes in Hollymead.
- Proffit Road (Route 649) shall be constructed with a "Neighborhood Street" design from Worth Crossing to Lanford Hills Drive, including sidewalks and bikelanes. The section from Route 29 to Worth Crossing shall be designed in a manner necessary to accommodate transition to the ultimate improvements to Route 29 and Airport Road. A major upgrade of Proffit Road east of Lanford Hills to Route 20 is not recommended; however, minimal spot safety improvements may be appropriate in certain locations.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Janice C. Farrar, Department of Planning & Community Development Assistant.