Albemarle County Planning Commission
September 25, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, September 25, 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; William Finley, Rodney Thomas, Tracey Hopper and Pete Craddock. Other officials present were Jan Sprinkle, Dan Mahon, David Benish, Greg Kamptner and Wayne Cilimberg.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Rooker asked for additional matters from the public. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – September 19, 2001

Mr. Benish said there was only one item, the Redfields ZMA, which was approved as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Rooker asked if any commissioner wished to pull an item from the agenda.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Items Requesting Deferral

a. **SP-2001-023 Crozet Laundromat (Sign#40)** – Request for special use permit to allow for a coin operated laundromat in accordance with Section [27.2.2.14] of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for supporting commercial uses. The property, described as Tax Map 56A3 Parcel 9B, contains .7 acres, and is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on Three Notch'd Road [Route #240] across from the old Con Agra facility. The property is zoned LI (Light Industrial). The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area 3. (Michael Barnes) ***DEFERRED FROM AUGUST 28, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. REQUEST DEFERRAL TO OCTOBER 2, 2001.***

Mr. Rooker opened the item for public comment. There being none, the hearing was closed.

Mr. Rieley moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to October 2, 2001.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. **ZMA-2001—004 SNB Car Wash (Sign #88, 89)** – Request to rezone 0.6 acres from C-1 Commercial to HC Highway Commercial to allow for a car wash. The property described as Tax Map 61 Parcel 147 is located in the Rio Magisterial District on Rio Road at the corner of Rio Road and Gasoline Alley. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Service in Neighborhood 2. (Elaine Echols) ***DEFERRED FROM AUGUST 14, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. REQUEST DEFERRAL TO OCTOBER 2, 2001.***

Mr. Rooker opened the item for public comment. There being none, the hearing was closed.

Mr. Finley moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to October 2, 2001.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Deferred Item

a. **ZTA-01-12 Wireless** – Amend Section 3.1, Definitions, and Section 5.1.40, Personal wireless service facilities, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code, to add a definition of "personal wireless service facility," to establish requirements for applications for personal wireless service facilities, and to establish regulations pertaining to the siting of personal wireless service facilities on a lot, including setback and yard requirements, and exempting personal wireless service facilities from having an approved site plan. (Jan Sprinkle) ***DEFERRED FROM AUGUST 28, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Ms. Sprinkle presented the staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if that still simplified the paperwork and the efforts of the applicants.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that the 25' setback is totally gone now. Right now, the only setback that would apply would be the height of the tower to the property line. Which is the same thing we had before.

Mr. Kamptner said that it eliminates the need of applicants to request variances.

Mr. Rooker said that under b6 on page 3, these are exceptions to the general requirement. He would like to have an understanding of the circumstances under which that would be applicable.

Ms. Sprinkle stated that the County had done a number of attachments to existing buildings, such as University Village, as long as they don't exceed the height and are flush mounted, they are allowed to be attached by-right, with just a building permit review.

Mr. Rieley asked if the term "structure" could mean a pole.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that it could, it could mean a tower.

Mr. Rieley asked if there was a pole that was given over to a different use, and as a result it was much taller, that original use was taken off, but the pole remained, does that mean there is a by-right use to put antennas up and down that pole.

Ms. Sprinkle replied it would, for three antennas. If it was a non-conforming tower that didn't have a special permit we would determine whether or not that was more or less non-conforming and allow only if it was less non-conforming.

Mr. Rieley asked for the distinction between our current regulation in such conditions and the proposal.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that we really do not have a regulation. We have been addressing these by policy. This codifies what we have been doing and then adds additional regulation.

Mr. Rooker said that the limitation to three and the flush mounting are new.

Ms. Sprinkle said we also added screening cabinets. Some of the additions have been to the water tanks.

Mr. Rieley stated that his concern was that there are times when this should come under closer scrutiny.

Mr. Rooker said it concerned him as well. This issue has been tightened from the prior draft. We need to think about this to see if there is an example of something we wouldn't want.

Mr. Rieley said an example would be a radio tower. If the tower ceases to function as a radio tower, then you have the tallest cell towers in the County.

Mr. Rooker stated that this does not bother him as applied generally to structures, but as it is applied to towers.

Mr. Rieley suggested that we could exempt towers and poles.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a maximum height.

Mr. Rooker said the question is, without this language, what happens?

Ms. Sprinkle said if you wanted to change that, it would be all new regulation.

Mr. Rieley stated that he thought we had not been dealing with this consistently because the WINA proposal came to us.

Ms. Sprinkle pointed out that they were replacing the tower totally.

Mr. Rieley said that the addition at Fashion Square. He wants to make sure we are not opening the door to a by-right use for something that we think should be scrutinized more closely.

Mr. Rooker asked if you exempted towers and poles where would that leave us.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that we would be doing the same thing.

Mr. Rooker said that you would have to come up with different language to apply to towers and poles.

Ms. Sprinkle stated that the next step of this would be to go to the tier system of review. That would bring anything, other than something that's totally invisible, before the commission for a ministerial review. It would not be the Special Use Permit; those would be reserved for the lattice towers. Treetops will become ministerial under your review, depending on their location.

Mr. Rieley said he thought the tier system needed some more work.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that existing towers that we've passed that are subject to conditions have limits attached to them. Basically, we are talking about towers that do not have existing conditions that limit what can happen.

Mr. Rieley said if you include transmission towers, there are quite a few. He is not terribly concerned about the addition of flush-mounted panels. He said he hates to see the door left open for a tower whose primary function ceases to become a cell tower.

Mr. Thomas asked if that isn't usually written into the conditions.

Mr. Rieley said that's what I would have assumed would have happened, but there are instances in which that have not happened.

Mr. Benish said that is a standard condition in the current regulations.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that what's considered flush-mounted can protrude by a foot on either side. He said he thought that where we are talking about new antennas on towers, it should get into the review process.

Mr. Rieley said it might be something as simple as a condition that states "if the primary use discontinues, the tower must come down.

Mr. Rooker said his only other question was in C1, at the end where the ordinance addresses certification for height. Do we want the certification to cover any of the other things?

Ms. Sprinkle replied that, generally we could see those other things.

Mr. Rooker verified that staff was comfortable with that.

Mr. Finley asked if the 25' setback was still in the revision.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that it was not.

Mr. Rooker said the easement language applies to the setback with respect to the height of the facility. That can be administratively approved if the applicant has acquired an easement on the property.

Mr. Finley asked if the easement had to be the height of the tower, or from the tower to the easement line.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that it would be whatever portion of the tower would fall beyond the property line.

Mr. Kamptner clarified item C2, which could be construed as three per application. The by-right application could add only one more if there are two already there.

Mr. Rooker opened the item for public comment.

Ms. Valerie Long thanked the staff for incorporating her procedural suggestions. She suggested stipulating that there is the option for applying for a special use permit. She asked for continued momentum and requested incorporation of the tier review program.

Mr. Jeff Werner, Piedmont Environmental Council, gave his comments (attached).

Mr. Rooker said that part of this goes to whether or not these facilities are actually special use permit applications to which conditions could be attached. Is it the case that there would be new facilities that would not require a special use permit?

Ms. Sprinkle replied none that she could think of.

Mr. Rooker said the special use permits would include what we have incorporated as standard conditions. They have been included so that, in cases where there is not a special use permit, the same kind of conditions attach.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that if and when we do the tier system, we might have to revise all of these.

There being no further comment, the hearing was closed.

Mr. Finley said that to me that means that you have the height of the tower in the easement, rather than the height left over if it should fall.

Mr. Rooker said the question is in the language.

Mr. Kamptner replied that could be stated a little more clearly, Mr. Finley is correct.

Mr. Rooker asked what do we want to do about our concern about item B6. My recommendation is that we consider requiring towers and poles to go through the special use permit process.

The commission generally agreed.

Ms. Hopper arrived.

Ms. Hopper wondered if, during the administrative review, standards would be followed as to visibility.

Mr. Rooker replied that it would not, if it was by right.

Ms. Sprinkle stated that we have addressed the size of the antenna and have required that the panels be flush-mounted.

Ms. Hopper asked if those criteria have addressed visibility.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that that is what they are intended to address.

Mr. Benish said it has addressed visibility in terms of design, but it is not looking to the site.

Mr. Rooker stated that the policy manual generally encourages the placement of antenna on large existing structures. Hopefully, these are sufficient criteria to limit visibility. We had narrowed our concern to where the structure was a pole or a tower.

Ms. Hopper said she would like there to be some discretion of staff to review those administratively. There still could be visibility issues based on what's surrounding the existing structure. She would like staff to have some kind of discretion to review.

Mr. Rooker suggested looking at some examples, such as if 3 flush-mounted antenna were added on the side of a silo that could not be higher than the silo. This encourages those kinds of situations. He said he is not overly concerned about the visibility of a flush mounted antenna on a large structure.

Ms. Sprinkle said we could add another regulation that could say the panels would have to be colored to blend in with the existing structure.

Ms. Hopper agreed with that. Those types of considerations could happen beyond what we're considering here tonight. She thought this was comprehensive, but would feel more comfortable if there was an administrative review. That would add some extra protection for the unusual situation.

Mr. Thomas said he agreed with her suggestion.

Mr. Finley expressed his concerns about a permit.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that any tower requires a building permit.

Mr. Rooker said an existing structure would not. He asked if there was any preliminary review when the application is made.

Ms. Sprinkle stated that we would receive the permit package, which shows what everything looks like. We do review the permit.

Mr. Rooker verified that staff would not sign off on the permit if they weren't comfortable with the screening that's in place.

Ms. Sprinkle replied that was correct.

Ms. Hopper said she did not want the staff to be stripped of their discretion in the sense of visibility issues. Perhaps there is some criteria we've missed. She would like to reserve staff's discretion. She asked if it would be appropriate for Ms. Sprinkle's office to have the review, rather than the planning staff.

Mr. Benish replied that staff would not be reviewing this.

Mr. Rieley said there would not be any discretion beyond what's permitted.

Mr. Kamptner stated these regulations mean to address all of those issues. They will determine whether or not the application complies with these regulations.

Ms. Hopper said that earlier in the report there was a mention of incorporating other aspects of the wireless policy into ZTAs.

Mr. Kamptner stated that would be coming in Phase II, which will implement the tier approach.

Ms. Hopper said she remembered that there would be administrative review and discretion. It would be the unusual situation where these criteria wouldn't capture our concerns.

Mr. Rooker stated that you couldn't have a by-right situation and have it subject to somebody's discretion.

Mr. Kamptner said that any standards would have to be specific, if we are talking about a by-right use, if they can meet the regulations they should be approved. The regulations are intended to address the visibility issue. If there is anything other else that is not addressed here, that should be addressed.

Ms. Hopper said it seems we have worked hard on making sure these antennas were put up in a way that didn't damage the viewshed. She would like to make sure a poorly place antenna does not affect other people.

Mr. Rooker stated that if the structure is large enough and it cannot go beyond the height, is the same color and flush-mounted, it seems that we would want to encourage that kind of location.

Ms. Hopper said if the structure is large enough.

Mr. Rooker said that perhaps we need to address that, the structure itself has to be of a certain size in terms of the width and height. He said he is generally not troubled until it gets to the point of being a tower or a pole.

Mr. Rieley stated that we have to take a certain leap of faith. We are not going to cover everything. We will end up with some things we wish weren't there and will try to correct them. This is our first opportunity to provide a positive incentive for people to go out and seek the kinds of sites that wouldn't bring them before us. If we exempt towers and poles I'll feel comfortable.

The commission agreed.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval with suggested changes.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 5-1 with Ms. Hopper voting no.

Public Hearing Items

a. **SP-2001-025 Food Lion at Branchlands (Sign #29 & 32)** – Request for a Special Use Permit to display seasonal plant items outdoors in an Entrance Corridor at the Food Lion Store located on the east side of Route 29, south of Branchlands Boulevard and west of Hillsdale Drive. The property is described as Tax Map 61Z, Section 3, Parcel 11, in the Magisterial District. The property is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Entrance Corridor (EC). (Dan Mahon)

b. **SP-2001-025 Food Lion at Mill Creek Sign #25 & 28)** – Request for Special Use Permit for a plan to display seasonal plant items outdoors in an Entrance Corridor at the Food Lion Store located at South Side Shopping Center, on the northeast corner of Avon Street (Route 742) and Mill Creek Drive. The property is described as Tax Map 77, Parcel 47, in the Scottsville Magisterial District. The property is zoned Planned Development Shopping Center (PD-SC) and Entrance Corridor (EC). (Dan Mahon)

c. **SP-2001-027 Food Lion at Forest Lakes (Sign #23 & 24)** – Request for a Special Use Permit to display seasonal plant items outdoors in an Entrance Corridor at the Food Lion Store located in the Forest Lakes Shopping Center between Timberwood Boulevard and Proffit Road, west of Worth Crossing. The property is described as Tax Map 46B4, Parcels 2 and 3, in the Rivanna Magisterial District. The property is zoned Planned Development Shopping Center (PD-SC) and Entrance Corridor (EC). (Dan Mahon)

Mr. Mahon presented the staff reports.

Mr. Craddock asked if that would put it out into the roadway.

Mr. Mahon replied that there is a three-foot paved surface across the front at Forest Lakes and Branchlands, and a five-foot surface at Mill Creek.

Mr. Rieley asked if it was separated by (inaudible).

Mr. Mahon replied that it was flush.

Mr. Benish stated that the surface was asphalt and striped and was distinguished from the traffic lane.

Mr. Cilimberg said that while the display would be allowed, the emergency lane would have to be maintained according to the fire code.

Mr. Rooker verified that this does not preempt the fire code requirements.

Mr. Mahon replied that it did not, the fire code would prevail.

Mr. Rieley said if the entire area is filled with material, the only place to stand would be in the travelway.

Mr. Benish pointed out that there is a parcel pick-up area.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the emergency lane is also a parcel pick-up area, but you can't have anything permanently sitting there.

Mr. Rooker said that in the other places that have this type of area, they do not have an attendant.

Mr. Rieley said that if it is parcel pick-up and emergency use, he is not concerned about it.
Mr. Craddock asked why the Pantops Food Lion was not included.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that these are all entrance corridor properties.

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

Ms. Valerie Long spoke on behalf of the applicant. She said that there would not be an attendant at any of the stores, customers would need to pay for items in the store. They agree with the conditions as proposed by staff. All three stores have limited visibility from the entrance corridors. All of the items being proposed for display are natural items, with the exception of the mulch.

Mr. Craddock said he would like to see the 3-foot spacing for a pedestrian walkway be marked somehow.

Mr. Rooker suggested adding that to the conditions.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested adding "Mark and maintain" to condition #2.

Ms. Katie Hobbs stated her agreement with Mr. Craddock's idea of having some kind of marking. She said that displays often creep out into the pedestrian walkway. If we are going to have sidewalks in front of buildings, could they please be sidewalks. Perhaps the outdoor display could be on a covered patio beside the store.

Mr. Rooker said he hoped the recommendation made by Mr. Craddock would partially deal with her concern. Given the limited items that can be displayed, it may actually improve the appearance.

There being no further comment, the hearing was closed.

Mr. Rieley suggested that it would be useful to incorporate in our site plan review the areas that are designated for pedestrians and display. This proposal is a reasonably modest one, but I do think that 3-feet is not wide enough for strollers or 2 people to walk side-by-side. The typical standard is 4' for a sidewalk. Perhaps we should require the addition of another foot of travel space.

Mr. Thomas asked if the stores are they keeping carts on the sidewalks. He said that at Forest Lakes people had to come into the street and back into the store because of all the carts.

Mr. Rooker said that we could require that an adequate pedestrian passageway be maintained at all times.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the condition would do that, as it requires it along the length of the store, with the exception of the projected area. It would also mean that you couldn't put carts there.

Mr. Rieley requested the change from 3 to 4 feet and incorporation of Mr. Craddock's suggestion that the area be marked with a permanent line.

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of SP-2001-025 with conditions as amended.

1) Items shall be displayed only in the areas of the recessed walkway in front of the store and along the front of the projected entranceway.

2) Mark and maintain a pedestrian aisle (min 4' wide) along entire length of the store, excluding the area in front of the projected entranceway.
3) No additional lighting shall be introduced to the site for the purpose of illuminating this display.
4) Display items shall be limited to those listed in Attachment C.
5) Storage of bagged mulch and potting soil shall be limited to the recessed display areas on the sides of the entranceway and not be stacked higher than three feet.
6) No new signage associated with this use shall be permitted. Pricing information shall not be displayed higher than three feet.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of SP-2001-026 with conditions as amended.

1) Items shall be displayed only in the areas of the recessed walkway in front of the store and along the front of the projected entranceway.
2) Mark and maintain a pedestrian aisle (min 4' wide) along entire length of the store, excluding the area in front of the projected entranceway.
3) No additional lighting shall be introduced to the site for the purpose of illuminating this display.
4) Display items shall be limited to those listed in Attachment C.
5) Storage of bagged mulch and potting soil shall be limited to the recessed display areas on the sides of the entranceway and not be stacked higher than three feet.
6) No new signage associated with this use shall be permitted. Pricing information shall not be displayed higher than three feet.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Finley moved for approval of SP-2001-027 with conditions as amended.

1) Items shall be displayed only in the areas of the recessed walkway in front of the store and along the front of the projected entranceway.
2) Mark and maintain a pedestrian aisle (min 4' wide) along entire length of the store, excluding the area in front of the projected entranceway.
3) No additional lighting shall be introduced to the site for the purpose of illuminating this display.
4) Display items shall be limited to those listed in Attachment C.
5) Storage of bagged mulch and potting soil shall be limited to the recessed display areas on the sides of the entranceway and not be stacked higher than three feet.
6) No new signage associated with this use shall be permitted. Pricing information shall not be displayed higher than three feet.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Old Business

Request for Extension of Blue Ridge Shopping Center Final Site Plan

Mr. Cilimberg presented the staff report.

Mr. Rieley said he thought the report was well put-together, but he was left wondering at the end what is at stake from the public perspective in the difference between 6 months and 21 months. What is to be gained? The only thing he can think of is that the property across the street is moving forward. Why not 21 months?

Mr. Cilimberg replied that we have always taken the basis of the extension, which was the result of delay of the County. The reason we've done that is because of the potential of ordinance changes. That's the greatest basis, by which we have used an unidentifiable extension.

Mr. Rooker said that would most likely act in the applicant's detriment.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that it is supposed to be based on the public's interest. It is not to try to penalize the applicant, but make sure that projects are subject to the same standards. Ordinance changes are supposed to represent a change that the public feels is necessary. We have avoided using economic conditions in trying to determine how long an extension could be. The applicant has revised to 21 months because that reflects a combination of impacts.

Mr. Rooker asked if there weren't cases in which applicants did not act on approved site plans and requested extensions at the last minute.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that we haven't had one that I can remember.

Mr. Rooker asked if they are generally acted on within the allowed timeframe?

Mr. Cilimberg replied or they expire. They have a five-year life, which reflects state law. In some cases they will take action to vest their site plans.

Mr. Rooker said he does not see a great County interest in having the applicant take steps to vest the current plan sooner rather than later.

Mr. Thomas agreed.

Mr. Rieley agreed. He said he is searching for language suggesting that an extension be made conditional upon ordinances that have been passed since the site plan was originally approved.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that on the top of the last page, there is a reference to the water protection ordinance that was adopted in 1998.

Mr. Rieley asked Mr. Kamptner if an extension could be conditional upon the ordinance.

Mr. Kamptner asked for a moment to formulate his reply.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Charles Rotgin, the applicant, deferred to Mr. Kamptner.

Mr. Kamptner said he thought there was nothing that authorizes conditions to be imposed on an extension. The applicant during the five-year period has a right to develop the site plan as approved. What we are talking about is a different approval altogether. In your consideration of the extension, you should weigh that against the fact that the ordinance came into being in 1998.

Mr. Rooker verified that pursuit of that does not require compliance with the water protection ordinance.

Mr. Kamptner replied that it is subject to the regulations that were in effect at the time of approval.

Mr. Rotgin, stated that our intent is to come up with a plan that not only aligns with Radford Lane but that also creates a sub-regional detention facility. The detention facility would also serve the balance of the area that doesn't drain into Licking Hole.

Mr. Scott Peyton, representing Scenic 250, observed that the applicant has had a fair and reasonable use of this property under a strong economy and has not moved forward. He questioned what public interest would be served by extending the site plan beyond its current date.

There being no further comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks there is a public purpose to be served, which is the significant possibility that we will end up with a better plan. He sees no public purpose to force the applicant to move forward. If we grant the extension, the worst case is we end up with the existing plan. The best case is we end up with a better plan. Assuming it's an inappropriate place for commercial development, is there a case for hurrying that development? He would prefer to give the applicant plenty of time to devise a better plan. He would support the applicant's request for a 21-month extension.

Mr. Rieley agreed. He said that we need to make clear that our action should not be viewed as an endorsement of any plan. This is a by-right development, and even if the clock ran out, it would simply mean another application process. It seems to be in the public's interest to allow this to be as good as it can be.

Mr. Thomas agreed.

Mr. Finley stated that the regional catch basin would eliminate the pond across the road, which would be in the public interest.

Mr. Finley moved that the request be approved for 21 months.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

New Business

Mr. Rieley said that Mr. Rooker sent the address for a website for Belmont, North Carolina that is remarkable in its similarities to our situation with the neighborhood model. On the web it doesn't have all of the illustrations, but a hard copy is available from the city. He requested that we have copies of that sent to us.

Mr. Cilimberg said that we had talked at staff level about visiting there.

Mr. Rooker said he was reading the National Governor's Conference Report, noting the reference to Belmont, NC. He went on the internet and found their traditional development regulations. He said he thought that might be of great help to us.

Mr. Finley asked how big Belmont was.

Mr. Rooker said he did not see the population posted on the site.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that it is a suburb of Charlotte.

Mr. Rooker said he would send the website address to Mr. Cilimberg.

Mr. Cilimberg said that we have set the joint meeting with the board for October 17th, starting at 5:00. We will discuss the implementation strategy, including the first master plan.

Ms. Hopper said she would be there.

Mr. Rooker asked if anyone would not attend. Let's assume everyone will be there and we will all eat dinner.

Mr. Craddock asked where 911 is with all their towers.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the missing tower from the first set has been resubmitted.

Mr. Rooker said that a consultant had determined that the plan would not require a tower on Peter's Mountain. He requested that a hard look be taken at that consultant's report.

Ms. Hopper said she recalled a deadline of August 2001.

Mr. Cilimberg said he would research that.

Mr. Thomas said they could implement it without the extra site.

Mr. Rooker stated that they were not going to let the FCC license expire.

Mr. Werner said that the County had acquired a 2-acre parcel on the ridge of Peter's Mountain. The information was that the County had hired a second consultant, which refuted the PEC's consultant. Things are moving quickly on Peter's Mountain.

Mr. Rooker stated that the special use permit would have to come to us. There was a clear interest in having alternative sites explored. Hopefully the County has done that or is doing that.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that it is a coalition of the City, County and UVA.

Mr. Rooker said that the special use permits are in the County.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary