Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 8, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, May 8, 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; and Pete Craddock. Other officials present were: Stephen Waller, Juandiego Wade, David Benish, Scott Clark, Jan Sprinkle, Elaine Echols and Greg Kamptner.

Call to order and establish quorum:

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

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Rooker asked for other matters not listed on the agenda from the public.

There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – May 2, 2001:

Mr. Benish said there was only one item, the work session for review of the neighborhood model, which is scheduled for their public hearing next week.

Ms. Echols pointed out that they made two changes, they wanted in the section on the clear boundaries for the rural areas, further qualification about the need to be sensitive to the rural development on the other side of the boundary. They backed off of some statements on the relegated parking section, relating to County involvement in the building of public parking areas. They reworded the language to "consider facilitating the acquisition of construction."

Consent Agenda:

a. **Free Bridge Land Trust Final Plat** – Request for authorization to use a private road in conjunction with a proposal to subdivide a 1.571 acre lot from Tax Map 78, Parcel 58G. The 5.947-acre property is zoned C-1 (Commercial). (Yadira Amarante)

b. **Approval of Minutes** – April 10, 2001.

Mr. Rooker remarked that the consent agenda has been revised. He asked if there was any matter to be pulled off for discussion.

Ms. Hopper moved to approve the consent agenda.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Items Requesting Deferral:

a. **ZMA 00-10 Avemore (Sign #85 and 86)** – Request to rezone 27.46 acres from R-10 Residential to R-15 to allow mixed use of 406 dwelling units, retail uses, and offices. The property, described as Tax May 78, Parcel 581 and Tax Map 78 B, Parcels 2A, 2B, 4B, 3-1 and 4-1, is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Fontana Drive approximately 1/10 mile from the intersection of Route 20 and Fontana Drive. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as urban density residential, recommended for urban density (6-34 dwelling units per acre) in Neighborhood 3 Pantops Development Area. (Michael Barnes) ***APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO JUNE 5, 2001.***

252

Mr. Rooker opened the public the item for public comment, there being none, he closed the public hearing.

Ms. Hopper asked to abstain from the three items requesting deferral because he employer does work for the applicant.

Mr. Rieley moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to June 5, 2001.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion, which passed 4-0, with Ms. Hopper abstaining.

b. **SP 00-69 Avemore (Sign #27, 60)** – Request for special use permit to allow professional offices in a residential development in accordance with Section [18.2.2.11] of the Zoning Ordinance. A concurrent request exists to rezone 27.46 acres from R-10 Residential to R-15 to allow mixed use of 406 dwelling units, retail uses, and offices. The property, described as Tax May 78, Parcel 58I and Tax Map 78 B, Parcels 2A, 2B, 4B, 3-1 and 4-1, is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Fontana Drive approximately 1/10 mile from the intersection of Route 20 and Fontana Drive. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as urban density residential, recommended for urban density (6-34 dwelling units per acre) in Neighborhood 3 Pantops Development Area. (Michael Barnes) ***APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO JUNE 5, 2001.***

Mr. Rooker opened the item for public comment, there being none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Loewenstein moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to June 5, 2001.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed 4-0, with Ms. Hopper abstaining.

c. **SP 00-70 Avemore (Sign #87, 99)** – Request for special use permit to allow retail stores and shops in a residential development in accordance with Section [18.2.2.12] of the Zoning Ordinance. A concurrent request exists to rezone 27.46 acres from R-10 Residential to R-15 to allow mixed use of 406 dwelling units, retail uses, and offices. The property, described as Tax May 78, Parcel 58I and Tax Map 78 B, Parcels 2A, 2B, 4B, 3-1 and 4-1, is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Fontana Drive approximately 1/10 mile from the intersection of Route 20 and Fontana Drive. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as urban density residential, recommended for urban density (6-34 dwelling units per acre) in Neighborhood 3 Pantops Development Area. (Michael Barnes) ***APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO JUNE 5, 2001.***

Mr. Rooker opened the item for public comment, there being none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Thomas joined the meeting.

Mr. Rieley moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to June 5, 2001.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed 5-0, with Ms. Hopper abstaining.

Public Hearing Items:

a. **SP-2001-004 Rainbow House (Sign #29, 32, 33)** – Request for special use permit to allow a community center in accordance with Section 14.2.2.1 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for community centers in residential districts. The property, described as Tax Map 90A1 Parcel D, contains 88.1 acres, and is located in the Scottsville Magisterial District on Hickory Street in the Southwood Mobile Home Park. The property is zoned R-2, Residential. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as neighborhood density (3-6 dwelling units per acre) in Neighborhood 5. (Juandiego Wade)

Mr. Wade presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jeff Riddle, the applicant and pastor of Jefferson Park Baptist Church. In the late 1980's a group from our church began an after-school club for children. In 1993 the group was offered a lot in Southwood and we obtained a used trailer for $1.00. The program blossomed into an after-school enrichment program for children led by church volunteers. In 1995 we hired a part-time staff person to direct the ministry. In April of 2000 we realized we had run out of usable space and decided to explore the purchase of a new mobile home. At that time, we discovered we had never received proper permission to operate at this location, at which point we shut down the program and transferred operations to our church facility. Our desire is to be in full compliance. After discussion with staff, it was decided that the best course of action was to submit application for a special use permit and a site plan. We have extensive support from the community. We plan to place a modular unit on the site if permission is granted. We would continue our after-school tutoring and mentoring program and our weekday summer program. We would like to express our appreciation for staff and urge the support of the commission for this application.

Mr. Rieley asked if the level of activity described the same as 1993.

Mr. Riddle said, roughly, yes.

Mr. Rooker asked for additional comments from the public, there being none, he closed the public hearing.

Ms. Hopper said it seems that the Rainbow House has provided a needed community service.

Mr. Rooker agreed that it was a very worthy application.

Ms. Hopper moved for approval with conditions.

1. The community center shall be located at 750 Java Court.
2. The community center is approved for activities discussed in this staff report. Other activities that will produce the need for parking are not allowed.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

SP-2000072 Crown Orchard Company (Nextel/Crown Castle) (Sign #48) – Request for a special use permit to allow the construction of a new equipment shelter in conjunction with the collocation of three panel antennas on an existing 250-foot tall lattice tower structure in accordance with Section [10.2.2.6] of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for radio-wave transmission and relay towers and appurtenances. The property, described as Tax Map 91, Parcel 28, contains 234.165 acres, and is located in the Scottville Magisterial District, on Carter's Mountain Trail, approximately 1 mile south of the intersection with the Thomas Jefferson Parkway (State Route 53). This parcel is zone RA, Rural Areas and the Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area 4. (Stephen Waller)

Mr. Waller presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Brian Kerning, representing Crown Castle addressed the commission. He pointed out that the site is a tower farm. He added that this additional building is a small building and will not have a visual impact.

Mr. Rooker asked for additional public comment, there being none, the closed the public hearing.

Mr. Rieley asked if staff had explored locating the facility underground.

Mr. Waller stated that you couldn't see the two existing facilities until you are at the site.

Mr. Rieley verified that they were below the "military crest".

Mr. Waller said yes.

Mr. Rieley asked if the new antenna would have to come before the commission.

Mr. Waller said they would not. According to the original special use permit, additional towers would have to be done administratively, but new antennas could be accomplished by staff review. Additional ground equipment was not included in the original special use permit

Mr. Rooker verified that the current request was only for the ground equipment.

Mr. Waller said it was.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that this kind of facility would no longer be permitted under our tower manual. This particular tower is not subject to the current review process.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval with conditions.

1. Approval of this special use permit shall only apply to the building described in the applicant's request, site construction plans entitled "VA-o64P-D Patterson Mountain Co-Locate Guyed Tower", dated January 21, 2001.

2. None of the related antennas, nor any future antennas for use by other service providers shall be installed on this tower prior to administrative approval, in accordance with condition number 4 of SP 93-15 which states:

   Staff approval of additional antennae installation. No administrative approval shall constitute support for or approval of, the location of additional tower, antennae, etc., even if they may be part of the same network or system as any antennae administratively approved under this section.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

c. **Review of the Totier Creek Agricultural/Forestal District** – Required 10-year review of the Totier Creek Agricultural/Forestal District. The district includes the properties described as Tax Map 121, Parcels 7, 72C, 85, 85A; Tax Map 122, Parcels 5, 5A; Tax Map 128, Parcels 13, 14A, 14B, 14C, 14D, 27, 29, 30, 72; Tax Map 129, Parcels 3, 4, 4A, 5, 6, 6A, 7A, 7D, 9; Tax Map 130, Parcels 1, 4, 5A; Tax Map 134, Parcels 3, 19; Tax Map 135, Parcel 7, 10, 11. The district is generally located south of Keene, south and east of Esmont, and west of Scottsville. The district comprises a total of 7789.622 acres. The area is designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and is zoned RA Rural Areas. (Scott Clark)

d. **Review of the Hatton Agricultural/Forestal District** – Required 10-year review of the Hatton Agricultural/Forestal District. The district includes the properties described as Tax Map 135, Parcels 13, 15, 15A, 17, 18, 19, 22, 22A, 22C; Tax Map 136, Parcels 9B, 19B. The district is generally located west of Scottsville, north of the CSX Railway, along routes 627, 726, and 625. This district comprises a total of 645.158 acres. The area is

designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and is zoned RA Rural Areas. (Scott Clark)

e. **Review of the High Mowing Agricultural/Forestal District** – Required 10-year review of the High Mowing Agricultural/Forestal District. The district includes the properties described as Tax Map 85, Parcels 33B, 39, 39A1, 39H, 41A, 41A1. The district is generally located south of Batesville, along Routes 693 and 694. The district comprises a total of 622.44 acres. The area is designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and is zoned RA Rural Areas. (Scott Clark)

Mr. Clark presented the staff report on all three items.

Mr. Rieley asked about the Totier Creek review, in which there was a withdrawal. He asked Mr. Clark to verify that withdrawals can be done automatically during the review period.

Mr. Clark verified that during the review period, the owners can withdraw by right with no fee, by submitting a letter.

Mr. Rieley asked if this withdrawal occurred during the review period.

Mr. Clark stated that it was received in response to staff's letters notifying landowners of the review.

Mr. Rooker asked if the public hearing could be opened on all items simultaneously.

Mr. Kamptner said yes.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing on all three items.

Mr. Charles Phinney asked if the shaded area on the Totier Creek map was the withdrawn area.

Mr. Clark replied that the red crosshatches indicated withdrawals.

Mr. Rooker closed public hearing.

Mr. Rooker opened discussion on the Totier Creek Agricultural/Forestal District.

Ms. Hopper asked if the commission was simply recommending a 10-year extension.

Mr. Rooker said yes, we would be recommending approval for a further 10 year term.

Mr. Rieley recommended continuance of the Totier Creek Agricultural/Forestal District for a 10-year term.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Rooker opened discussion on the Hatton Agricultural/Forestal District.

Ms. Hopper moved for continuance of the Hatton Agricultural/Forestal District for a 10-year term.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Rooker opened discussion on High Mowing Agricultural/Forestal District.

Mr. Loewenstein moved for continuance of the High Mowing Agricultural/Forestal District for a 10-year term.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.
Regular Items:

a. **Temporary Contractor's Storage Yard for Carriage Hill Apartments, Phase 2 (Cathcart Properties, Inc)** – Three waivers/modifications of Section 5.1.18 need to be approved by the Planning Commission. (Jan Sprinkle)

Mr. Sprinkle presented the executive summary.

Mr. Rooker expressed safety concerns. South Pantops Drive is an extremely busy road during most times of the day. He is concerned about trucks crossing the road away from an intersection. He is also concerned about debris on the road. There are frequently large rocks on the sidewalks and road from the site, at least once a week he encounters a 1-3 pound rock. He remarked that during the construction of Phase 1, there was a great deal of debris left on the site that blew off onto the sidewalk and the road.

Mr. Rieley said those seem to be reasonable concerns. He pointed out that 2 out of 3 waivers went to those points. There is a reason they need to be on the same parcel. The reason for the setback is so debris is far enough away from the public roadway so it's not a nuisance. This is a greater than 50% reduction in the setback. The fact that the roadway is a busy one, gives him concern.

Ms. Hopper stated her agreement.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. David Cathcart, Cathcart Properties, is the developer of Phase 2 of Carriage Hill. The traffic is something we are aware of, it was also a problem with Phase 1. Our vantage point is to alleviate a lot of the problems associated with Phase 1, including access to the site. The site itself is very constrained, deliveries resulted in a back-up of trucks into the roadway. This would allow us to schedule deliveries. There are no flat areas except for roadways, building pads, and parking areas. As far as litter and traffic are concerned, there would not be large trucks traveling back and forth. Deliveries would be made to the construction yard, the developers would use small trucks to transport materials to the site. We have planned to reduce litter on this site. Space is tight with numerous slopes.

Mr. Rooker asked about the property to the north. The road off of Route 250 has been partially cut through toward South Pantops Drive. Could property off o f that road be used for construction staging?

Mr. Cathcart replied that the property is actually being used. That roadway is now a required emergency access way at this time.

Mr. Rooker asked if he could move the staging area around as building proceeded.

Mr. Cathcart said that was a good question, but it just did not work that way. Phase 1 had more possibilities for flat areas. With a project of this size we will be utilizing some space even with this plan, but without more, the contractors will be on top of each other. One of the major benefits is the shortening of the construction project time. This plan will enable us to orchestrate the project efficiently.

Mr. Rooker asked for additional public comment, there being none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Craddock asked if this was closer than 150' to WinterHaven.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that she has not measured it, and is not certain, but stated that it is probably close.

Mr. Craddock said that could be disturbing for the folks at WinterHaven.

Ms. Sprinkle stated the WinterHaven was actually below the construction site.

Mr. Rooker stated that it would be close to 150'.

Mr. Craddock said that the road was a dustbowl during Phase 1. He asked if there were mandatory truck washings.

Ms. Sprinkle stated that was handled through the erosion control plan. A wash rack is required on the Carriage Hill side, if necessary they could also require one on the Storage Yard side as well.

Ms. Hopper asked if there was any way to increase the setback.

Ms. Sprinkle said she did not explore that with the applicant. She is certain that it can be changed.

Mr. Rooker stated that the applicant has some good reasons for wanting to do this, but very little of what he said addressed the concerns expressed at the outset. He said that he does not think he can support the application. If it were approved he would want to see it approved for a short period of time.

Mr. Rieley would not have a problem supporting a longer period than 18 months. He is really stuck on crossing a major public road with a large construction project. The arguments in favor of this application are ones of convenience. Congestion is bad enough as it is, approval of this application could cause problems related to public safety.

Ms. Sprinkle said that she did talk to someone at State Farm who stated that he was not specifically concerned about the traffic, but he did request a truck sign to alert drivers.

Mr. Loewenstein asked if it would be possible to arrange temporary signalization of the crossing.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there is no intersection there and it is a state road.

Ms. Sprinkle also pointed out that they are offset.

Ms. Hopper said that even with no increase of volume, the road crossing seems to be the sticking point.

Mr. Rooker said the ordinance requires an adjacent parcel for a reason.

Mr. Loewenstein agreed.

Mr. Rooker said it is unfortunate that it's a tight site. This is not a negative reflection on the project itself.

Mr. Thomas asked when the applicant would cross the road.

Mr. Loewenstein said he would schedule trips to minimize traffic impacts.

Mr. Thomas stated that would be a remedy to the traffic situation.

Mr. Rooker pointed out a letter from the applicant, which states that "with ongoing construction, materials need to be moved continually." In his observation things were coming and going virtually all day long during Phase 1, which is not out of the ordinary.

Mr. Rieley said he is in sympathy with the applicant's needs. But safety is the primary concern.

Mr. Rieley moved to deny the application.

Ms. Hopper added to the issue of scheduling of deliveries. Throughout the day, South Pantops Drive is a popular cut-through. Even if you schedule the deliveries there is heavy traffic all day.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which passed 5-1 with Mr. Thomas voting no.

b. **CPA-01-003 Rivanna Village** – Resolution of Intent – The request is to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from Neighborhood Residential to Community Service for Tax Map 93A1, portion of Parcel 1, Parcels 2, 3 & 4 and Tax Map 80, Parcel 50. (Elaine Echols)

Mr. Thomas disqualified himself because his company does business with the applicant.

Mr. Craddock abstained from voting, as he is president of the East Rivanna Fire Department.

Ms. Echols presented the staff report.

Mr. Rieley asked, on the issue of the linkage of the zoning and comprehensive plan, what our precedent is on that. Typically we like to get the comprehensive plan in place. Is there precedent for moving both items through simultaneously.

Ms. Echols said there is not.

Mr. Rieley asked what the implication was from the point of view of timing, could you expect it to take 6 months longer if the items are considered individually.

Ms. Echols said generally, the rezoning takes a shorter period of time because most of the issues have already been addressed. Most of it depends on how long it takes to get the comp plan amendment through.

Mr. Rieley said that would be the case even if they run through simultaneously.

Ms. Echols said that staff likes to have something to compare against.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was anything that prevented the applicant from filing a rezoning change that lags behind by a month or so.

Mr. Benish said he believes they have submitted the rezoning request. The difficulty is with the rezoning process you need to know what the comp plan is going to call for in that area. The only way to know that is with a clear consensus as to what amendment is going to be made.

Ms. Hopper stated that she does not think there is any reason why the comprehensive plan amendment should take a long time.

Mr. Rooker said that here we are starting out with a level of detail that we haven't in the past. He said he is really just trying to find out about the process. He asked if it is possible for the applicant to submit a zoning change that follows behind by something less than the full length of time for the Comprehensive Plan change to be completed.

Mr. Rieley said that as long as you act on rezoning after the comprehensive plan is in place.

Mr. Benish stated that one of the things that accelerates an application is the completion of the traffic study.

Ms. Echols said that since they already have the application, we can hold until we feel like we have gotten a consensus.

Mr. Benish said staff would be coming back to further discuss this project and the other CPA.

Mr. Rooker asked about the traffic study included in the package.

Ms. Echols replied that these are VDOT's preliminary comments.

Mr. Rooker asked if they used standard numbers for trip generation compilations. He said it would be interesting to see not only vehicle trips, but also vehicle miles traveled on that section of Route 250 between Glenmore and Free Bridge. This project might eliminate or reduce current vehicle miles by Glenmore residents.

Ms. Echols stated that she expects additional work to be done.

Mr. Rooker said there was some mention in the letter that US 250 would serve this potential development and that cost sharing of improvements to Rt. 250 should be considered. He said he would find it helpful to have further discussions with VDOT about their plans for improvements and the cost thereof.

Mr. Loewenstein wondered what that sentence meant precisely. As a member of the CHART committee he has a lot of interest in the topic.

Mr. Rieley asked if he missed the signature line on the VDOT letter.

Ms. Echols replied that there are another 4 or 5 pages of another development proposal that follow those two pages, but it is signed.

Mr. Benish stated that what is appropriate during the CPA review is indicating the timing of development consistent with the infrastructure available.

Mr. Rooker said to put tonight in context, this is not a public hearing, and was not advertised as such. The resolution of intent is not project specific, if this resolution is passed, at some later time a concrete proposal would come before the commission. There would be at least one public hearing on that. If a rezoning request comes along, there would be an additional public hearing. There would also be hearings on both items at the Board of Supervisors level. He shared his apologies with the audience, but the commission is not taking any action on this particular project at this time.

Ms. Hopper commented that she is the Planning Commissioner for the Rivanna District, and gave her contact information.

Mr. Rooker asked for comment from the applicant. He asked that the applicant try to present the information in a way that is viewable by everyone in the audience.

Mr. Frank Kessler, Glenmore resident. Said that nothing was done wrong in the communications. There was a leaflet placed in the boxes of Glenmore residents with a lot of disinformation. We have held a public meeting at the Glenmore Country Club, and are presently working with the fire department and with Monticello. He has with him Steve Runkle, and Frank Cox.

Mr. Frank Cox, the developer, of the Cox Company of Charlottesville. He would like to communicate that from a development perspective, we are not here to make a complete presentation on this project tonight. He said he wanted to make sure that you know we are available to talk with you at any time. Last year Mr. Kessler asked us to come out and begin discussion with him about the Rivanna Village area. His interest was stimulated by the work from the DISC project. We proceeded with work sessions among the Glenmore Development Team, the Cox Company, etc. The village plan that we ultimately arrived at is one that provides an excellent case study of the way in which we've tried to organize the land uses in Rivanna Village. We have tried to develop something that ascribes to the ten basic principles of DISC, but would generate development. We have already done peak-hour traffic counts. The traffic generation factors for Glenmore are substantially less than what VDOT prescribes with their standard traffic count. By virtue of the demands for neighborhood convenience related services in Glenmore there would be a certain amount of internal absorption. There will be some offsetting of traffic. Further study will require some time and detail.

Mr. Rooker said it would be interesting to look at vehicle miles traveled on Route 250 between Glenmore and Free Bridge. Traffic studies don't normally deal with a whole corridor, just intersections.

Mr. Rieley said that would be an origin and destination study.

Mr. Cox said that the applicant will take a look at those points. The layout for this community is one that is developed along a geometric pattern. The architecture is closely ascribed to Merchant's Square in Williamsburg. There will be a mix of uses vertically, within buildings. We will employ wrap-around architecture. The commercial portion is specifically oriented toward a village. The core will be the six buildings centered in the project. There are several blocks that could be developed into even higher density residential. He said that he has heard many people who would like to have older family members move closer to them. This development could provide Independent living for retirees. The largest retail use would be 16,000-18,000 square feet grocery store, along the lines of Foods of All Nations. There are several locations in which free-standing buildings could be built. Several locations are provided as alternatives for churches and places of worship. A 10-acre lake serves the triple purpose of water quantity, water quality and passive recreation. There is an opportunity over time to provide linkage of Glenmore Way into the village center and a parallel community roadway. The plans also show a secondary entrance off of US 250. We recognize that moving forward will take some time and patience.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was any intent to change Glenmore from a gated community.

Mr. Cox said it would remain gated, but the village would not be.

Mr. Rooker asked if the village would be built with a private road.

Mr. Cox stated that our timeline is probably shorter than one that would allow VDOT to approve a new urbanism street.

Mr. Rooker asked if any of his boards dealt with transportation issues.

Mr. Cox said that one of the things they thought was essential was the definition of various types of streets within the village.

Mr. Rooker asked if the proposal included underground utilities.

Mr. Cox said that it does. As we work toward solutions, the key items are how to best handle infrastructure, to provide good pedestrian access, parallel on-street parking, and a center median in the entrance way. He is also interested in streetscape improvements including lighting, benches and landscaping. He implored the commission to approve the resolution of intent and let

work progress. He said that the applicant would like to have the commission work with them to make a case for the amendments. He stated his belief that the Neighborhood Model cannot be successful unless the commission can see the details. Somewhere in the process there needs to be a dialogue that would allow the applicant to include the details, without a significant lag in the process time.

Mr. Rooker said that we have before us a proposed resolution from staff.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that the resolution of intent is quite general and deals with issues that the commission has been talking about for some time now, even though the impetus is a specific project in this case. He moved to adopt the resolution of intent.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion.

Mr. Rooker said that in order to implement any of the DISC principles, general changes to the Comprehensive Plan would need to take place.

Ms. Hopper asked what the broader implications of this CPA were.

Mr. Rooker said that issue might be outside of the scope of this amendment. He asked Ms. Hopper if she would like to discuss that issue tonight, or in connection with the project.

Ms. Hopper replied in connection with the project.

Mr. Loewenstein said his question is if it is not just in connection with this project, the language probably would cover this in the generic sense.

Mr. Benish said that one of the things that we'll come back to you with is the history of the prior policy.

Mr. Rooker remarked that the entire land use policy has been based upon segregated land use, the result of which is that the general population needs to get in a car to do everything.

Mr. Benish stated that our policies are changing now. This resolution does merit some modification to reflect a potential land use map change.

Mr. Rooker asked if he had a specific recommendation for language change.

Mr. Kamptner suggested adding "and to amend the land use map as appropriate, " at the end.

Mr. Benish said he thought that was more comprehensive.

Mr. Rooker said this resolution is not at all specific to this project.

Ms. Hopper stated that she realized the resolution was that broad, but the report was very focused.

The motion carried 4-0, with Mr. Thomas and Mr. Craddock abstaining.

Mr. Rooker asked if the commissioners wished to have further discussion on the report.

Mr. Rieley requested scheduling a work session.

Mr. Loewenstein asked for thoughts about a timeline.

Mr. Benish said that staff would probably come back within 4 weeks.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that the next work session will not be a public hearing either and the commission will not take an action.

Old Business:

Mr. Rooker asked for any old business.

Michael Barnes asked to leave on your worktable the summary of the traffic study for Sperry, ask VDOT has asked for changes to the study, the summary will likely change.

Mr. Benish stated that the applicant had done a lot of work upfront and had it pretty much ready to go. They understood additional comments would be coming from VDOT.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was one volume that puts forward conclusions.

Mr. Benish said he thought it did.

Mr. Rooker said the gentleman who did the traffic study said that one of the volumes was basically a summary and contained conclusions.

Mr. Benish stated he thought Mr. Barnes had gotten the summary to the commissioners.

Mr. Cox said that the summary is the lead document, Volume 1. He will provide to the staff for distribution.

Mr. Rooker asked if the whole report would be resubmitted.

Mr. Benish said that some of the assumptions would have to be redone.

Mr. Loewenstein said he would like to see all three volumes when they are finished.

Mr. Benish asked if anybody else wanted a full booklet.

Mr. Rieley and Mr. Rooker replied as long as they are available, they would like copies.

New Business:

Mr. Rooker read into the minutes the following resolution:

Proposed resolution be it resolved that the Planning Commission.

ACPC
Resolution Adopted by Unanimous Consent
May 8, 2001

The Members of the Albemarle County Planning Commission, by unanimous consent, do hereby adopt the following resolution:

Whereas, the Neighborhood Model, which arose out of the report by the Development Initiative Steering Committee, recently received a meritorious award in the Professional Project Category from the Virginia Chapter of the American Planning Association; and

Whereas, the Neighborhood Model is a result of significant work and effort by the DISC Committee and by certain employees within the Albemarle County Department of Planning and Community Development.

Now, Therefore, be it:

Resolved, that the Planning Commission hereby extends its congratulations to the DISC Committee, the Department of Planning and Community Development, and to Wayne Cilimberg and Elaine Echols, for receipt of the meritorious award in the Professional Project Category from the Virginia Chapter of the American Planning Association

Dated as of the 8th day of May, 2001.

Signed by the members of the planning commission.

Mr. Rieley moved to adopt the resolution.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary