Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 17, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, April 17, 2001 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were: Dennis Rooker, Chairman; William Rieley, Vice-Chairman; Jared Loewenstein, Tracey Hopper, Rodney Thomas; William Finley, and Pete Craddock. Other officials present were: David Benish, Joan McDowell and Scott Clark.

Mr. Rooker established a quorum and called the meeting to order.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

None were offered, and the meeting proceeded.

Consent Agenda

a. **SUB-2001-049 Dunlora Phase 3B Preliminary Plat -** Critical slopes waiver request. (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Hopper abstained from voting on the consent agenda because her law firm does work for Robert Hauser Homes.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of the consent agenda.

Mr. Finley seconded the motion, which passed 6-0 with Ms. Hopper abstaining.

Work Session

a. **Rural Areas** - Staff presentation on development trends in the rural areas, to be followed by discussion of the presentation and of proposed next steps in developing the Rural Areas chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. (Scott Clark)

Mr. Benish pointed out that this was the first session to begin work on the Rural Areas and the focus of this session will be to give some general background information regarding the status of the rural areas. We expect that you will ask for more information. We will also talk later about some of the upcoming items the commission will need to review and some questions and confirmation of process.

Mr. Clark said this was mostly a presentation on background information about the rural areas. He asked the commissioners to ask questions and provide feedback as he spoke.

The 1st section is on statistics in farmland and forests in the County. The federal census of agriculture has a lot of data going back at least as far as 1910. There has been a remarkable change in the number of farms in the County over the last 100 years. Most of the significant change happened in the middle of the century, with slower change over the last 25 years.

The acreage of farmland has also been decreasing. The decline in farm acreage has been

relatively throughout the century. A working farm is one that produces a certain value of agricultural products during the year. In 1995 the value was $1,000.

Mr. Rieley asked if a landowner leases stable space, is that considered a farm.

Mr. Clark said he did not know.

The number of farms decreased most rapidly just after WWII. The decrease in farm acreage since 1950 has been steadier than the decrease in the number of farms.

Small farms disappeared rapidly in the 1950s and 1960s, accounting for the fact that numbers of farms dropped faster than farm acreages. Small farms remain a small percentage of the total in Albemarle. The 1 to 9 acre class has virtually disappeared and the 10 to 49 acre class has also dropped significantly.

Participation in agricultural and forestal districts increased throughout the early 1990s, but has now begun to drop. He is curious to see the reason behind the change in the pattern and determine what should be done to correct it. This may be due to development pressures – participants are permitted to withdraw during the District reviews. Landowners have told him that they would like to retain flexibility for the future, even if they do not have immediate plans.

Mr. Rooker asked if all land that is in farmland is in forestal district land.

Mr. Clark said that was not true.

Mr. Rooker stated that one could have land in forest that you develop no product from.

Mr. Clark said it is more difficult to determine the status of the forest.

Mr. Rooker asked how much of the property is forestal and how much is agricultural.

Mr. Clark said you can tell from the categories in the taxation revenues.

Mr. Clark said that the bar graphs represent categories of use-value taxation in the County. The black diamonds are what the USDA says we have in farms in the County.

The next chart compares data on forest incomes from the state forestry service with farm incomes from the USDA. Agricultural products have generally had higher total revenues than timber. However, agricultural revenues have been declining. At the same time, timber harvests have been increasing in value, indicating increased forestry activity and increased pressures on Albemarle's forests.

Mr. Rooker stated that it is more marked if you look at the decline in purchasing power.

Mr. Clark pointed out that all the information is converted to Y2K dollars.

Hardwood harvests show no clear pattern of increase or decrease, but pine harvests have been steadily increasing. This may indicate in increase in pine harvesting and planting in response to the increasing demand for softwoods.

Mr. Rieley asked if there was a relationship between that and the pine bark beetle infestation of

the 1990s.

Mr. Clark said that is an issue that has been raised, but they need more detailed information to determine the answer.

Issues
- Continuing loss of farms, both in numbers and in acreage.
- Severe reductions in number of small farms.
- Declining agricultural-product revenues to support farms.
- Increasing harvests of softwoods.
- Possible limits of Agricultural and Forestal Districts.

Questions for consideration:
- Farms and Farmland
  - What are the causes of farm losses, and which ones can be addressed through local government action?
  - How can the County best protect its remaining farms? How can smaller parcels be kept in non-residential uses?
- Forests and Forestry
  - What is the role of forestry in the future mix of rural land uses?
  - How can more sustainable forestry (vs. Industrial softwood production) be encouraged in the face of increasing softwood demand?
- Existing Policies and Tools
  - How can land-use taxation be applied most fairly? Is it successfully encouraging the protection of rural lands?
  - Are Agricultural and Forestal Districts helping to achieve rural-protection goals for the long term? Are they the best tool? What other voluntary methods would be more effective or would provide additional protection?

Mr. Rooker asked how many people are employed in agriculture in Albemarle County. How many real working farms do we have vs. people who have a farm as a hobby. It somewhat enters into whether or not as a policy we are trying to protect farms or protect open spaces. Is farming a significant business out there.

Mr. Rieley stated that it calls into question one of the fundamental tenets of our rural policy, which is used as a rational for protecting open space. He stated that perhaps that should be framed more broadly to acknowledge the importance of open spaces.

Mr. Benish said that the numbers are generally available through the Ag Census. If most of their income is made off the land they are included.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to have that information.

Mr. Clark spoke on residential development in the rural areas.

Purposes of the RA Zoning District:
- Preservation of agricultural lands and forestal lands and activities.
- Water supply protection.
- Limited service delivery to the rural areas.
- Conservation of natural, scenic, and historic resources.

Growth Management Policy
Goal: Protect and efficiently utilize County resources by:
1) Emphasizing the importance of protecting the elements that define the Rural Area:
   a) Agricultural and Forestry resources;
   b) Water supply resources;
   c) Natural resources;
   d) Scenic resources;
   e) Historic and cultural resources;
   f) Limited service delivery.

Since 1985 the rate of new parcel creation in the Rural Areas has held relatively steady.

This chart represents the new parcels by size:
- The largest group of new rural parcels (42%) is between 2 and 5 acres in size.
- The next largest group (30%) are from 5 to just under 21 acres.
- Another 4% were below the 2-acre standard (0.5 dwelling unit/acre) for development-right lots.
- In other words, 76% of new parcels in this period were below the 21-acre minimum that County policy calls for.

Mr. Finley asked how many acres were represented.

Mr. Clark was not certain that he had that information.

Mr. Finley asked with the reduction in farmland, how much of that is going to residential use. He asked if Mr. Clark was counting forestal areas.

Mr. Clark said that he was looking at both together.

Mr. Finley asked where did all that land go, what is it being used for today.

Mr. Clark said that was the gap between the USDA data and the state forestry data. We don't always know if the land has gone out of production or into development.

Mr. Clark said this is only counting the lots currently zoned RA.

Mr. Rooker said that if you go back over a period of years, the land has gone into a variety of uses. There is a strong reason why the largest number of lots created falls into the 2-5 acre category, that's because of the 21-acre rule. When you divide a piece of property into parcels, at that size with the limit on number of parcels, you get 2-5 acre lots.

Mr. Rieley did a quick calculation. There have been 50,000 acres converted from agricultural use to residential use during the time.

Mr. Clark pointed out that the distribution of new-parcels sizes in the last five years analyzed has been essentially the same as over the full 1985-1999 period. This suggests that the pattern set by the current Zoning Ordinance is not changing, and is not getting us closer to our goals of preserving larger parcels for farming and forestry.

The rate of small-parcel development in the Water-Supply Protection Areas has been slightly

lower than outside those areas, however, the protection areas only add up to about 42% of the Rural Areas. In fact, new under-21-acre parcels have been created at a higher density within the protection areas. The only limitation on development in the protection areas is the prohibition of special-use permits for additional development lots.

New rural-area parcels by Comprehensive Plan Area.

Rural Preservation Developments, which are intended to reduce the impact of rural residential development, have only rarely occurred in the County. We need to learn why RPDs are not more common. The additional difficulty of securing approval and the lack of (monetary) incentives may be factors.

Population growth rates are not consistent across the Rural Areas. Overall, the Rural Areas grew only slightly slower than the Development Areas. Rural Area 4 (the Scottsville District) grew faster than the Development-Area average. These numbers are taken from counts of dwelling units in the areas, rather than the census bureau.

How far can rural growth go? One possible answer is provided by the TJPDC's 1994 analysis of building potential in the County. According to the study, current policies would allow rural population to grow to 189,636 persons, or 413% of the 1990 population level. This study did not account for all limiting factors, but it does indicate the level of development theoretically made possible by the current Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Finley asked if this was based on division rights.

Mr. Benish said they calculated the existing division rights and estimated the rights available in undivided properties. It did not take into consideration a significant number of constraints to development.

Mr. Craddock asked if there was a critical mass number, which would result in degradation of the rural area.

Mr. Benish does not think its been examined in that way. This is not a projection, but an estimate of capacity.

Mr. Finley asked for the current population of the County.

Mr. Benish said that it was about 84,000.

Mr. Rooker said with 250 houses per year being built, 50,000 would seem to be about right.

Mr. Finley asked if you take total rural acreage divided by the population, you get rural density.

Mr. Clark stated that an average for entire County does not tell you much.

Mr. Rooker said that based on the 1990 census, more than half the County's population is in the Rural Areas.

Mr. Benish we have traditionally been about 50% urban/rural.

Issues and questions

Issues

- Relatively steady rate of residential development in the Rural Areas, with no evidence that this development is "related to bona fide agricultural/forestal use."
- Majority of new RA parcels are under the preferred 21-acre minimum. Nearly half of new parcels are under 5 acres.
- Greater density of new residential development in the Water Supply Protection Areas.
- Lack of interest in RPD (clustering) alternative to standard subdivisions.
- Resource conservation –
    - Lack of direct data on impacts to natural resources (but much can be inferred from data on land divisions and population changes).
    - Historic
    - Scenic
- Rapid population growth in the Rural Areas, not greatly different than that of the Development Areas.
- Conflict between Comprehensive Plan/Zoning Ordinance goals and reality.

Questions

- How can the County reduce the rate of residential development in the rural areas?
- How can the Zoning Ordinance be changed to better implement our RA goals?
- How can the DISC program help direct growth into the growth areas?

Mr. Rooker stated that our policies are not really geared toward creating larger lots.

Mr. Benish said that we want to see them in smaller lots, but it's the volume that is the concern. We would like to see the large lots at one end and the smaller lots at the other end.

Mr. Rooker emphasized importance of maintaining large unbroken areas of open space as habitat for animals.

Mr. Finley stated that is seems like no one is really concerned about viable communities in rural areas.

Mr. Clark said it goes back to how many people are still working the land vs. living in the rural areas and working in the city or the development areas. In the future, we will talk about the role of the historic small communities scattered across the rural areas.

Mr. Finley pointed out that the number of people working in agricultural pursuits will never be very many. What's wrong with living in a rural area and working somewhere else? Rural communities will dry up and then large landowners will get most of the land.

Mr. Benish said the general consensus was to stay with the overall growth management plan that encourages development in designated areas. We need to consider increased requests for improvements and assistance in the crossroads communities. Batesville has asked for County assistance in building sidewalks. Some have expressed interest in allowing more variety of uses in the rural areas.

Mr. Finley said it is very difficult to get a commercial zoning in a rural crossroads.

Mr. Benish said that, basically, no commercial zoning is allowed in the rural areas. There are certain special uses that are commercial in nature, but are agricultural or serving a dispersed rural community. Day cares and country stores are permitted.

Mr. Finley said that rural residents don't have the center to go to meet neighbors. They have to drive to the city to partake of services such as dentists and doctors.

Mr. Benish said aside from certain exemptions under home occupations, that's essentially correct. One of the remedies under the current comprehensive plan would be the designation of a crossroads area as a village.

Mr. Finley stated that people in the rural areas will always have to drive 10-15 miles to buy their groceries.

Mr. Benish the DISC committee did not go into specific rural policies other than general statements about what the rural areas should do in relation to the development areas.

Mr. Finley said where it was highly desirable in the growth areas, it seems to be denied in the rural areas.

Mr. Benish stated that the rural area is not intended to be a residential area. Activities seen as catalysts for growth are specifically discouraged in the rural areas.

Mr. Finley asked how many rural people were involved in the development of that plan.

Mr. Benish said the policy goes back to the first plan, which was developed in 1970.

Mr. Clark stated that the next section shows tax maps in the rural areas. They selected three areas with different rates of parcel fragmentation.

Mr. Benish pointed out that the pattern was obvious as the development was all around roadways.

Mr. Rooker asked where Hydraulic road was on the map.

Mr. Benish pointed out the location of the road.

Mr. Clark showed the locations of agricultural/forestal districts, which didn't exist in 1980. We have high levels of development with land protection in the same area.

Policy Directions:
- Existing Comprehensive Plan policies;
- Agricultural/Forestal Industries Support Committee;
- DISC Committee

1996 Land Use Plan – Growth Management Goal
1) Emphasizing the importance of protecting the elements that define the Rural Areas:
   a) Agricultural and Forestry resources;
   b) Water-supply resources;
   c) Natural resources;
   d) Scenic resources;
   e) Historic and cultural resources;
   f) Limited service delivery.

1998 Natural Resources & Cultural Assets Planning Commission

Goal: Protect Albemarle County's agricultural lands and forests as a resource base for its agricultural and forestry industries and for related benefits they contribute towards the County's rural character, scenic quality, natural environment, and fiscal health.

Mr. Finley stated that the County should include rural people in that.

Mr. Clark said he hopes they are included in "rural character".

1986 Comprehensive Plan – Rural Residential Development

Discourage residential development other than dwellings related to bona fide agricultural/forestal use.

- All decisions concerning the Rural Areas shall be made in the interest of the four major elements of the Rural Areas, with highest priority given to preserving agricultural and forestal activities rather than encouraging residential development.
- Residential development not related to bona fide agricultural/forestal use shall be encouraged to locate in designated Growth Areas where services and utilities are available, and where such development will have minimum impact on rural resources and agricultural/forestal activities.

Committee Recommendations for Policies and Strategies:

- County policies and regulations should support agricultural/forestal interests;
- Preserve farmlands and forests;
- Provide fair taxation for agriculture and forestry;
- Develop marketing strategies for all agricultural/forestal products;
- Develop educational programs for the public;
- Develop educational programs for producers;
- Protect water resources and water quality.

Mr. Rieley asked for the composition of the Agricultural/Forestal Industries Support Committee.

Mr. Benish said it was large group made up primarily of rural residents who had some involvement with agriculture. It also included representation from the Department of Forestry, the Extension Office, and County staff.

From the 2-6-1999 DISC report to the Board of Supervisors:

- ...direct development toward the Development Areas and away from the Rural Areas.
- ...45-50% of the County's single-family residential development is occurring in the Rural Areas, which is contrary to the goals of the Comprehensive Plan.
- ...the Zoning and Subdivision regulations make development more difficult in the Development Areas and facilitate development in the Rural Areas.
- ...the development potential of the rural Areas should be reduced concurrent with making the Development Areas more attractive places for residential development.

Ms. Hopper said she would like to understand that too, perhaps a side-by-side presentation.

Mr. Clark said it was worth going over again for the rural area review.

Mr. Finley said don't you need to show acres of rural vs. acres of residential.

Mr. Clark pointed out that this was just a quote from the committee's report.

Mr. Benish said that staff would look into the issue.

Mr. Thomas said that the third bullet needs some explanation as well.

Strategies:

As part of the Rural Areas review for the Comprehensive Plan, develop strategies to reduce residential development in the Rural Areas. Serious consideration should be given to these tools:

- Phasing of development rights over time;
- Having the same regulatory requirements for development in the Rural Areas as in the Development Areas;
- Raising the minimum lot size from 21 to 42 acres;
- Preserving opportunities for land divisions to provide affordable housing for County residents;
- Educating new residents on the growth-management policies of the County, including the provision of fewer services to the Rural Areas.

Mr. Finley pointed out that if you had 60 acres you could not make a parcel.

Mr. Rooker said the regulations would only apply to the remnant parcels. You would have your five development rights.

Mr. Benish said this is the minimum lot-size non-development right property. The 42 acres comes from studies that show that size is more than the minimum necessary for reasonable and productive forestal activity.

Mr. Finley said that our policy curtails much of the value of the rural properties.

Mr. Benish said it reduces the density in the rural areas.

Mr. Finley stated that farmers give up and sell out because they can't make it financially. Financial help for agricultural activities would do more to preserve farmland than anything else.

Ms. Hopper said larger lots might too, the current zoning ordinances make it too sweet not to sell.

Mr. Finley stated that all they have is their parcel to sell. If you take away that right they end up in the poor house.

Ms. Hopper said it is a tricky balancing act.

Mr. Benish stated that the County has not looked into how this would be implemented.

Mr. Finley stated that if you double the required acreage for a residential lot in the County, you

will double the reduction of farmland.

Mr. Benish said if you talk in terms of density rather than lots, other methods may allow the same benefit with less impact.

Mr. Rooker stated that one way to do it would be to implement some strategies. Virtually require some sort of rural preservation development.

Mr. Benish said it was unlimited 2-acre lots.

Mr. Rooker stated that it was substantially changed to where we are today. Interesting to see if it has had any impact.

Mr. Benish said he is sure it has had a significant impact. There is a pretty consistent pattern of single-family detached product that has stayed constant.

Mr. Thomas stated that the comments from the Greene County Planning Commission were that Albemarle County pushes people out to other Counties.

Mr. Benish said that something to look into would be the regional ramifications.

Mr. Thomas said that, according to the Eastern Initiative meetings, Albemarle County doesn't allow enough affordable houses to be built.

Mr. Finley asked what was intended by providing fewer services, services in these areas are already limited.

Mr. Rooker said that this is just letting people know that there are fewer services.

Mr. Finley verified that rather than further limit services, the County would be advising people of the limited nature of services available.

Mr. Finley said that a good majority of the rural people are happy not to have that.

Mr. Thomas stated that at last night's meeting at Grace Episcopal the residents commented that they realize that they won't have certain services.

Mr. Finley said that they are a vanishing species that ought to be protected.

<u>List of possible next steps</u>

1. Draft "Guiding Principles" for rural area review.
2. Review permitted uses in the RA Zoning District.
3. Review density and development patterns and develop policies.
4. Address Rural Public Infrastructure and Facilities Issues.
5. Development of Chapter 4.

Mr. Finley asked at what stage would there be public hearings on these issues.

Mr. Clark said he did not know. He would be interested in gaining less formal input earlier in the process.

Mr. Loewenstein asked if the work currently being done by the groundwater committee would be factored into the rural area. Since a large number of our historic resources are located in the rural areas will the recommendations of the preservation plan be factored in.

Mr. Benish said they would. Commissioners should remember that the rural areas will be a section of the comprehensive plan. We are trying to develop a specific section for the rural areas as a parallel to the land use plan. It is not separate in any way.

Ms. Hopper stated that those are the tools for a bigger thing, a macro-vision. It would be helpful to hear about the micro-tools. It seems that there is a fairly strong commitment in the community in having a hard line for the development areas. She would like the issue of 50% development in rural areas vs. 50% development in development areas addressed current ordinances encourage building very large houses in the middle of fields in the Rural Areas. She would like the County to address affordable housing with a detailed measurable plan. The Historic resources, natural resources, water, vistas and rural community way of life should be preserved.

Mr. Finley asked how this would evolve.

Mr. Benish said that the commission is the committee working on this now. If you feel like this is an approach we should undertake, we could talk about establishing an advisory committee.

Mr. Benish said we took silence to mean we should move forward under the normal process.

Mr. Rooker doesn't think we should get into pushing for a committee. The last slide on the board, which is "next steps" is the proposed process.

Mr. Benish stated that the next one you'll see is the guiding principles, which you should have by next month.

Mr. Loewenstein said that the next steps as outlined seem to make sense.

Mr. Finley stated that there are far-reaching ideas in these slides. He asked how people in the rural areas have an input into this process.

Mr. Benish pointed out that the commission can choose at any time in this process to call for public input. The Commission can go to public hearing when there is a product to present to get public input. The work sessions could be open for public comment. The Commissions could look at a notification process to allow for early input. The Commission can tailor the process as you see fit.

Mr. Finley said that these people traditionally will not come out to the public meetings.

Mr. Rooker said that it seems to him that there will be plenty of opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Finley pointed out that we are talking about 50% of the population.

Mr. Rooker said that there would need to be something for people to direct their comment toward. He pointed out that most of the information presented was from current plans.

Mr. Finley stated that they got there with very little knowledge of 50% of the population.

Mr. Rooker said that the commission can't make people come and comment. He stated his belief that if people feel they will be affected, they will come and comment.

Mr. Finley asked about the advertisement, who does it get too, how do they learn what's going on.

Mr. Benish said that is the standard format listing of items in the newpapers. We could use our PR person to get certain issues in the public.

Mr. Finley said that in growth areas it is stressed that the community must know what is going to happen. Farmers may not know.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that Mr. Finley could make a recommendation for something specific in the notification process.

Mr. Thomas said that we all have concerns.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that most of us live there.

Mr. Benish stated that there are neighborhood organizations in the rural areas. We can try to keep our PR person aware of certain issues. We can also establish a group of rural community organizations.

Mr. Rooker asked that staff gather a list of those organizations so that they could be mailed information about upcoming issues.

Mr. Finley stated that DISC got considerable publicity. He asked that a citizen's committee be appointed.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that DISC got a lot of publicity because the newspaper thought it was an important issue. Appointing a committee does not indicate how important the issues are. It would delay dealing with an issue that we consider to be very important.

Mr. Benish said that the general approach has been for the Planning Commission and the Board to handle the biggest documents. The next steps in the rural areas might be a committee to address a specific issue.

Mr. Rooker said that he would like to see us move forward expeditiously with the achievement of these steps.

Mr. Benish stated that he is optimistic that we will move forward expeditiously.

Mr. Finley said that some of these steps have far-reaching ramifications. He asked how word can get out to the rural population.

Mr. Benish said that the work session would be followed by a public hearing. The Commission could also set up regional meeting.

Mr. Rooker said that in this five-step process, is it anticipated that we would not take action until

the fifth step.

Mr. Benish said that you could very well take action along the way.

Mr. Rooker stated that it might be helpful to have a number of actions. Perhaps we could look at the process to see at which points action might be taken and public hearings held.

Mr. Benish said that perhaps at the end of each topic we could hold a public hearing.

Ms. Hopper said that it makes sense that the Board might not want to see it after every action.

Mr. Benish said that the Commission may need to go back once you're done. Staff is not going to wait three months if we can begin something else.

Mr. Rieley said that since the next step is drafting guiding principles, he would like to put three issues on the table, 1) the language in the current plan overly emphasizes agriculture and forestry, conservation should be on equal footing as an objective;

Mr. Finley asked if Mr. Rieley meant by ordinance or voluntary means.

Mr. Rieley said he meant as a rationale for our actions in the rural area.

Mr. Finley asked for what purpose.

Mr. Rieley said for water quality, wildlife habitat, and many other reasons.

Mr. Rooker said this issue came up in the Spring Hill subdivision. The issue there was preservation of the land and conservation.

Mr. Benish said that conservation of natural resources does not preclude conservation of productive land.

Mr. Rieley said he is not suggesting it should be competitive.

Mr. Finley said there are good conservation programs now that will work with individuals to develop the land and pay incentives. The person who has a financial interest has to get some kind of return.

Mr. Rieley added issue 2) that there should there be a time mechanism that restricts how many lots can be sold;

Mr. Rooker said to him that is not so much a guideline rather than an implementation strategy.

Mr. Rieley raised 3) the issue of affordability of housing, we run the risk of having the rural areas be a place for wealthy people only.

Mr. Rooker stated that is a goal that may run counter to the other strategies.

Ms. Hopper said that in the development area there are not a lot of affordable housing options.

Mr. Rooker suspects that the majority of affordable housing in the County is in the rural areas.

Mr. Benish said that some would argue that in this area affordable housing is in Greene and Fluvanna Counties. We need to look at that issue from a regional perspective.

Ms. Hopper asked if we ever have joint meetings with neighboring Counties.

Mr. Benish said that there had been a previous meeting with Greene County, but that might be an input process we need to consider.

Mr. Finley asked if there was any continuation of the exchange after the previous meeting.

Mr. Benish said there was some, but the primary contact left the County, communication has since become one-sided.

Mr. Craddock said that an earlier meeting in Scottsville with Fluvanna and Buckingham was well-received.

Mr. Finley said that sounds much better than the one with Greene County.

Mr. Thomas said that in Albemarle County the purchasers are pretty much controlling what's being built in Albemarle County. He asked if we could put in some requirement for affordable housing. The other Counties will suffer even more so with the new regulations in the Rural Areas.

Mr. Rieley stated that this is an issue that needs to be kept on our screens.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was anything we could do to help that situation.

Ms. Hopper said that there are zoning tools that we can use.

Mr. Rooker stated that one of the guiding principles we want to include is making provision for affordable housing.

Mr. Benish said that some of the other principles will address what Mr. Loewenstein addressed. There may be some duplication within the principles.

Mr. Rooker said he believes that staff has a good idea of how we want to move forward.

Mr. Benish said that staff has not planned on any formal process with any adjacent Counties. He asked if that was something the Commission was interested in.

Mr. Rooker said he thought the Commission should be cognizant of the issues and if along the way there is an appropriate time for a meeting or some other contact, we should do so.

Mr. Rooker said that other Planning Commissions receive the copies of our agenda.

Mr. Thomas said that Nelson County is a part of that as well as Louisa County. Each County has their own plan. Many of the neighboring Counties, with the exception of Fluvanna, are promoting growth.

Mr. Thomas stated that the sooner we can meet with the other commissions, it would help us to

move in a direction that would benefit the region.

Ms. Hopper said she would like to meet with a lot of Counties at once to save time.

Mr. Rooker asked what would be accomplished by having a meeting with that many people.

Ms. Hopper said that maybe that's where we need to establish a committee.

Mr. Rooker said that perhaps we could consider appointing one or two of us to meet with the other planning commissions.

Mr. Benish stated that perhaps we could use some input from the other Counties to discuss the implications of this plan.

Mr. Thomas said that what he saw in the County's around us was an urban ring with Charlottesville in the middle, a rural ring, and another urban ring.

Mr. Rooker said he is not sure how much we can do about that. He said that he would like to have the Planning Directors from the surrounding counties address the Commission.

Mr. Thomas said he liked that idea.

Mr. Rooker thanked the staff for their presentation.

Old Business

Mr. Rooker asked for any old business.

Mr. Benish said that the Commission needed to make an appointment to CHART.

Mr. Rooker asked if everyone had read the e-mail. He said that Mr. Loewenstein had expressed an interest.

Mr. Thomas said that he would withdraw his name from consideration and support Mr. Loewenstein.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was a consensus. The commission agreed to appoint Mr. Loewenstein to the Committee.

New Business

Mr. Rooker asked for any new business.

There being none, Mr. Rooker adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary