Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 9, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, October 9, 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 and Pete Craddock. Other officials present were Michael Barnes, Elaine Echols, David Benish, Greg Kamptner and Wayne Cilimberg.

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 additional matters from the public. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – October 3, 2001

Mr. Cilimberg stated that last week the board reviewed the special use permit for the Laser Tag at Planet Fun, which was approved with conditions, and the Baker After School Program which was also approved. The Pantops Place modification was approved as recommended. They also reviewed and approved all of the miscellaneous zoning text amendments.

Work Session:

CPA 01-04 Albemarle Place [Sperry]- The proposal seeks to amend Tax Map 61W Parcels 19A and 19B Comprehensive Plan designation from Industrial Service to Regional Service, to support an eventual rezoning from LI, Light Industrial, to PUD, Planned Unit Development, for the purposes of creating a mixed residential, office, and commercial development. The properties consist of approximately 62.24 acres and are located in the Jack Jouett Magisterial District and in Neighborhood 1. The properties are located west of Seminole Trail (Route 29 North

Mr. Barnes presented the staff report.

Mr. Rieley observed that the open space mapped was only the public open space. He asked if Mr. Barnes had calculated the floor area ratio for this plan.

Mr. Rooker said we would need to know how many stories each of the buildings are.

Mr. Barnes said that what they were looking at was the total square footage of the open space.

Mr. Rooker said you can't calculate the Floor Area of Buildings on this site from the information on this chart.

Mr. Rieley said that would be interesting to know the next time this come up.

Mr. Rooker stated that it's apparent there are many connected streets running into the area.

Mr. Barnes said that an interesting question was where are the amenities in the form of a larger green space, that relate to this project. How can Whitewood Park and the MeadowCreek area come into play with this project?

Mr. Rooker asked Mr. Barnes to indicate on the map the location of the streams.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was some suggestion that the grade differential be eliminated by fill.

Mr. Barnes replied that the site is close to grade. It's a question of the intensity and density of development driving that.

Mr. Rooker said so the grade differential you refer to that creates the need for retaining walls is created by the development activity itself.

Mr. Barnes replied that it was. He pointed out the grade changes on the map.

Mr. Rooker said he thought we had done that on the Hollymead Town Center site, so we are not treating this in a unique way.

Mr. Rooker said he thought it would be helpful to get an numerical comparison of the total square footage of development permitted with the current industrial zoning as compared with the requested rezoning.

Mr. Finley asked how this development would effect the viability of the two industries.

Mr. Barnes replied that there is a long list of justifications in the applicant's report. The company itself has sold the property. He is not sure what that means for the long-term viability of that industry.

Mr. Finley is that what you mean when you say you think the viability of that industry might be affected.

Mr. Barnes replied that he looked at it a couple of different ways. First, does this industry need to expand, does it need to have a buffer, will it have an eventual need for that land. The plant itself sold the land off shows they do not envision needing it. Second, how do the two uses work together.

Mr. Rooker said there are really have two different parcels of property. The parcel in between Comdial and Sperry remains contiguous to and in between two industrial uses.

Mr. Barnes said that something to look at would be the potential of the site being developed for industrial uses in the near future.

Mr. Finley said that in your background you talked about the possibility of establishing a regional center. What do you mean there when you say a regional center?

Mr. Barnes replied that the current designation of the property is industrial service, it could also be a transitional area with mixed development on a community scale. A community scale would include smaller retailers.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that Rivanna Town Center is more of a community service scale.

Mr. Barnes said there are a range of possibilities here. You could have something of a community scale or regional scale. We may not be able to answer that question tonight.

Mr. Finley suppose it is eventually recognized as a regional center, would it effect the design on the board or the other site designs out there.

Mr. Barnes replied that it may effect the other ones. There is sometimes a debate on whether it's government's role to regulate how much land is available for development or let the free market dictate it. How much square footage can we reasonably support in the County?

Mr. Rooker added there is the question of where is the best place to build out, given our infrastructure.

Mr. Finley also questioned the character of the development. Rental rates would be high. This sounds a little bit elitist. Does a regional center depend primarily on location or character?

Mr. Barnes replied that this site plan is focusing more on the retail, rather than the housing.

Mr. Cilimberg said we need to look at the components of what the applicant proposes to do. The applicant is proposing a fairly significant amount of square footage in retail. You have at least one larger box as well as what would likely be a grocery store and a multiplex theater. Creating a destination point will make it a regional project. They'll need a draw from a fairly large area to support that.

Mr. Rooker asked what the size of Fashion Square Mall is.

Mr. Cilimberg replied it was in the neighborhood of 500,000 square feet.

Mr. Rooker said this proposal is for 872,000 square feet of retail.

Mr. Finley verified that we were looking at this as a normal project.

Mr. Cilimberg said that for the amount of square footage proposed and the characteristics, it would be a regional use under the plan. It needs to get a designation associated with that. Mr. Barnes is asking you if this is the right location for that scale of use, he is also noting other locations where regional use is proposed. When you are looking at that, you are looking at transportation, services, location and population of the market.

Mr. Barnes stated that perhaps those questions cannot be answered tonight.

Mr. Cilimberg said if you can isolate the information you have and realize you still need information on market and transportation, what is the physical capability of this location to handle the development proposed. It may very well be that you can adjust the conclusion based on other factors. What we tried to do tonight is to provide for some of the physical aspects of the site. If you can focus on that, it may drive some of the transportation and market considerations.

Mr. Rooker said this is a little bit of the chicken or the egg situation.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that we were trying to find a starting point for that discussion.

Mr. Rooker remarked that the staff report was well done. We will try to arrive at some kind of consensus on the information presented tonight.

Ms. Hopper asked of the three locations, is there a statement in the comprehensive plan that suggests there should be a regional development in this general area.

Mr. Cilimberg responded that there are other lands in the area designated as regional service that are not developed. Hollymead Town Center and Northpoint already have that land use designation.

Mr. Craddock asked how much water Sperry uses currently.

Mr. Barnes replied that he had not idea. But he has asked if there is there sufficient supply, the answer was yes.

Mr. Craddock said he was curious to see how much water they were using in comparison to the project. He said he was also interested in the number of car trips anticipated.

Mr. Barnes said that under the existing plan, the applicant could put offices there. It can be developed at a fairly high intensity now.

Mr. Rooker stated that it would be helpful to get the potential development under the current zoning.

Mr. Rooker suggested going through the issues presented in the staff report individually.

As proposed, the site grading would remove most of the woods. Is this acceptable? And If properly designed, does the plan need to retain the wooded buffer?

Mr. Thomas replied that he would like to see some of the trees remain as a buffer.

Mr. Rooker said there are a long series of duplexes along Commonwealth Drive. One question is the overall site, is it appropriate to remove all of the trees and second is the question of the buffer.

Mr. Finley asked if the applicant could be required not to remove the trees.

Mr. Rooker replied that in terms of ultimately approving the plan, we could include requiring some existing tree coverage to remain. Generally, when we are looking at infill development of an intense nature, it is going to be very difficult.

Mr. Cilimberg said there will be a requirement under our ordinance for tree coverage. There will be canopy requirements. You get a bonus if you preserve existing wooded areas. But in most infill situations, it would be pretty difficult.

Mr. Rieley said the second piece of the question is a little more difficult. He agrees with Mr. Thomas that if the configuration and uses are developed as proposed, we would like to see substantial buffering. He is not certain that this is the configuration we will ultimately end up with.

Mr. Rooker stated that based on the current design, we should maintain the wooded buffer between the site and the Commonwealth Drive area.

Mr. Finley asked what would be the minimum on a buffer.

Ms. Hopper asked how many feet were designated before as a buffer. In speaking to the goal of interconnectivity, there could be some creative ways to interconnect through trails and paths.

Mr. Rooker said that to interconnect to Commonwealth, they would have to buy some of those residential units. It would be helpful to get feedback from the residents in that area regarding that connection. We are acknowledging that most of the woods on existing site would be removed with the current plan. We would like to see some of the wooded buffer maintained. The extent might depend on staff determining the location of trees on the site in that area.

To what degree is the use and height of retaining walls acceptable on this site? Under what conditions should they be used?

Mr. Rooker stated that the west side of the site calls for 10' to 20' retaining walls.

Mr. Rieley said he shared staff's uneasiness regarding the use of retaining walls. The internal walls, which can be worked into the design, is one thing. But, when they are walls that either face an existing neighborhood or cut off a future connection, that's a substantial problem.

Mr. Rooker agreed. To the extent that you have twenty-foot retaining walls, you are not serving any goal of connectivity. He would like to see a design that would minimize the retaining walls, especially as it faces the residential areas. He said that he would not be as concerned about the walls that would face the Comdial property.

Mr. Thomas said that the problem there would be the chance for connectivity from Comdial to Greenbrier Drive, which would be altered with a road.

Mr. Rieley stated that there is such an interrelationship between this issue and several other issues presented tonight.

Mr. Finley asked what's the alternative to 10' to 20' retaining walls.

Mr. Rooker replied a less intense development that doesn't require as much grading.

Mr. Rieley said he thought that was the result of the big box in the northwest corner and the parking associated with it. There is not much room to slope to the adjacent landforms.

Ms. Hopper said she would be interested in seeing alternatives to the retaining walls that could be provided.

Mr. Barnes pointed out the height of the retaining wall.

Mr. Rieley stated that the general response is that it is a concern.

Mr. Rooker said that it is difficult to say that any single issue is a reason in and of itself why the commission would not approve the application. We are responding to these issues on a one by one basis.

Mr. Finley asked if the streams were covered anywhere currently, other than going under Route 29.

Mr. Barnes replied that they go under Commonwealth Drive. The northern stream goes into another pipe by the Pepsi plant. The southern one goes into a pipe under Seminole Square and ends up in a basin behind Giant.
Mr. Craddock asked if the road got smaller as it neared the location of the big box. His concern is in conjunction with any type of possible interconnection over to Comdial.

Mr. Barnes replied that the width of the road is something that can be changed at the time of the rezoning plan.

Mr. Craddock stated that not a whole lot of people are going to run across that road to go to a big box if that's a main travelway at some point.

As proposed, the project would pipe two streams of marginal quality. Do the goals for developing this site merit piping the stream? What degree of stream destruction is acceptable?

Mr. Rooker described the streams.

Mr. Barnes said he would not call the southern stream pristine. It is shown as intermittent on the USGS.

Mr. Rieley asked if there is water in it now.

Mr. Barnes replied that there was.

Mr. Rieley said that then it was a perennial stream.

Mr. Barnes said there were several places where you couldn't see out of the bank on the northern stream. The other side is exhibiting erosion. The Sperry plant does not have to contain runoff. There is more aquatic life in that Southern stream.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a retention pond holding the Northern stream back.

Mr. Barnes said he thought there were some sites above that that had retention facilities. Where it passes under Commonwealth it almost acts a retention facility.

Mr. Rooker asked if preserving the streams was an important consideration, even though it might limit some of the connectivity.

Mr. Thomas asked if there had been any opinions about the positive and negative effects of piping the streams.

Mr. Barnes replied that he really couldn't answer that question.

Mr. Finley said that when this project is finished, the stream will be the equivalent of a storm sewer.

Mr. Barnes said it would be difficult to maintain with all of the impervious cover. If you want to not pipe the stream and use it as a resource, it could be accomplished, but it would be difficult.

Mr. Rooker suggested asking Mr. Hirschman to provide a report on this issue.

Mr. Thomas asked what is the runoff that comes through that area now.

Mr. Rieley said he thought the major issue is almost a philosophical one, in that when you have the option of leaving the stream above ground, that is generally a much better thing. The cumulative impacts on Meadow Creek should be a major consideration.

Mr. Finley said he thought we should request this as a priority item. This plan has to be piped.

Mr. Rooker said he agreed. We need more information on an expedited basis. Would we have any control over the piping of the streams.

Mr. Kamptner said that the critical slopes come into play.

Mr. Rooker stated that these streams are not designated as perennial.

Ms. Hopper pointed out that Mr. Hirschman had drafted a memo about evaluating perennial and intermittent streams. She said she would be interested in hearing more back from him on that issue. He suggested a point system.

Mr. Barnes stated that they were working on that system now.

Mr. Rieley said it is justifiable to take a close look in this situation because the proposal brings with it more flexibility in setting the standards. He said he appreciated the staff making the distinction between the two streams. In addressing the road alignment, it may raise ways to deal with keeping one of the streams open.

How should the undeveloped land adjacent to Sperry and Comdial Factories be developed in order to privide access to these industries and maintain their viability?

Mr. Rooker stated that we also raised the question of looking at these as two separate parcels.

Mr. Rieley said it does seem curious, dealing with that piece separately. He asked if he understood correctly that the comp plan change would effect the entire block.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that staff would suggest looking at the entire block as part of the comp plan change. It may very well be that you wouldn't change the designation on the industrial properties.

Mr. Rieley said he was getting at the same issue Mr. Rooker raised, where should the line be drawn.

Mr. Rooker said he was uncomfortable looking at changing the designation of those properties without any plan before us.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that that would leave us with a horseshoe shaped piece of property between two industrial service areas.

Mr. Thomas stated that Sperry would still be there. If Sperry were to leave, then there would already be the change in the zoning.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the zoning would not likely change.

Mr. Rieley said it would almost be an invitation for that change in use.

Mr. Finley asked if the same owner had the Sperry plant.

Mr. Rooker replied that the owner would have to request the zoning, but not the comp plan change.

Mr. Finley verified that it would still remain industrial until they requested otherwise.

Mr. Rooker said the change would include a lot of potential uses for that property that may or may not be appropriate without looking at a plan.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that another way to look at it is that you have industrially designated properties. There may be the need to consider change, but for now, if you are uncomfortable with making a different designation, you might want to defer to the future and look at this particular request in terms of how it relates to those properties.

Mr. Rooker replied that he would feel more comfortable with that approach. How important is that access to the overall traffic flow on the site.

Mr. Barnes said that we don't know yet.

Mr. Thomas stated that he sees it as an interconnectivity road going back to Route 29.

Mr. Rooker said that there were two issues. In the first, we agree that we want to take out the Comdial property and Sperry property as comp plan changes now. In the second, do we want to look at these parcels together or separately.

Mr. Finley asked what the advantage would be to looking at them separately.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there are two separate parcels and the parcel on the North lies between two industries. Does it make sense to take that property out of light industrial designation.

Mr. Finley asked if the north stream touched the second parcel.

Mr. Rooker replied that the north stream is on that second parcel.

Ms. Hopper pointed out that the north parcel extends all the way to the top.

Mr. Rieley said it makes sense to look at them as separate parcels.

Mr. Barnes pointed out the separate parcels on the map.

Mr. Rooker said that we want to keep our options open.

Schools

Mr. Rieley stated that the plan for 600 high-income apartments is pretty contrary to the neighborhood model. The plan we ultimately end up with might draw more children.

Mr. Rooker said there is also a significant variation between the low and high numbers. He said that the schools appear adequate to handle this development.

Libraries

Mr. Rieley said he would endorse the staff's statement.

Fire and Rescue

Mr. Craddock asked if this would be affected by the new fire agreement, when the city won't go out of the city limits.

Mr. Thomas said he thought they were working on an agreement for the Pantops area.

Public Open Space Infrastructure

Mr. Rooker said it would be helpful to get the total population being served, including in the City.

Mr. Rooker said that within that question is the extent to which the open space is adequate. This project does not afford the kind of usable open space we should see on 60+ acres of land.

Ms. Hopper agreed.

Mr. Rieley agreed and said he thought improvements to the parks should be considered.

Mr. Cilimberg said that when you had the village at Rivanna before you in the last month, we talked about open space. You said that you needed to look at the purpose and quality of what was provided. Is there anything in terms of type that strikes you as being particularly necessary in what is a pretty dense urban space?

Mr. Rieley said he thought we were talking about something that is probably more dense than downtown Charlottesville.

Mr. Rooker said that would imply about 6 acres of open space based on this. It is a significant amount of commercial development and demands some public open space that is usable.

Mr. Barnes said he didn't want the debate to go in that direction. These are different types of uses. In some respects, this is a pedestrian mall. This is retail in its orientation.

Mr. Rooker stated that open space can take different forms based on potential users. What was the amount of open space proposed for the town center at Rivanna.

Mr. Cilimberg had that very large area at the lake.

Mr. Rooker said that even there, we were looking at roughly 9 percent open space. Ten percent would imply around 6 acres of open space for this development, which would not be too little to ask. This development is surrounded by high density residential.

Ms. Hopper asked how many acres were currently on the proposed plan.

Mr. Rooker replied that it was less than 2 acres, about 30,000 square feet in the mall area. There is another area of similar size on the west side.

Mr. Barnes replied that his estimate was around 4 percent.

Mr. Rooker feels that's significantly less than we should see in this kind of development.

Ms. Hopper said it was worth considering that this was a different type of development than the downtown mall. Drawing a straight parallel between the two is not necessary. We should definitely see more open space than what is currently shown.

Mr. Finley said he feels a little crowded by the plan, how does it breathe? Is there not an open space requirement already in the ordinance?

Mr. Cilimberg replied that there is a certain amount required in planned developments. He believes it is about 20%.

Mr. Rooker said he thought that was significant.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that we do need to look at minimums.

Mr. Thomas asked why the downtown mall is all considered open space.

Mr. Barnes replied that sidewalks become open space.

Mr. Rieley said he would not argue that the plaza is not a usable open space, there is just not enough of it.

Mr. Rooker stated that he was not prepared to say that 10% is the number.

Mr. Rooker asked if there were any existing suggestions for improvements to Whitewood Park.

Mr. Thomas said there had been some discussion along with the development of the river property. There may be an enlargement of that Park

Mr. Barnes stated that the park has not really been brought forward as an issue.

Mr. Rooker said that there is a general recognition that this area needs additional usable open space.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that he did not think that there is going to be any real expansion. There is not any active plan for additional use of the park. We do hope to have a bicycle facility along what was to be the Greenbriar connection to Rio Road. We have a regional detention basin on the north side of the park, which would be integrated. The intent of Whitewood Park has been to remain greenspace and more of a natural trails area.

Mr. Rooker said he was trying to determine what was meant by posing the question here.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that Whitewood Park would not change a whole lot.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to see the total usable park area available to the residents and the total population in that area. He suggested a quarter-mile radius. We need to consider the need for additional open space as the population expands in that area.

Mr. Cilimberg said staff would provide a picture of that quarter-mile radius that might show what features exist, including pedestrian systems. That would give you some context for comparison.

Mr. Rooker stated that it might alleviate some concerns.

Mr. Craddock asked if we had usage figures for Whitewood Park.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that Parks and Rec might have some information.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that a big part of the open space in the neighborhood is around the schools.

Mr. Finley asked if the park or the greenway is approved, who would pay. Would surrounding developers participate?

Mr. Cilimberg replied that would not be likely. There can be some contribution towards park facilities as part of the rezoning process. There is no formal process.

Mr. Rooker said that there is nothing to prevent a developer from acquiring additional land for park space.

Mr. Craddock asked if Albemarle and Jouett fall within a quarter mile.

Mr. Barnes replied that they would not.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that Whitewood Park is not in that radius either.

Mr. Rooker said that most people living in this development are not going to walk to Whitewood Park to use it.

Pedestrian/bicycle improvements

Mr. Rieley concurred.

Mr. Thomas agreed.

Mr. Rooker said that the suggested pedestrian connection west of the existing sidewalk along Rt. 29 is perhaps not practical given that most of the frontage is not owned by the applicant. There is a sidewalk along that side of 29. If this development met all other criteria, he would not impose that on the applicant.

Mr. Cilimberg said that some of the alternatives the study recommended were to deal with the relationships between uses and the sidewalk on 29 itself. With sidewalks throughout this development, you are getting that, and it is more of a relationship to external areas.

Mr. Rooker said the orientation of this project is pretty much internal. Is an internally focused development more appropriate than a development that would be more focused to Route 29.

Mr. Rieley said that one of the major weaknesses of this plan is that there is a strong new streetscape being developed on a proposed street, whereas the real street gets the rear view. He would like to see that treated in a more urbane way along Hydraulic Road. Route 29 is a little bit different issue because it carries such a large volume of traffic.

Mr. Thomas said he thought that from the City side of Hydraulic road, it kind of flowed across the road. He said he thought Mr. Rieley made a good point.

Mr. Rooker stated that one of the things we did with the Hollymead site was to at least make certain that the facades that faced streets had the appearance of the fronts of buildings.

Ms. Hopper said she liked the idea of having that really be a streetscape.

Mr. Rooker asked about some of the pedestrian ideas. How reasonable is it to request a developer to incorporate them into the design.

Mr. Rieley said he read the staff's strong feeling about this as an endorsement of the concepts rather than a prescription.

Mr. Barnes stated that tying this project in with the adjoining neighborhoods is important. He is not prepared to say who would pay for it in the end.

Mr. Rooker said he thought the question was how do you get there.

Mr. Barnes stated that the purpose of the report was to tie together the many different elements that need to be considered. I think we all can agree this is a good idea. The actual implementation may be something that is more on a rezoning level.

Mr. Rieley stated that he was gratified to see the work from another study brought to bear in the early stages of planning.

Public Transportation

Mr. Rieley asked if anybody from Charlottesville Transit had an opportunity to look at this plan.

Mr. Barnes replied that they had not.

Mr. Rooker said that we need to have them look at this to make sure that the traffic flow is conducive to serving this development.

Mr. Craddock asked if the County paid anything for the City to run its buses through there.

Mr. Rooker replied that there is a sharing agreement currently.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that we are essentially paying for County routes.

Road Interconnections

Mr. Rooker asked if it made sense to deal with this without a traffic analysis. He said he is somewhat uncomfortable with coming out with any kind of declaration or suggestion without one.

Mr. Thomas said he agreed, he would like to wait until we can see a traffic study and suggestions.

Discussion was deferred on this topic.

Mr. Rooker asked how do the right-of-way needs for the widening of Hydraulic Road impact this potential project.

Mr. Barnes replied that staff had not considered it to the extent that we looked at how it would effect the orientation.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that Hydraulic is five lanes. There is no sidewalk on one side and no bike lanes.

Mr. Rooker said that is not a true five-lane.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that it has substandard lanes.

Mr. Cilimberg said they went to the bare minimum of lane width.

Mr. Rooker stated that we need to consider optimally what should be done with Hydraulic Road in that area. We need to take into consideration the right-of-way needs, as well as sidewalks and bicycle lanes.

Mr. Rieley said that a grade-separated interchange should be considered at Route 29 and Hydraulic.

Mr. Rooker said he would assume that will be dealt with in the traffic study.

Mr. Barnes stated he thought we would have to deal with that.

Water/Sewer Capacity

Mr. Rooker said he assumed we would ask the applicant to provide some kind of a study to deal with that issue.

Mr. Cilimberg said that it is a given. That is really more for the zoning stage of things. What we need to know that there is the capacity in place to service this location.

Mr. Rooker stated that the conclusion is that there is adequate capacity.

Stormwater

Mr. Rieley said he thought this was a huge issue, as we have substantial degradation of the Meadowcreek drainage. Assuming that we are going to build only to our current standards and guidelines is really not enough. We need to look very hard at the net impact on that drainage.

Mr. Rooker asked at what point to we get a determination of what's needed at the interceptor level.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that is a problem that exists in the system. We should ask the service authority to let us know to what extent that would inhibit development.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that we need to ask that question right away.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the public has normally taken that responsibility.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to know what the public's potential investment requirement is.

Ms. Hopper stated that this is not the first infrastructure issue that has come up. It seems that this issue would have priority over the road improvement issues. There is going to have to be a commitment to support the development we are talking about, to providing the infrastructure.

Mr. Rooker said that the scale of the development may impact the public investment required. If we are undertaking a significant public expenditure, we need to plan for that in the capital improvement program.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it would be in the authority's capital improvement program. This sounds like this is an infiltration

problem. This should not be happening with a sanitary sewer.

Mr. Finley said that the report brings up the existing and potential problems.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that whatever is built at that site will have to be handled in terms of it's flow.

Mr. Rooker said that the stormwater basin is an issue that needs some significant study.

Analysis of Comprehensive Plan Goals

Mr. Rooker asked if the commission could really deal with this issue tonight or do we need to see other information.

Mr. Finley replied that we need further information.
Mr. Rooker said that perhaps we can have a follow up work session after the traffic study is in place.

Mr. Rieley congratulated staff on this report.

Old Business

Mr. Rooker asked when the Peter's Mountain tower would come back before us.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that it would come before the Board's December meeting. He would say it is in November. It is not on the last schedule.

Mr. Rooker said that he would like to make certain that this doesn't come before us in a mode that we have to make a decision on this in a short timeframe. He would like to get it in plenty of time to address land use issues.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that staff is relying on the applicant. He said that we have urged an examination of the alternatives right now.

Mr. Rooker said that we have had a least one report that said the system could be completed without the use of Peter's Mountain at a lower cost. He would like to see all of these consultant reports. He would like to see a report as to why that alternative would not work.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that we have already asked for documentation and emphasized through the County Executive's office.

Mr. Rooker said he hopes we are open mindedly exploring the alternatives. It is not in the County's interest to stick with that site if there are alternatives.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that we have to make sure we are giving the applicant time to get all of that together.

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

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary