Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 2, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, October 2, 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, Rodney Thomas and Pete Craddock. Other officials present were: Elaine Echols, Juandiego Wade, Joan McDowell, John Shepherd, Jan Sprinkle, Stephen Waller, Greg Kamptner and Wayne Cilimberg.

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 additional matters from the public.

Mr. Jeff Werner, of the Piedmont Environmental Council, commented on the proposed public safety radio tower in the Southwest Mountains Rural Historic District (comments are attached).

There being no further comment, the meeting proceeded.

Consent Agenda

a. **SDP 01-054 Mechum's River Farmers' Market (Café No Problem) Minor Site Plan -** Request is for a modification that would allow an extension of the hours and days allowed for the operation of a farmers' market. (Stephen Waller)

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

Ms. Hopper moved for approval of the consent agenda.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

4. Deferred Items:

a. **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 SEPTEMBER 25, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Ms. Echols presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker asked if there is a rendition of how the building would look with the proposed changes.

Ms. Echols passed along a photograph with the comments from the design planner. It would have a residential form with a hipped roof, the roof color would be compatible with the other

roofs in the area, black and gray. It would either have a vinyl or stucco exterior in off-white and earth tones, with a brick base.

Mr. Rooker said that apparently it is nothing like what was in the packet.

Ms. Echols replied that it was not.

Mr. Rieley said he assumed that all of the soapy water would go into the sewage system and to the treatment plant.

Mr. Benish replied that the water would be recycled.

Ms. Echols pointed out that the applicant is required to contain the runoff. The service authority has asked the applicant to work out whether the wastewater goes to the County or the City.

Mr. Loewenstein asked Ms. Echols if she had provided the text of the conditions of the critical slopes waiver.

Ms. Echols replied that they were in the staff report, on the last page.

Mr. Loewenstein said that they were not identified separately.

Ms. Echols said you needed bullets, sorry about that.

Mr. Rooker said that the items recommended as proposed conditions are on page 9 or 10.

Mr. Loewenstein said they were on page 10, it's all there, it's just stated a little differently.

Ms. Echols stated that the items on 8 and 9 are the comments that have come from the different departments, and what is necessary for final approval.

Mr. Rooker verified that it was not necessary to add the three items on page 10 as conditions.

Ms. Echols replied that it was not, staff cannot add conditions to the critical slopes waivers.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jerry Northcutt, one of the applicants, said he would be happy to answer questions.

Mr. Thomas said he was glad to see it become a car wash rather than a used car lot.

Mr. Northcutt said it was a very small lot with a slope on it, which limits its uses.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be loud blowers inside the building.

Mr. Northcutt said there would be blowers, but they are not loud. The equipment is if fairly new on the market and is quiet. The noise from the traffic is greater than the noise from the equipment.

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

Mr. Loewenstein asked if the noise impact would be ameliorated if we imposed hours of operation.

Mr. Rooker stated that the applicant said he did not have an intention of operating other than during daylight hours. We could ask the applicant if he would proffer some kind of hours of operation.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that the report says within the existing hours of operation of the convenience stores and gas stations along Rio Road. Those hours are beyond daylight.

Mr. Rooker said he thought there was something in here where the applicant said he would not operate except during daylight hours.

Ms. Echols said she thought they would be operating in conjunction with the hours of the other businesses.

Mr. Northcutt said that they had not really determined that as yet. They don't think that noise will be an issue, particularly with the four-lane highway in front of it. People will likely not be washing their cars at 2:00 in the morning. If we limit to daylight hours, then we will close at 4:00 p.m. on a winter day, which is limiting from a business standpoint. We see ourselves in a commercial area because we are between three gas stations. There is one house that possibly could hear something. The other 3 houses are screened.

Mr. Rooker asked if he would agree not to operate the car wash between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.

Mr. Northcutt said he would like to comply with what the other commercial establishments are doing in that area.

Mr. Rooker stated that there is some concern that noise from a car wash might be a little different than noise from a store. If there were a period of time during the evening in which you do not plan to operate, we would feel better if you would proffer those hours of operation.

Mr. Northcutt asked if he could have an opportunity to study the percentage of business during certain hours of the day. He said he believes there is a percentage of business done with people on their way to work.

Mr. Rooker suggested that he could proffer something at this time and ask for an amendment before it goes to the board, which would give you a reasonable period of time to study.

Mr. Northcutt stated that this is a drive-through, which makes it attractive to parents with small children.

Mr. Thomas said he would feel comfortable with the applicant's previous suggestion. He asked if it was like the one on Ivy Road.

Mr. Northcutt said it was, this is an automatic.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that they are not noisy. The noise factor should not be an issue.

Mr. Rooker said that he did not know what those hours were, it is not enforceable as it is.

Ms. Hopper stated that it sounds like maybe noise is not an issue.

Mr. Northcutt said that the issue here is the space. You cannot get any more on this lot. He would rather proffer not to add anything else to this property than to proffer hours.

Mr. Rooker asked about 11 p.m. to 6 a.m.

Mr. Northcutt countered with midnight to 5 a.m.

Mr. Rooker said he thought the concern was that noise could be something of an issue for the residents. People generally don't want to hear noise until midnight during the week.

Mr. Northcutt suggested the hours of midnight to 6 on the weekend.

Mr. Rooker suggested establishing the hours at 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. during the week and midnight to 6 a.m. on the weekends.

Mr. Finley asked if the closest house was on the other side of Rio Road.

Mr. Northcutt replied that it was, but there were five lanes of traffic separating the two. He said he thought that if it were a concern for the residents, they would be here tonight.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that there was one resident who was concerned. This is something that should have been looked at before it ever got here. It would have been worthwhile to determine the hours of the other operations. This is a little different in terms of potential noise generation from a convenience store with a gas pump.

Mr. Northcutt said that the homeowner was satisfied that this was a non-issue based on their discussion with her. The bays are parallel to the houses, so any noise is headed toward the Aetna station.

Mr. Rooker stated that the wall would also help to break down the sound.

Mr. Thomas said he still feels that the hours should be by store hours.

Mr. Rieley asked Ms. Echols to comment on the enforceability.

Ms. Echols replied that zoning's take on the issues was that those kind of conditions or proffers give them some pause because of enforceability. There are other convenience stores with drive-through car washes on that stretch of road and none of those other uses are restricted. She said she does not know the hours.

Mr. Benish pointed out that we couldn't control the hours of operation of the surrounding businesses.

Mr. Rooker said he thought that general feeling was to not impose hours of operation.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of ZMA-2001-004 with proffers.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Ms. Hopper moved for approval of the preliminary site plan with conditions.

1. [32.5.6(n)] Show the location of all outdoor lighting on the plan.
2. [32.6.6(j)] Provide a description and photograph or diagram and show the location of each type of outdoor luminaire that emits 3,000 or more initial lumens. Please be aware that installation of such luminaries in the future that are not shown on this plan shall require an amendment to this plan.
3. [32.6.6(j)] [4.17.4(b)] Include a photometric plan on the site plan demonstrating that parking area luminaries are in compliance with 4.17.4(b).

Mr. Finley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of the critical slopes waiver and the waiver to allow for one-way circulation.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. **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 SEPTEMBER 25, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Mr. Barnes presented the staff report.

Mr. Finley asked if the owner would close the easternmost entrance temporarily or permanently at this time.

Mr. Barnes replied that essentially the applicant needs the SP to get the laundromat in this building. They intend to provide the building in the back sometime in the future. It may be that once they come back with the site plan, a one-way entrance would make more sense, but that has yet to be determined. The owner has agreed to close the entrance now with some bollards or planter boxes.

Mr. Finley verified that the last sentence in condition #2 would still apply.

Mr. Barnes replied that at the time that is reopened we would have to revisit the issue of rescinding this condition.

Mr. Rooker verified that the owner has agreed to this condition at this time.

Mr. Barnes said that furthermore, the applicant has stated that as far as removing the concrete from the entrance and restoring it with a sidewalk, he would be willing to do that at a later date, but not at this time due to the questions of further development at the site.

Mr. Rieley asked if any consideration was given to terminating the two-way access with some kind of a physical barrier. Normally, with one-way circulation, it is very inconvenient to travel in any other direction. This has built in ambivalence.

Mr. Rooker said it should be just one-way.

Mr. Rieley stated that perpendicular parking suggests two-way circulation.

Mr. Finley said he did not see how it could work any other way. The problem could be resolved by removing one of the arrows.

Mr. Rooker agreed. He suggested removing one of the arrows and making it a true one-way circulation.

Mr. Loewenstein suggested putting in angled parking on the side. He said it seems to defy the concept of safety.

Mr. Rooker proposed that the commission ask engineering to look at the possibility of making the change we've recommended regarding the circulation.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jon Quesenberry, speaking on behalf of the applicant, said he would be willing to answer any questions at this time.

Mr. Finley pointed out that 90 people signed up as approving this application.

There being no further comment, Mr. Rooker closed the public hearing.

Mr. Finley moved for approval of SP-2001-023 with conditions. The Planning Commission proposed that the Engineering Department consider requiring true one-way circulation.

1. The owner shall provide for the parking and directional signage in general accord with the improvements shown on the sketch plan, prepared by Raymond E. Gaines, Architect titled "Crozet Laundry" and last revised 9/19/01 prior to opening the laundromat use granted under this Special Use Permit. Finally, the individual parking spaces shall be permanently delineated on the site.
2. The owner shall close the eastern most access point on Tax Map 56A3 Parcel 9A in a manner that meets with the approval of the Albemarle County Department of Engineering and Public Works. The requirements of this condition shall be preformed prior to opening the laundromat use granted under this Special Use Permit.
3. The applicant shall provide a traffic island or bollards to protect the parking space designated number "1" on the sketch plan.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

The Commission also approved a site plan waiver request in accordance with Section 32.2.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to the following:

1. The owner shall remove the two-way circulation from the western side of the parcel and replace it with a one-way circulation that proceeds counter-clockwise around the building. Additionally, the owner shall replace the perpendicular parking spaces, labeled "1-5" on the plan, with four angled parking spaces.

Mr. Loewenstein moved for approval of the angled and parallel parking authorization and the one-way circulation authorization, with the proposed changes to the one-way circulation waiver.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary