Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 16, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, October 16, 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

Ms. Lorraine Zitnay, of Cismont, brought up the deterioration of the road in her neighborhood. She said that the road is wash-boarded and deeply rutted. The neighborhood's desire is to have the road paved in place for 8/10 of a mile at the worst section of the road. It would be cost effective to pave the road because VDOT has to come for maintenance every 6-8 weeks. Safety is the second issue. The fire trucks from Stoney Point use the road to answer calls in Cismont. She requested the assistance of the commission for getting the road paved. She does not think it is viable to wait 10 years.

Mr. Cilimberg said that, to be paved-in-place, roads need to have 100% of the right-of-way available along them. Pave-in-place is not a method that has been used very often by VDOT. While we would like to see that in many of our paved projects, we have not had an indication from VDOT that they would be willing to do that. He asked Mr. Benish if Rt. 600 was on the list of unpaved roads.

Mr. Benish replied that he did not think it was.

Mr. Cilimberg briefly outlined the process for requesting a pave-in-place. He said there are a number of roads that already have completely donated right-of-way that are in line to be paved. There is a limited amount of money for paving unpaved roads in the County. He said that perhaps we could communicate with VDOT to see if there are other measures that might be undertaken.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – October 10, 2001

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the applicant for the Merrie Meadows project does want to have camping activities in association with the church. That camping activity would likely be considered as an activity associated with a church, not requiring a separate special use permit. We feel the analysis needs to be expanded to include the impact of the camping. The Board of Supervisors has decided to refer that application back to the planning commission. The Crozet Laundromat was approved as recommended. The Board approved the Hollymead Town Center. The Board of Supervisors passed the town center comprehensive plan amendment with specific reference to the master plan. It included an allowance for over 65,000 square feet in a single retail use and it directs that be addressed in it's impact. There was no upper limit placed on square footage. In the master plan there is an indication of two buildings over 65,000 square feet. The FAR was reduced to .5 as a target for ultimate FAR. The allowance for a crossover on Rt. 29 was provided to be based on traffic studies and VDOT approval. The 100-foot buffer was not a requirement in the final action of the Board.

Mr. Rooker asked if it would be possible for the component bordering 29 to be developed as a big box.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the two largest would be adjacent to 29 and oriented perpendicularly. We provided the commission's recommendation with additions and deletions. The master plan document also includes a fairly large area of T & D development with mixed use, streets and boulevards, and a fairly significant residential area. It does continue all of the transportation recommendations made last year.

Mr. Rooker said that we had actually discussed more than one crossover.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there were no new crossovers under what was recommended and the Board approved. This plan amendment allows for the possibility of one new crossover between Hollymead Dr. and Timberwood Blvd.

Mr. Rooker said that the commission had actually set out some places where overpasses were advisable.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that still remains.

Mr. Finley asked who made the master plan.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the property owners used consultants to put the master plan together. It was about a 3 or 4 month process for them.

Mr. Benish said that it was after the February work session that the applicants requested that the Board not act until they developed a master plan, which was submitted in July.

Mr. Rieley verified that the Commission would be taking future action based on a Comprehensive Plan revision that Commission has never seen.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the Commission would get the amendment and the plan document to you.

Item Requesting Deferral

a. **ZMA-01-03 Rio Square (Sign #95 & 96)** – Request to rezone 3.04 acres from Residential R-6 and R-2 to Planned Residential District to allow for townhomes, single family detached homes, and office. The property, described as Tax Map 62A1 Parcels 2-4, 2-5, 2-4A and 2B-13 is located in the Rio Magisterial District on Rio Road [Route 631] at the intersection of Rio Road and Wakefield Road. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Urban Density (6 to 34 units p0er acre) in Neighborhood 2. (Michael Barnes) ***APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO NOVEMBER 13, 2001***

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

Mr. Thomas moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to November 13, 2001.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Work Session Items

a. **Six Year Secondary Road Plan** – The purpose of this work session is to provide:
- Initial overview of the Six Year Road Plan process;
- General review of the existing projects on the County's priority list of road improvements and potential projects to be considered for inclusion in this year's revision of the list; and
- Opportunity for Planning Commission to discuss the County's existing priority list or other potential projects/issues. (Juan Wade)

Mr. Benish presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker requested a copy of the priority rating system.

Mr. Benish said he would make sure the commission had that.

Mr. Rooker said it looks like our priorities and VDOT's match.

Mr. Benish replied that generally speaking, they match our priorities. There are projects that are rated high on our list that are not eligible for state funding. Unpaved road projects are our lowest priority.

Mr. Rieley stated that there are issues relative to the pave in place. Their reticence to do what the speaker has asked to be done is well founded. Generally, the worst thing you can do to a rural road is to pave it without making geometric changes.

Mr. Benish said that it is difficult to make the drainage work without some improvements.

Mr. Rieley asked if there had been any discussion with the city about a connection with Sunset Avenue.

Mr. Benish said that we have been discussing how to address traffic with the city. We have recently discussed updating that area study. We hope that all three entities can work together.

Mr. Thomas said it would be interesting to work with the area around 5th Street and Old Lynchburg Road.

Mr. Rooker said there is at least one rezoning that's been applied for.

Mr. Benish said he thought it was at Sandy Lane or Sandy Point with up to 1,000 units.

Mr. Rooker stated that was something I assume the City would like to do.

Mr. Benish said it will be coming to you as a CPA shortly.

Mr. Rooker asked if that is part of long range planning, why shouldn't we have the results of the planning before we start amending the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Benish said that the applicant would have his day to make his argument. Typically we have not had a public hearing on this issue.

Mr. Rooker said he didn't see any reason why we can't act on this tonight. He asked for a short explanation of the fact that projects that have high priority are not necessarily funded in the order of their priorities.

Mr. Benish replied that they are generally funded in the order of their priority, but given the complexity of a project, one may be funded before the other.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that there's no funding for the Meadow Creek Parkway Phase II through 2016.

Mr. Thomas asked if a developer was doing that.

Mr. Benish stated that was the Meadow Creek subdivision in the City. Based on our rating system, it is fairly low. But if it is done in association with a development, it could be done much quicker.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that this is going through County property to get to Rio Road.

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of the Six-Year Secondary Road Plan.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

b. **ZMA-01-06 Montclair (Sign #71)** – Request to rezone 107 acres from Residential [R-1] and Rural Area [RA] to Planned Urban Development [PUD] to allow for 240 dwelling units and some commercial uses. The property, described as Tax Map 56 Parcels 93B, 100, 100B, 100C, 100D, and 100E, is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on US Route 250 approximately 1 mile west of the Route 240/250 intersection. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Density, recommended for 3-6 units per acre, in the Crozet Community. (Michael Barnes)

Mr. Barnes presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker verified that the entire property was in the development area today.

Mr. Barnes replied that it was and outlined the property.

Mr. Rooker asked what kind of buffer was left with the property to the West.

Mr. Barnes replied that it would be very close to the property line. He is not sure of the effects on the buffer.

Mr. Thomas asked what the distance was from the road to the residence.

Mr. Barnes said that there was very little distance.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a knoll between the commercial area and the residence.

Mr. Barnes replied that there is a stream valley. The slope rises gradually back to the house.

Mr. Finley asked if the applicant planned to maintain the buffer towards the creek and along 250.

Mr. Barnes replied that they do a good job with the buffers along the waterways. There is one section in which they will be adding vegetation.

Mr. Craddock said that most of the vegetation would be on the Montclair side.

Mr. Barnes replied that the driveway runs close to the property line.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was any consideration given to entering 250 more toward the center of the property.

Mr. Barnes replied that would require more fill work. He pointed out the drainage and the critical slopes. He said he is sure it can be done. But we saw this a good planning because it allowed for future interconnections.

Mr. Thomas asked where Greenwood Motel was in relation to the entrance.

Mr. Barnes pointed it out on the map.

Mr. Thomas asked how many entrances are on 250 between Greenwood Motel and the proposed entrance.

Mr. Barnes said he would need to look at the map more closely.

Mr. Thomas said he thought there was nothing across 250 from where the proposed entrance is.

Mr. Benish stated that there were four entrances in that space.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that you could keep the potential connections without entering along the south side of the property.

Mr. Barnes said he had not thought through that option.

Mr. Rooker said the applicant had a presentation to show the commission.

The applicant, Mr. Vito Cetta, said he had been working on this project for 17 months and has met with numerous members of the Crozet community and the 250 corridor. He affirmed his belief in the Neighborhood Model.

Mr. Rooker asked Mr. Cetta to comment on the changes to the plan that were made based on meetings with neighbors.

Mr. Cetta said that there were six items: we agreed to a minimum setback, affordable housing, that the commercial space would not be built for a while, we would have a maximum of 240 units, and the two lots on the far end would be 2 single family homes.

Mr. Rooker verified that he said it would be possible to move the entrance.

Mr. Cetta said it would be possible, but VDOT would have to help.

Mr. Finley stated that it seems it would be more central.

Mr. Cetta said he would agree. He brought up the community center and the single loaded road and pointed them out on the map.

Mr. Thomas asked what is the slope going down to the creek on the other side of the single loaded road.

Mr. Cetta replied that the existing slope is less than 25%.

Mr. Thomas asked if that would provide usable recreation area.

Mr. Cetta replied that it would, but that it is passive.

Mr. Rooker asked what he would be willing to proffer regarding the look of the buildings.

Mr. Cetta replied that there would be a set of condition, that they would not encourage flat roofs, and interesting pastel colors. We would like to have a lot of control. Curbs, gutters and tree streets make this project more expensive. We have to do something that is more interesting.

Mr. Rooker asked if he intended to have design guidelines established prior to the rezoning.

Mr. Cetta said he would.

Mr. Thomas said he thought the entrance in the middle would be better.

Mr. Rooker said that you could keep the buffer in that area with the middle entrance.

Mr. Barnes said that the road in this area was curving. There is a fill slope along 250 at this point.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that there is quite a slope there.

Mr. Rooker stated that they had road in that area already.

Mr. Barnes stated that this area is a bank, the curve in Route 250 may have to lay back the bank for visibility, which might impact the buffer.

Mr. Rooker said that the applicant agreed to consider that. The engineering aspects are something that could be worked out.

Mr. Rieley said there were a lot of details he liked a lot about this plan. There are others that are not good examples of the neighborhood model. This proposal as it's brought to us is something of a hybrid between conventional and the neighborhood model. At this density we shouldn't be looking at cul-de-sacs, it looks as if it's a model that fits with a lower density development. The other issue is one of the overall density in this particular area because it is on the edge of the growth area. It is a long way from downtown Crozet. The character of Route 250 is significant. He is concerned about what seems to be an extremely ordinary townhouse development next to 250. He would like to see it back off in density or be more urbane. It seems too dense, particularly the townhouses closest to the road.

Mr. Rooker said he is wondering whether or not it is worth sacrificing the preserved open space for interconnectivity within the development. They are preserving areas of connection with future development.

Mr. Rieley said that if that's the case, then this density is too much for that pattern.

Mr. Thomas said the applicant has done a great job of protecting the waterways.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that this is at the low end of the recommended density for the area.

Mr. Finley said that with taking out the open spaces it's over three.

Mr. Rooker stated that one advantage of this design is that it leaves a significant amount of open space. 30% open space is at the high end in the development district.

Mr. Finley asked Mr. Rieley what he meant when he said the development should be more urbane.

Mr. Rieley said it seemed as if this was caught in the middle, it should go one way or the other. His preference is that it becomes less dense due to its location on the edge of the growth area.

Mr. Finley stated that in our next item we'll be talking about the neighborhood model district. Does that PUD cannot still have a mix?

Mr. Rooker said he questioned whether we should take up the next item first. It was pointed out that they are not requesting a comprehensive plan change. This does not require any significant amendments to the PUD ordinance.

Mr. Finley stated that overall it's favorable in that you don't have to make all these changes. A lot of the components of this proposal reflect the neighborhood model.

Mr. Rooker said that staff has done an analysis of this with respect to the principles of the neighborhood model. The general conclusion is that in most circumstances, it meets the twelve principles.

Mr. Rieley stated that the townhouse part in front is the part that bothers him most. This is a pattern you find all over the place.

Mr. Rieley said he thought that was the most problematic section, although a scale change would be helpful.

Mr. Thomas stated that there are a lot of townhouses in the front, but there is also a lot on the back. There are 97 homes in that front area.

Mr. Barnes added new point for consideration. Original iteration of the townhouse section was for those to be live/work units. The zoning ordinance restricts those uses at this time. The applicant backed off pursuing live/work in that area.

Mr. Craddock verified that the whole complex was 240 units.

Mr. Barnes stated that they have on the application plan, ranges of potential units. They are putting a cap on it at 240. There is some flexibility in the plan.

Mr. Craddock verified that by right they can build 90.

Mr. Barnes replied that they can build about 90 or 95.

Mr. Craddock verified that no commercial was permitted.

Mr. Barnes replied yes.

Mr. Thomas said that the buffer of the highway, set at 100', potentially 125' would be even better.

Mr. Rieley stated that 100' is not very much.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that it is about twice the length of this room. He asked what thought went into the siting of the townhomes along 250.

Mr. Cetta replied that there was no particular reason why it is there. The neighborhood principles work well in a flat area. The topography here really tells you where the roads need to be. He said there is a site plan that is an 89-unit subdivision that is allowed by right, which he pointed out to the commission.

Mr. Rooker asked how heavy the existing buffer was between 250 and parcel L.

Mr. Barnes replied that it was no wider than the rest of it. It is probably about 40 feet. We would have to have a turn and taper lane for the westbound traffic.

Mr. Rooker said he would like to see consideration given to entering at another location. The density of parcel L seems to be too high. He would like to see consideration given to additional buffer between the commercial area and the adjacent property. This is a better plan than the plan for a traditional development.

Mr. Finley asked if he was proposing scattering the townhouses.

Mr. Rooker replied that the density is not necessarily the end all of the design for the neighborhood model. The density on parcel L is too high given all the factors. Putting 40% of the units on that parcel is not something that should be done.

Mr. Finley stated that all of us want to participate in the DISC model. Was it the idea that all the lower-priced houses would be clustered together?

Mr. Rooker said he thought the idea was that affordable housing would be clustered together with the other housing. This seems like you are building a little enclave of affordable housing which adjoins a neighbor who is keeping his property rural.

Mr. Rooker asked what was in M.

Mr. Barnes replied that those were triplex units, as in D. The concept plan is not proffered, the application plan is. If you see attached houses in one area, they might not be there in the application plan.

Mr. Benish said the specifically the application calls for detached and attached single family and multi-family in both L and M.

Mr. Rieley asked for the work schedule from here.

Mr. Barnes met with VDOT last week regarding the roads. They are supposed to provide a letter regarding the narrower roads. Depending on that letter, it will go relatively quickly if we are close to agreement. As for a time schedule, we will come back as soon as the issues are addressed.

Mr. Rooker stated that we need the kind of visual detail that we asked for with respect to the Clover Lawn property.

Mr. Rieley said we have requested proffered plans.

Mr. Rooker asked how this package of information matches up with the package we would expect to see under this proposed TND ordinance. This might ultimately be approved based upon its matching the principles of the neighborhood model. We should get the same kind of packet of information.

Mr. Rieley said his concern centers with L, but the overall density is too great.

Mr. Finley asked if there should be more neighborhood model features in that enclave.

Mr. Rieley said he would expect to see squares that look like squares, and greens that look like greens. Perhaps roads with a terminus at the end, like those recommended in the Neighborhood Model.

Mr. Barnes asked if the commission was looking for something more like a concept plan.

Mr. Rieley said he would like to see drawings that show tree-dimensional views.

Mr. Rooker stated that we are only asking for several representations of the architectural styles and components.

c. **ZTA 01-08 Worksession #1: PUD With Neighborhood Model Option** – Request by Glenmore Associates to amend Section 20 of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for the Neighborhood Model Option as part of a Planned Unit Development. (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker asked if there was anybody here that doesn't think we should create a standalone ordinance.

Everybody agreed that we should.

Mr. Rooker stated that in the second paragraph it says that you had obtained some other ordinances. He asked if this was generally the organization followed in those ordinances.

Ms. Echols responded that they took Wisconsin's. We liked the format and the simplicity of it.

Mr. Rooker asked for a copy of that.

Mr. Finley asked for a copy of the Belmont, NC plan.

Ms. Echols said she had a copy. She noted that ordinance is not suitable for the planners in Belmont. There are still some good features in it.

Mr. Rooker said that when we went through the DISC report, we basically made the decision that is reflected in your statement. We decided that we would not require strict adherence to the transect. We do not disagree with the statement.

Mr. Finley asked if Montclair would be close to a code of development.

Ms. Echols replied that it would. It is not totally comprehensive. Guidelines for how landscaping is going to be done, architectural features, any kinds of details along those lines, we would be looking for in a neighborhood model district.

Mr. Finley asked where the criteria will be, that the applicant will draw from.

Ms. Echols replied that we were hoping to consider roads the next time.

Mr. Finley asked if that information would be somewhere in the ordinance or regulation.

Ms. Echols replied that would be part of the design standards. As a staff, we need to look at that part of the neighborhood model to see if it is explicit enough to help guide this particular district. We have to sort through the different street types. The issues of public vs. private streets and what cross-section should be used need to be addressed. Right now, the standard is for VDOT streets regardless if they are public or private.

Mr. Finley asked if VDOT could change that.

Mr. Rooker replied that is true if it is a public road, but don't we define the standards of private roads?

Mr. Benish replied that we did, but they were based on VDOT standards.

Mr. Rooker replied that we could base them on something else.

Mr. Rooker asked if there were any comments or suggestions on that.

Mr. Benish said it gives us discretion.

Mr. Rooker said we typically have seen where the density is less than what is proposed in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Benish said that the primary concern was in the mix of uses.

Ms. Echols stated that you know this from going through Clover Lawn. You'll see it in a couple of upcoming applications. The challenge of dealing with density of residential use and commercial development is a challenge in terms of balance.

Mr. Rooker stated that in the last Sperry work session, it was brought up what could be done on the property as a matter of right. It would be helpful to have staff do that computation.

Ms. Echols asked if he was referring to comprehensive plan amendments or rezonings.

Mr. Rooker replied that he was talking about an ultimate rezoning.

Ms. Echols stated that section 8 deals with planned districts generally.

Mr. Finley asked if he comes up with his own standards.

Ms. Echols replied yes.

Mr. Rooker asked why the parking regulations would not be up for grabs. He said that anything can be amended.

Ms. Echols replied that in a planned district, the language of section 8.2 talks about conflict between one regulation and another. The board can create the new regulation. But there are parameters and every time one of those conflicts come up we have to determine with zoning if that is one that is up for grabs, or does is need to go to the BZA for appeal.

Mr. Rooker asked why don't we just change that section. It has been perfectly clear that we need more flexibility in terms of parking requirements.

Ms. Echols stated that's what C is.

Mr. Rooker agreed that the neighborhood model should not be available for the contiguous areas.

Mr. Thomas verified that the commission had decided to take a hard line on the development area.

Mr. Rooker said that the expansion of the development areas is a separate decision.

Mr. Finley asked if it would only be in the neighborhood model district that you would have the flexibility.

Ms. Echols replied that the flexibility would be in the planned districts as well as in this particular district.

Mr. Rooker asked for comments on the proposed minimum size, everyone was agreeable.

Ms. Echols stated that it is the applicant's responsibility to articulate why a certain feature is not provided.

Mr. Rooker asked if, given where we are today, we really need to have another work session on this before we see an ordinance. He said he preferred to have an ordinance as a basis for discussion.

The commissioners agreed.

Ms. Echols said that staff would check if they were at a crossroads.

Mr. Rooker suggested that or presenting both options. We have problems of trying to implement plans because of the existing ordinances. He asked if at the end of the day we can create an incentive for people to want to use this form of development. If we develop an ordinance that is workable and clear there would be incentive to use it. We want this to be less cumbersome, rather than more cumbersome.

The applicant stated that proposed what we proposed because we thought it would be the way to go. It was not our intent to have the ability to expand the growth areas. We should add that item C can be waived by the planning commission. He does not think that it makes sense to automatically preclude that.

Mr. Rooker said he thought that was a good recommendation.

Mr. Thomas asked what the minimum would be.

Mr. Rooker replied that he didn't think there should be a minimum.

Mr. Craddock stated that it would keep the flexibility open.

Mr. Rooker said if the applicant can make a good showing, then we would have the ability to grant the waiver.

Mr. Frank Cox said that our reading of 10 or 15 development ordinances and having been involved a number of similar projects, the real conundrum in the review and approval comes on the issues of how is it decided and to what extent are waivers permissible. Where we have seen significant failures in the ordinances is that there is not a clearinghouse person assigned within staff to review and make assessments. The streets are a good example. Inside the new urban streets we have things other than just the pavement, water, sewage, drainage lines, all of which fits into what would be an extremely narrow space. In many instances engineering and planning are at loggerheads over a certain issues. One person has to be assigned the role of making the final call.

Mr. Rooker said he was interested in the scope of the areas that would be included in that discretion. It seems like a good recommendation.

Mr. Cox brought up the comment of the application or the ability to apply the neighborhood model to the land only inside the development area. Our suggestion is that you have the right, but not the requirement to consider properties contiguous to the development area. There are a lot of properties that have existing zoning that are either becoming or unbecoming. There are a number of properties that lie just outside the development areas.

Mr. Rooker said he thought that if you had property that was zoned commercial, it might be appropriate, but not in the case of rural areas.

Mr. Thomas asked about the other idea if it was a residential area that had a small portion that was not in the growth area.

Mr. Rooker the problem is, if it's zoned rural area he would prefer that it stay as such.

Mr. Finley said that in the past we have not allowed it to spill over into rural area.

Mr. Benish stated that the difficulty is in evaluating that. It may be an interesting issue to consider in the rural area review.

Mr. Rooker said he was talking about those instances in which the comprehensive plan and zoning differ.

Mr. Benish stated that if you looked at that rezoning, what basis do you look at the TND review for those.

Mr. Rooker said that at the end of the day we want the community to be able to make the best use of the land. It might be advisable to allow a piece of property that already has an intense zoning to be pulled into TND.

Mr. Rieley asked if staff could address that issue.

Ms. Echols said that while we could have the language included, anybody can request any zoning district anywhere. Requests often don't go very far. That language would not preclude you from reviewing an application and rendering a judgment on it.

Mr. Benish stated that we need bear in mind there are a lot of other development policies that effect how that land can be developed.

Mr. Rieley said that some of those are mitigated if it's a more intense zoning.

Mr. Benish stated that staff would look at the issue.

Ms. Echols said that was one of those things we thought we would bring back for policy discussion. There is not a comfort level established yet. We'll bring a recommendation to you.

Mr. Rieley first thing we have to do is get rid of the ordinances that preclude easy location of utilities.

Mr. Finley pointed out that maintenance is a major issue as well.

Mr. Rooker stated that at the end of the day it is important that we have something that works and makes it easier to do one of these developments.

Mr. Rieley said he believes our various departments are working towards the same end.

Old Business

Consent agenda

a. **Approval of Minutes –** August 21, 2001 and August 28, 2001.

Mr. Thomas moved approval of the consent agenda.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Rooker asked how it was arrived that the commercial component of the Montclair property would be limited to 5,000 feet.

Mr. Benish stated that the applicant did not start with a significantly higher number. It is limited in scope to a size that would be supportable by the development.

Mr. Rieley asked if there were figures available that make a connection between the number of residents and the amount of commercial space they could support.

Mr. Benish replied that we had our fiscal impact planner examine that issue.

Mr. Rooker said that his concern is that if we are trying to create a neighborhood model development, trying to eliminate car trips is one of the things we are trying to pursue. Does 5,000 square feet of retail space provide that?

Mr. Benish replied that in this particular area, you would.

Mr. Rooker said that is one of the reasons to consider the moving the entrance of this project. Otherwise the commercial area takes on a 250 aspect, rather than an internally focused aspect.

Mr. Thomas asked for the amount of retail and office space.

Mr. Rooker replied that there is 15,000 square feet of office space and 5,000 square feet of retail space.

Mr. Craddock said he thought that was about the same size as Clover Lawn.

Mr. Rooker stated that 5,000 is a pretty small retail area.

Mr. Benish said that we hope at some point in time, we can provide for a connection westward.

Mr. Rooker stated that we have to respect the fact that that property owner would like to maintain his property as rural.

Mr. Thomas agreed that he deserves all the privacy he can get.

New Business

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded and transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary