December 11, 2001

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, December 11, 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 Chair; Rodney Thomas, William Finley, Tracey Hopper, and Pete Craddock. Absent from the meeting was Jared Loewenstein. Other officials present were Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney, V. Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development, Margaret Doherty, Principal Planner, Michael Barnes, Planner, and Susan Thomas, Senior Planner.

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 items from the public.

Mr. Jeff Werner of the Piedmont Environmental Council provided information on the County's tower policy, from a newsletter from Ted Kreines. He pointed out that page 2 has a list of web sites for the Federal Communication Systems and APCO. He said he felt it was his responsibility as a citizen to bring it to Planning Commission.

Mr. Rooker said that he had forwarded the information to the Commissioners from APCO, along with a copy of an article from *USA Today*.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – December 5, 2001 – Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the December 5th Board of Supervisors meeting.

Consent Agenda-SUB-2001-238 Foxcroft Phase IV - Request to build private roads (shared driveways) pursuant to Section 14-232(A) and request for a waiver of the requirements of Section 14-514(D) for 30' right of way widths for private roads. (Karl Guiler)

Mr. Rieley noted that the reason that the analysis between public and private roads was not provided was that this is in the growth area.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that it is looked at differently in the growth area and focuses more on meeting the public need. In each case it serves 2 lots, which is not the normal scale of a private road.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of the private roads (shared driveways) and the waiver request with the following conditions pursuant to Section 14-235 of the Albemarle County Code:

1. [14-235(A)] The subdivider shall submit maintenance agreements, which satisfy the requirements of Section 14-313.

2. [14-235(B)] The final plat shall contain the statement required by Section 14-303(N).

3. [14-235(D)] The final plat shall contain the following statement pertaining *specifically* to the private roads (shared driveways), "The streets in this subdivision may not meet the state standards and will not be maintained by the Virginia Department of Transportation or the County of Albemarle."

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

SP-2001-032 Gillums Mountain PWSF (Sign #58, 59 & 60) - Request for special use permit to allow a 85.5 foot high wireless telecommunications "wood-like" pole in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for wireless towers and appurtenances. The property, described as Tax Map 73 Parcel 31C, contains 39.5 acres, and is located in the Samuel Miller Magisterial District on the east side of State Route 708 approximately .5 miles north of the intersection of State Route 708 and State Route 637. The property is zoned Rural Areas (RA). The Comprehensive Plan designates this property

as Rural Area. (Margaret Doherty) ***DEFERRED FROM THE OCTOBER 23, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.***

Ms. Doherty presented the staff report.

Mr. Craddock asked if there was a fence around this property.

Ms. Doherty stated that there was and she did not feel it would be highly visible from Rt. 708.

Mr. Rooker invited public comment.

Mr. Brian Toue, zoning manager with Shenandoah Tower Services, noted that this is one of 8 sites located in Charlottesville. 87.5% of Devon's sites in Albemarle County are co-locations. We disagree with staff's inclusion of the three existing 3 monopoles. They should be viewed on-site specific merit alone and not include the proximity of other facilities. The Personal Wireless Facility Policy adopted by the BOS does not allow for co-location opportunities, therefor, the proliferation of single carrier poles is inevitable. This is clearly demonstrated by the fact that 4 service providers attempting to locate wood poles in proximity are located to the east. Devon only wants to compete with the 3 wood poles and to cover the same geographic are. Devon is distinguished merely by being the last carrier in this area. To quote from the staff report, the immediate result of approval would be the proliferation of monopoles in one area. Devon is simply asking that you use the same criteria that were used in the 3 previous reviews for this area. The site is slightly visible from adjacent parcels. The site was approved by the ARB at its 10-15-01 hearing. Outside of the proposed 10' buffer, we are adding 25 extra trees, at a 2" caliper at 65-80 feet. We have worked with staff to locate the site in the least obtrusive area. The site is in a mature grove of trees with an average top elevation of 744'. This site is of critical need to Devon as it completes phase one for Albemarle County. The applicant would have co-located in this area had one been available.

Mr. Rooker asked how long it would take the plantings to reach maturity.

Mr. Quillen replied that the trees would be 12-15' tall at planting and would take 20 years to reach full growth.

Ms. Paula Figgett, of Shenandoah Tower Services, said that she has followed this application from the beginning. We have looked at various locations with staff members and have added the trees. This site is the furthest away from Rt. 708 and I-64. There is a very small window in which you can see the balloon.

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

Mr. Rieley asked how many companies are licensed to operate in this area.

Ms. Doherty replied that she is only aware of the 3 on the parcel next door.

Mr. Rieley asked how many carriers are licensed to operate in the area.

Mr. Rooker said that there are 7 wireless facilities allowed in the area.

Mr. Craddock stated that he could see the tower from the bridge, but it did not appear to be 15-20' above the trees. He is glad to see that there are 3 antennas on the tower, noting that you would have to apply for another special use permit for each antenna.

Mr. Rooker said that the close proximity of the other towers would increase the visibility of all of the towers and creates a problem from a visibility standpoint. He pointed out that the application says that this tower is highly visible from the north and west, specifically from Rt. 708. Staff believes that no amount of landscaping will hide this site from Rt. 708 for at least 20 years.

Mr. Thomas stated that the way the pole is situated right now, it is visible from the bridge of Rt. 708, for

approximately a 20' span. He is disappointed that the pole was not moved in one direction or the other as it would have been hidden behind the trees. The pole as it sits now is visible.

Mr. Rieley remarked that this is a significant departure from anything that we have ever approved. He is also concerned about tower farms. He is not convinced by the argument that if you approve one site you have to approve the other 6 because otherwise you are discriminating against the other 6. Visibility is the basis of the wireless manual. As you add more towers you have a detrimental effect on the visibility. He said that there would be grounds for denial even if the other three towers weren't there.

Mr. Thomas asked how far the pole is from I-64.

Paula Figgatt replied that it is more than 1,000 feet. The parcel abuts I-64. We were subjected to the ARB because it was more than 500 feet away. It was her understanding that they would have to go back through the process if we moved the pole. The balloon has been moved around on the site. Each time we were asked to put it back on the original site. We have the full support of the ARB. 2 commission members were present at the site, and do not feel it is visible from I-64. We had 5 separate balloon tests in different seasons.

Mr. Rieley said it was his understanding that this was deferred because commissioners were concerned that it could be positioned better on the site.

Figgatt replied that the commission wanted to see the balloon test, however, no commissioners showed up except for Mr. Craddock. There has to be a site in this vicinity. We want to move forward with this proposal.

Mr. Thomas added that there was a view where you could see through the clearing, but you had to stop under the 708 bridge to see this view. There is probably a 20' span on Rt. 708 where it is visible, but you would have to stop.

Ms. Doherty added that at the November 16th balloon test, Mr. Cilimberg got a direct shot of the balloon from properties on the north side of I-64 and the east side of Rt. 708.

Mr. Cilimberg said he used the driveway on Rt. 708 and looked back to the site and this was clear more so than on the 708 bridge. On I-64 you had to look for the balloon when going west, but it was not visible going east. He did not notice coming from the south on 708 but he did notice it coming from the north. He said he saw it without stopping.

Mr. Craddock said he thought all the towers on I-64 are highly visible now that the leaves are off the trees.

Mr. Thomas stated that the three on the Weber site are very visible

Mr. Rooker said he thought the problem is that there are 3 towers in this proximity. He pointed out that the ARB does not approve or disapprove a tower, they establish conditions. The decision as to whether or not the tower is permitted is for the Planning Commission to ultimately recommend to the Board.

Mr. Cilimberg stated the ARB, in their review, can advise the PC and could recommend denial of a legislative act. In this case, the issue was not visibility from I-64 to nearly the degree as it was off of the entrance corridor. They would not comment on Rt. 708.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that the issue is not relevant to Rt. 708 or the parcel across the road.

Ms. Hopper moved for denial of this application.

Mr. Rieley seconded the motion for denial, which carried by a vote of 5-1 with Mr. Finely abstaining.

SP-2001-048 Regional Public Safety Radio Project (Peters Mtn.) (Sign #77 & 78) - Request for special use permit to allow a 110-foot tall lattice, self-supporting, emergency communications tower with antennas extending up to approximately 125 feet, ground equipment and a 12-foot by 32-foot equipment shelter, on 2 acres zoned Rural Areas (RA). The proposal is being made in accordance with Section 10.2.2.6 of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows for micro-wave and radio-wave transmission and relay towers within a 60-foot by 60-foot lease area. The property, described as Tax Map 50/Parcel 1D and is located on Peter's Mountain Road approximately 4.5 miles from the intersection with Turkey Sag Road (State Route 640). This site is located on Peter's Mountain in the Rivanna Magisterial District and designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan. (Stephen Waller) ***DEFERRED FROM THE NOVEMBER 27, 2001 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO DECEMBER 18, 2001.***

Mr. Rieley moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral to December 18, 2001.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ZTA 01-07 – Alleys and shared driveways - Amend Sections 3.1, Definitions, 4.4, Visibility clearance at intersections, 4.6.1, Frontage and lot width measurements, 4.6.3, Lots, yards adjacent to streets, 4.11.2.1, Accessory structures, 5.1.39, Off-site employee parking for industrial use, and 32.5, Preliminary site plan content, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code, to define "alley," "driveway," "private road" and "shared driveway," to require adequate site distance be provided where alleys intersect with other travelways, to clarify that frontage for a lot served by a shared driveway or alley shall be provided along the public street or private road, to require that the regulation pertaining to required lots and yards adjacent to streets also apply to alleys and shared driveways and provides an additional setback for a shared driveway, to clarify the location from where the yard shall be measured, to clarify that the setback for accessory structures applies not only from the property line, but also certain travelways, and to allow the director of planning and community development to waive the setback from alleys in limited circumstances, to allow a parking area to be separated from an industrial use by an alley, and to require that alley easements and rights-of-way be shown on preliminary site plans. (Elaine Echols)

AND

STA 01-01 - Alleys and shared driveways - Amend Sections 14-106, Definitions, 14-303, Contents of final plat, 14-313, Instrument evidencing maintenance of certain improvements, 14-512, Standards for both public streets and private roads, and 14-514, Standards for private roads only, and to add Section 14-241, Circumstances when shared driveways and alleys may be authorized, of Chapter 14, Subdivision of Land, of the Albemarle County Code, to define "driveway" and "shared driveway," and to amend the definitions of "alley" and "private road," to establish the conditions and procedures by which shared driveways and alleys may be authorized, to require that final plats contain information pertaining to alleys and shared driveways, to require that alleys be subject to an approved maintenance agreement, to add that an alley may provide reasonable access to a lot, to clarify the design standards for alleys, to allow alleys to be provided on the side of certain lots and to be subject to approval by the county engineer. (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols presented the staff report.

Mr. Finley verified that the changes were underlined.

Mr. Rieley asked Ms. Echols to clarify the final resolution of the setback from the garage doors to the alleyway itself.

Ms. Echols replied that we have put in the ability for the agent or the director of planning and community development to modify either the setback or the alley easement upon the recommendation of the director of engineering. If there are reasons for modification, it can be done.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that public safety would also be a consideration.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing. With no comment the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Kamptner noted that the public hearing needs to be reopened announcing both the ZTA and the STA.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that there was an applicant.

With no comment the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of the text amendments as proposed in ZTA-01-07.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Hopper moved for approval of the text amendments as proposed in STA-01-01.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

SP-2001-036 Darden Towe Park Phase III Improvements (Sign #63) – To allow for fill in the floodplain in accordance with Section 30.3.5.2.2 (3) of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows for landfill permits. The property is Darden Towe Park and is described as Tax Map 78 Parcel 1. It contains 12.1 acres and is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Elk Drive [State Route 1421]. The property is zoned R-1 (Residential). The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Parks and Greenways in Urban Neighborhood 3. (Michael Barnes)

AND

SP-2001-044 Darden Towe Park Phase III Improvements (Sign #62 & 64) - To allow for a boat launch in accordance with Section 30.3.5.2.1 (2) of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows for water related uses. (Michael Barnes)

AND

SDP-2001-091 Darden Towe Park Phase III Minor - Request for preliminary site plan approval for a canoe launch, trails and a picnic shelter on 12.1 acres zoned R-I, Residential. (Michael Barnes)

Mr. Barnes presented the staff report.

Mr. Rooker asked if these could be heard together.

Mr. Kamptner stated that they could be heard together but would need separate actions.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing on this issue. With no comment from the public, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Thomas asked if the mitigation plan had been reviewed.

Mr. Barnes replied that they still need to bond the plan with the County.

Mr. Craddock stated that the canoe launch is inside the gates at Darden Towe. He that he assume this closes when the park closes. He asked if the other area is chained at night.

Mr. Barnes replied that it was not.

Mr. Craddock ascertained that the trail is open 24 hours

Mr. Rooker stated that anyone could walk into the park at any time, even though the park closes at dark.

Mr. Bill Meithneck said that basically this was a response to the result of blocking off vehicular access to an existing fishing area. We have taken the opportunity to provide proper access for the handicapped, at a proper grade, and angle from Free Bridge Drive. This would be accessible as it is now. The trail would be accessible at all time, but the intent is to make this a day facility only, but there is nothing to keep them from using it at any time.

Mr. Barnes said that if this became a problem the Park's Division could close it off.

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of SP-2001-036 with the condition.

1. A stream buffer mitigation plan must be approved and bonded with the Albemarle County Engineering Department prior to the beginning of any construction or grading.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of SP-2001-044 as shown on plan L1 5 of 10 attachment D, with the condition.

1. The fill in the floodplain shall be in general accord with the plan produced by Land Planning and Design Associates, Inc., entitled "Darden Towe Park, Phase III Development" (sheets L-1, L-2, L-2A, and L-3), dated July 31, 2001 and last revised on November 8, 2001.

Mr. Finley seconded the motion, which carried unanimously

Ms. Hopper moved for approval of SDP-2001-091.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

ZTA 01-10 Shopping Center Parking (PD-SC) – Amend Section 4.12.6.6.2, Schedule of specific requirements for number of off-street parking spaces, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code, to change the minimum number of parking spaces required per one thousand square feet of gross leaseable area from 5.5 to a minimum that varies depending on the gross leaseable area. (Michael Barnes)

Mr. Barnes presented the staff report.

Mr. Rieley asked if the sliding scale in the staff report is directly from the Urban Land Institute.

Mr. Barnes stated that it was slightly modified. The ULI Study stated that between 200,000-600,000 it could range from 4.5 and 5.0. We are within that range. One of the concerns at staff level was that at the break point it would drop down if it were not more gradual in its decline. The literature would suggest that we could be slightly more aggressive with slightly lower numbers.

Mr. Rieley asked what is the public downside of allowing the numbers to be as low as any reputable study shows that it should be.

Mr. Barnes replied that it comes from locally observed examples such as Shoppers World.

Mr. Rieley asked why is it a problem for the public in general.

Mr. Barnes replied that if you don't have enough parking then people park in the travelways or fire lanes and that is a public safety issue.

Mr. Craddock asked what it is at Shoppers World.

Mr. Barnes replied that it was 160,000. They are at the optimum level right now.

Mr. Rooker stated that it is sometimes difficult to get to the parking space because of circulation.

Mr. Rooker opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dick Gibson, representing the applicant, said that their concern is not the sliding scale but the portion of it that is applicable to Fashion Square. Our original proposal was to reduce the PD-SC parking from 5.5 spaces to 4.5 spaces. In support of that we have a couple of items. First is the actual usage: there are 3,135 spaces at Fashion Square, 650 of which are never used. There is just of 590,000 square feet of gross leasable area, which includes some contemplated expansion, which works out to 4.21 spaces based on actual use. The 4.5 request would allow a comfortable margin. We provided the Urban Land Institute material, which demonstrated that the needs do vary based on size. For centers like Fashion Square 4.44 spaces per 1,000 square feet of GLA are recommended by the ULI. The staff report indicates that 5.5 is in excess of the real use requirements and recommends 4.5. We request that the commission endorse staff requests and recommend approval to the Board.

Mr. Rieley asked for the gross leasable area.

Mr. Gibson replied that it was 590,212 square feet, which includes some planned expansion.

Mr. Rieley stated that another 110,000 square feet would put them into the next category.

Ms. Hobbs said that she is pleased to see this on the agenda, this is commendable and should be encouraged.

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

Mr. Rooker stated that this in line with other recommendations taken in the past

Mr. Rieley moved for approval of ZTA 01-10.

Ms. Hopper seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Work Session: Neighborhood Model Implementation (Susan Thomas)

Ms. Thomas presented the staff report.

Mr. Rieley said that he found the memo surprising and provocative. He thought that what they had asked for was reasonable and we got a long list of reasons why we can't do it. He said that it seems to be more reasonable than what was proposed as an alternative. He would like to hear about the enhanced design process in terms of the 7 aspects listed. He would like to know exactly what the target is and what would come out of it. Developing a framework plan gives a predictable target and he worries about saying that we are going into a public process as the target.

Ms. Thomas replied that it may look better to staff as it is a more familiar process. It would be a two step mechanism. The first step would be a recommendation to the PC to expand the process for collaborative design and you could either support or deny. If you said yes, we would set up a meeting with our designer and possibly our public participation consultant. In some cases you would not need the design element as much as you would need agreement from the neighborhood on a set of guidelines for development. An applicant may want the credibility that the public sector process would give it. We are anticipating one meeting, at the most two. Since we are not master planning, it would be problematic if the process delays the normal schedule.

Mr. Rooker asked for the difference between a general framework plan and a development context plan. It is saying "appropriate to the site" but it also seems to be putting this into a context of what surrounds it. He is not sure that an applicant would understand what this envisions and who is providing it.

Ms. Thomas replied that when you are talking about a framework plan you are talking about the entire neighborhood. The context plan is the area of influence more immediate than the entire neighborhood. It is really a question of scale or scope.

Mr. Rooker asked how the applicant is to know what is expected by way of the process for his application. This seems to leave a wide latitude for someone to make a determination as to what that process will be. It seems that if you do this two or three times, you'll have a framework plan for an area. He is not convinced that we would save staff time and resources.

Mr. Cilimberg said that from a context plan standpoint, the idea is planning in response to what is being initiated in an area and determining what the proper context is and it becomes part of the process of that application. The PC would make the determination of the level of scrutiny. Applications can be few or many so the impact on staff could be in spurts.

Mr. Kamptner said that it would also depend, in part, on the willingness of the applicant to want to go through this process

Mr. Cilimberg asked if framework plans are the initiating factor how are we to deal with applications before the plan has started. Framework plans will take time unless there are significant resources devoted for getting them done for all the neighborhoods outside of Crozet. To put the resources at the table to do the framework plan will take time. He asked what happens to the applications submitted before the framework plan is done.

Mr. Rooker replied that if it is a rezoning, we have the power to ask for whatever information is necessary to make a decision. It seems that we have almost built into the process some of what is contemplated in this list. He asked how does this differ from what we are doing with larger rezoning, such as the Sperry project.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that Sperry was a CPA not a ZMA. CPAs always take some time. The view of the CPA is in context. The questions are would it have been better to do framework plan for all of neighborhood 1 first and delayed Sperry or would it be better to deal with Sperry in the context of the area it's in. Right not, they are in the process and it is being analyzed based on their project. The relationships being reviewed are based on their project and how it relates to the area around it.

Mr. Rieley stated that whether they wait or not is up to them. If there is no framework it place, then the application will be analyzed on the best information available.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that we also could wait on the framework plan.

Mr. Cilimberg said that we have to program how we are going to bring the resources to the table. Our question is how many will be done at once. We can deal with applications with the staff that we have. Framework plans are a different staffing and resource issue. Unless we spread them out, the timeframe becomes an issue.

Mr. Rooker said that it might be helpful to have a consultant develop a proposal for how a framework plan would be done. That would include the amount of time it might take and how it would be done. It would help to quantify what we are looking at.

Mr. Finley asked how much duplication would we have in the framework and master plan.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that that is a point to think about as you would be trying to schedule framework plans. Master plans would be started in 6-month intervals. By the end of next fiscal year will have started

our 3rd master plan, and we are looking at doing 7 altogether. We could include in the RFP process a separate request for approaching context in terms of how in relates to development. He does not know if we can get more than general ranges or estimates on costs.

Mr. Rooker stated that part of that would depend upon the extent to which a framework plan can fit into the overall master plan process, as opposed to viewing it as something alien to the master planning process.

Mr. Rieley said that seems that what has been lacking in many of the applications is what is lacking from the public perspective. Setting this kind of physical framework is the most important thing for a planning department to do. We need to come to an agreement about what the key issues are.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that we are doing this, to some extent, with Sperry. We expanded the information we want to with respect to this proposal. With all the time and effort spent on the project and some of the questions raised, a framework plan for the development area would be there more quickly than the ultimate decision on the Comprehensive Plan request
He is not sure that we are doing the developer any favors by attempting to accomplish this on a piecemeal basis.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that we have to determine the reasonable area to look at for the interchange of issues. It does become a question of what the framework or context plan is in terms of the area you are trying to address.

Mr. Rooker stated that things like the transportation component go outside of this. The transportation information we are requesting with the Sperry application goes outside of the immediate context area.

Mr. Cilimberg said that the context might change from project to project. If we know the kind of things you want we can advise applicants that this would be important information. He said that what is covered in a context or framework approach may be the same. It is more a question of who initiates it.

Ms. Hopper wondered if we could coordinate all three, the master planning process in Crozet, selecting the 2 plans to be done in the next fiscal year, considering the priority for framework plans and continue to use a context process in applications as well. Is this conceptually possible? We certainly can't do 7 framework plans in a year.

Mr. Finley asked how many consultants are in budget.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that we have budget in this fiscal year for a consultant to do the first master plan and the public process associated with this. We are asking for funding next year to undertake two more master plans. The idea was they could be used in a variety of ways.

Mr. Thomas asked which would be the best framework or context.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that one of the issues is how much we are able to do with the public in advance, how much we have to do in response to projects, and the timeframe. Framework plans are an advanced planning effort.

Mr. Rieley said that framework plans set out what's at stake from the public perspective out front so everyone can see it and react to it.

Mr. Finley asked who would do this, staff.

Mr. Rooker replied that there are really two approaches, one is the framework plan, which is initiated by the staff. The second is the context plan, which is a response to an application.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that in a perfect world, we would like to be able to get out front with this kind of planning.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that we are not sure that we can bring enough resources to the table to complete framework plans. For that reason, we tried to put it in a responsive context.

Mr. Rooker replied that he thought that what was recommended is a good process if there is not framework plan

Mr. Rieley said he believes that the master planning component is the weakest part of the Neighborhood Model and runs a real risk of getting too detailed. He thinks that setting the framework is to everyone's benefit.

Ms. Hopper asked about doing the framework plans before the master plans

Ms. Thomas replied that if there hadn't been a commitment in the neighborhood model to go ahead with master planning, that might have been a viable alternative.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the first part of the master planning process would be the baseline information, physical characteristics and the lay of the land, critical environmental features, etc. The first master plan will create a framework in the beginning and then evolve. Staff involvement does not change a lot between a framework plan and a master plan. We have to have a staff person who is working on it full time.

Ms. Thomas said that one of the biggest challenges to the framework plans would be managing the public involvement. People's expectations in terms of public involvement are high.

Mr. Rooker said that it seems that from start to finish 7 plans are designed as an integrated process, then you are not spending any more time or resources doing framework plans and then master plans as long as they fit together. What you are saying is that we don't have the resources to be doing these all at one time.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that in reality, if we could get 7 staff people who could run 7 processes from framework to master plan we could start in March. The master plans will take about a year and will be staggered by 6 months.

Mr. Rooker said that the framework plan was just the first step in the development plan. The real issue is how many can you have underway at any given time, considering the staff issues. He said that it seems that the first part of the process in each development area would provide guidance that would be ahead of the final result. If we don't follow a process that includes this at the front end then you wait for a year for guidance for what is planned for the area.

Mr. Finley asked if an application, such as the Sperry project, would have to wait until master planning was completed.

Mr. Rooker replied that you would have to look at each project on a case by case basis. We would have to make a recommendation based on the best information available. What we are saying is if we move forward rapidly with a process that gives useful information about each area, then we will have some kind of guideline for what is expected to occur in that area. The public involvement process will define some of the major issues that are important in that development area. We are trying to determine what is the best way for the process to move forward, to give us the most useful information with the resources available

Mr. Cilimberg asked if in master planing for the defined area, we would like a consultant to tell us how they can approach the project that gives a set of guiding information for considering new development activity in that area that does not have to wait for the master plan.

Mr. Rooker said it would help to see an outline of the master planning process that will be used for the areas that provides a framework type of plan. It would be helpful to make certain that the RFP includes

that discrete step in the beginning so that it is useful for the area in terms of landowners, adjacent owners, and public decision-makers.

Mr. Cilimberg said that we also what to include in the RFP a discrete component that gets them to advise how they could assist us with projects submitted prior to master planning.

Ms. Thomas stated that staff has a rough layout for the master plan process, that would be finalized once the consultants are on board.

Mr. Rooker said that we are asking, as part of that outline, developing a framework plan with out expanding the expense.

Ms. Thomas replied that was a natural part of the process, it is just a question of naming it and saying we expect this product.

Mr. Rieley said that from his experience, that piece will be the least expensive and most valuable.

Ms. Thomas stated that we have received a strong recommendation that we prepare an official map. That would really be a transportation plan for the County.

Mr. Cilimberg said that there are critical features that need to be analyzed, one of the most important of those is roads.

Mr. Rooker said he thought we were talking about a general consensus on what a framework plan includes. If you tell your consultants that you want a discrete product at the end of the first step, they can help define what that product might be.

Mr. Cilimberg said that we can include for the consultant to respond to how they might provide service in areas where there is no framework plan occurring. In those areas there is a concern in the development community that their projects will be caught in a "no man's land". We need to identify a way to deal with them. They rely on the NEIGHBORHOOD MODEL that was approved. They are hoping that there is a level of trust that they can submit things that meet the NEIGHBORHOOD MODEL and get feedback and don't get caught in a situation where they are waiting.

Mr. Rooker replied that we have had a number of applications come before us since adopting the NEIGHBORHOOD MODEL, and we have moved forward on those applications. A framework plan might have been completed more quickly than a CPA without it.

Mr. Cilimberg said that there are those projects that may want to get into the county process next week, or have begun. Their interest is in knowing that they can get review under the NEIGHBORHOOD MODEL with the realization that we haven't gotten particular plan elements underway yet. In Crozet, the master planning process will start in March. For those that are considering making application that's where you want to go in the process for Crozet.

Mr. Rooker said that if we get useful information at the end of step A, it may enable projects to move forward because it is fairly clear how they fit in.

Mr. Finley asked at what point will we have the 8 steps on how to proceed.

Mr. Cilimberg said that would be a policy that you would follow in dealing with projects that are not under a planning effort.

Mr. Rooker pointed out that this process is somewhat discretionary on the part of the planning commission.

Mr. Rieley stated that what is wrong with doing what we have been doing, is that we are operating without critical information.

Mr. Cilimberg said that what we need to do is find those key things that people need to address up front.

Old Business

Mr. Rieley requested a copy of the language and map for the Hollymead CPA.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Recorded by Janice C. Farrar, Department of Planning & Community Development Assistant.
Transcribed by Lynda Myers, Recording Secretary.