Albemarle County Planning Commission
December 5, 2000

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, December 5, 2000 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were: Mr. William Finley, Chairman; Mr. Dennis Rooker, Vice-Chairman;; 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; David Benish, Chief of Planning & Community Development, Mr. Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney; Mrs. Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Lee Catlin, and Mr. Juandiego Wade, Transportation Planner. Absent from the meeting was Pete Craddock.

A quorum was established and the meeting called to order.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public – None were offered and the meeting proceeded.

Neighborhood Model – Review draft two in anticipation of Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Ms. Catlin reviewed the Planning Commission's action to date on the Neighborhood Model and asked Mrs. Echols to begin taking the Commission through the changes. The Commission reviewed Sections 1 thorough 5 of the Neighborhood Model and made the following changes:

Page 4 Centers religious buildings (including but not limited to churches, temples, mosques, and synagogues) use this reference throughout

Page 17 Consistent with page 84

Page 19 Space between high density and areas

Page 18 "Like squares, plazas and greens, streets are like public rooms." (new sentence)

Page 22 Second column/first bullet – will instead of may

Page 22 Edit caption – move "potential"

Page 7 # 2 substitute "experience"

Page 16 "Will" changed to "can"

Page 7 Add color after Neighborhood Model

Page 13 Reduced Cost - Restate 1st sentence in more general terms

Page 15 Figure 2:14 eliminated or replaced

Page 16 Eliminate sentence "A center may be a …"
Eliminate "The center should be located within …" with last sentence in 1st column (consistent with page 77)
COMBINE THE ABOVE CHANGES INTO ONE PARAGRAPH

Page 20 Figure 2:25 residents of the adjacent community do not have convenient access to shopping center:

Page 21 "Under most zoning ordinances. . ." for first sentence

Page 24 Instead development <u>often</u> takes place, delete certainly

Page 6 "The principal vehicle for affecting change in development practices . . . will be The Neighborhood Model"

Page 7 Delete "away"
Renumber figures

Page 13 Under reduced water pollution delete last sentence

Page 17 Edit "A person generally is confortable . . ." consistent with page 84

Page 30 Delete first sentence

Page 25 1st bullet – instead of acceptable the desired urban land use model

Page 25 "It shares with these two development <u>models</u>"

Page 27 Under Disadvantages of TND delete 3rd bullet

Page 28 Insert in last bullet "location, frequency or types"

Page 26 Lower case "Edge" and others

Page 31 Caption <u>above</u> graphic

Page 31 Change setback continuum < >

Page 46 Example of "possible" instead of anticipated Pantops Area Example
Table 5:1 – Example of Possible

Page 41 Clean up captions

Work Session - Six Year Secondary Road Plan For 2001-2007 - The purpose of this work session is to provide: (1) Initial overview of the Six Year Road Plan process; (2) General review of the existing projects on the County's priority list of road improvements and potential projects to be considered for inclusion in this year's revision of the list; and (3) Opportunity for Planning Commission to discuss the County's existing priority list or other potential projects/issues.

Mr. Benish noted for the benefit of the Commission that typically they have not held a public hearing on the Six-Year Plan.

Mr. Wade pointed out that there are several members of the public who would like the opportunity to speak.

John Martin, lives on Catteron Road in Free Union, noted that this is the fourth consecutive year that he has appeared before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors requesting that Catterton Road not be paved as it is a beautiful rural country road. He stated that he felt the rural areas should be preserved, pointing out that in his view there is no reason that this road should be paved. He asked that Catterton Road be removed from the Six Year Secondary Road Plan until such time as there is an opportunity to sit down and work out a policy and plan for all secondary roads in the County.

Mr. Finley asked Mr. Martin if he lived on the section of Catterton Road that would be paved.

Mr. Martin stated that he lived approximately 1/8 of a mile from where the paving would stop on Catterton Road. He felt that paving Catterton Road would be a catastrophe and would increase traffic and speeding if it were paved.

Ginger Ashcom stated that she lives on the section of Catterton Road that is scheduled for paving. She suggested straightening the curve and not paving the road. The money that is scheduled for repaving of this road could be used somewhere else in the County. She noted that the majority of people living on Catterton Road do not want it paved. Mr. Utz, from VDOT, stated that there are no plans for the location of the road; this is left up to the bulldozer driver. She reiterated that property owners on this road do not want it paved—they want to keep it a gravel road.

Steve Blaine, representing Thomas Saunders, stated that Mr. Saunders is opposed to paving the road. Mr. Saunders owns one mile of road frontage on Catterton Road and has owned this property for approximately five years. Health and safety issues can be addressed by straightening the curve.

Mr. Wade stated that the purpose of this worksession is to discuss the Six-Year Plan and look at Attachment F, the County's priority for the six-year improvement. VDOT has provided a draft plan based on their financial plan. This year there has been a number of changes not necessarily new roads, pointing out that VDOT has a new way of

estimating projects. This has had a devastating impact on secondary road projects in the County. With regard to Old Ivy Road, the Board of Supervisors essentially told staff that this project has been on the list for many years and then determined if it could be included as part of the bypass project. At this point, staff is recommending that the project remain in the six-year plan.

Mr. Rooker asked if it were possible to have a two-lane component and also have a sidewalk under the bridge. He noted safety concerns in this area.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that VDOT does not have any control of that portion of the right-of-way underneath the bridge.

Mr. Wade pointed out that VDOT has control of the right-of-way under the bridge, but not the bridge itself.

Bill Mills, VDOT representative, indicated that the three lanes will be tapered down to two lanes with a sidewalk on each side. The center lane will be used for turn lane movement.

Mr. Thomas noted concerns with the drainage in this basin area.

Mr. Benish pointed out that the grade of the road might cause complications.

Mr. Rooker asked staff to look carefully at the safety considerations in widening the road.

Mr. Rieley questioned the 7.2 million-dollar figure for the Ivy Road improvement. He suggested obtaining comparative costs of railroad bridge improvement to road improvements for the Old Ivy Road project;

Mr. Wade stated that the Ivy Road Design Study was conducted in 1995. This report indicated that a parallel road was necessary and would require a certain grade. This estimate (7.2 million) was to improve the road and look at the bridge.

Mr. Wade pointed out that the Six-Year Plan includes:

- two requests for unpaved roads
- Some projects were removed from the Six Year Financial Plan because of a cost impact
- VDOT has added 3 new unpaved roads to the six year funding cycle: Rt. 623, Rt. 769 and Rt. 784
- The Board of Supervisors decided to use unpaved road funds for regular projects.

Mr. Rooker asked for clarification regarding the loss of revenue.

Mr. Mills stated that this is not significant for one year, but it is a permanent reduction. This would be approximately an $8,000 per year reduction. He noted that this figure could change from year to year.

Mr. Thomas noted the drainage problems in the area and suggested moving the road.

Mr. Benish pointed out that the railroad runs parallel to Old Ivy Road. VDOT looked at continuing the road and intersecting with Alderman, pointing out that there are significant complications to this. For instance, turning the road to get the maximum width under the abutments takes grading. The land can not be developed until the road is upgraded

Mr. Rooker asked if the Commission could receive a copy of the priority point system

Mr. Benish pointed out that unpaved roads are ranked based on the priority list. Development will not move forward until the property owners have provided full right-of-way.

Mr. Finley noted that on the remaining portion of Catterton Road, the adjacent owners are willing to donate the right[-of[-way. He would like to see this continued through to Rt. 601.

Mr. Benish pointed out that there is a request for the western unpaved section to be in the construction program as a paved project.

Mr. Wade pointed out that projects are on the road improvement list for a long time. He noted that this is a public request and can't be removed by staff. For one project last year, staff met with all the impacted property owners to address the issues and reach a compromise. This can be done on a case-by-case basis. Staff is willing to meet with the residents of Catterton Road and try to reach a compromise. Again, he noted that this is not a project that staff is proposing, but is a public request. This will be removed if so directed by the Board of Supervisors or Planning Commission. He noted that there are some residents that are very dedicated to not wanting this road paved.

Mr. Finley pointed out that the Board of Supervisors elected to keep the Catterton Road project in the six-year plan. He noted that the Planning Commission recommended going forward with this, pointing out that this did not include Rt. 601.

Mr. Wade pointed out that the Commission needs to decide if they want to hold another work session. If the Commission chooses not to hold another worksession, then they are forwarding the Six Year Secondary Road Plan to the Board of Supervisors suggesting that (1) staff meet with the residents of Catterton Road and attempt to reach some compromise; and (2) recommend that the Catterton Road project stay in the plan.

Mr. Finley suggested including a spot improvement/paved shoulder project for Barracks/Garth Road.

Mr. Rooker suggested that with respect to the Catterton Road project the Commission recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they consider using a public informational meeting approach comparable to that used for Rt. 635 to determine public support for this project;

Mr. Rieley asked if this process would allow the residents to craft their own proposal. He pointed out that he is in favor of a process that brings the residents together with VDOT to help make an informed decision.

Ms. Hopper noted safety concerns on Proffit Road.

Mr. Benish pointed out the scope of this project noting that it will have to go through the planning and development stage.

Mr. Thomas noted the new school that will be built in the area and asked if any portion of this road could be spot improved.

Mr. Benish noted the sharp curve at the intersection of Pritchett Lane where speed is high. He problem is that there is not much that can be done without impacting the adjacent areas. Some things that have been discussed are posting speed limits more frequently and the residents are requesting that the road be posted--no vehicles with more than two axles. He also noted that discussion has taken place about the feasibility of a three-way stop at some strategic locations as well as other traffic calming measures.

Mr. Rooker suggesting that the Commission recommend advancing the Proffit Road project as quickly as possible. He also suggested that consideration be given to making spot improvements for Proffit Road in the interim of the improvement project.

Mr. Rooker noted that Garth Road is a heavily traveled road, pointing out that there a re a number of accidents on this road. This is a long road, which would require a substantial commitment of resources to improve the safety of this road.

Mr. Rieley stated that perhaps an analysis of all secondary roads should be undertaken to determine where you can get the most safety improvements for the money spent. He also noted that bicyclists want paved shoulders.

- Mr. Rooker moved to forward the Six year Secondary Road Plan for 20001-2007 to the Board of Supervisors, with the following comments:

- With respect to the Catterton Road project, recommend to the Board that they consider using a public informational meeting approach comparable to that used for Rt. 635 to determine public support for this project;
- Obtain comparative costs of railroad bridge improvement to road improvements for the Old Ivy Road project;
- Recommend including a spot improvement/paved shoulder project for Barracks/Garth Road;
- Consider spot improvements for Proffit Road in the interim of the improvement project;
- Recommend advancing Proffit Road project as quickly as possible.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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