Joint Albemarle County Planning Commission/Disc II Meeting
May 20, 2002

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing with the Development Area Initiatives Steering Committee II (DISC II) on Tuesday, May 20, 2002 at 5:00 p.m. in meeting room #246, at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Those members present from the DISC II Committee were: Bill Edgerton, Marilyn Gale, Katie Hobbs, Tom Loach, Steve Runkle, William Rieley, Steve Von Storch, Eric Strucko, Chair; Bob Watson, Sherry Buttrick and Jeff Werner.

Planning Commission members attending were: William Rieley, Vice-Chairman; Rodney Thomas, Pete Craddock, and Bill Edgerton. Absent from the meeting were: Jared Loewenstein, William Finley and Tracy Hopper.

Staff present was Elaine Echols, Senior Planner.

Other members of the public present were Marcia Joseph, Ivo Romensko, Chuck Rotgin, and Percy Montague.

Mr. Rieley, Vice-Chairman called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 5:10 p.m.

Mr. Strucko, Chair, called the meeting of Disc II to order at 5:10 p.m. He noted that since three Planning Commission members were present that it was a joint meeting. The Board of Supervisors prompted this meeting on May 1st due to their consideration of a text or language change to the Comprehensive Plan's land use plan.

Ms. Echols provided history on the proposed changes in language of the Comprehensive Plan that would help support the Neighborhood Model.

Mr. Strucko stated that during the public hearing of the Board of Supervisors, Chuck Rotgin, Steve Runkle and Bob Watkins made some suggested changes in the language. The Board felt it appropriate for this body, DISC II, to review the suggested language. Therefore, this meeting was scheduled. The Chair said that, even though he did not know the process, he assumed that this would eventually go before the Planning Commission. In the interim, Planning staff went through Mr. Rotgin's recommended language changes and organized the issues in the document that were sent through regular mail and email and made recommendations on whether they would support the proposed language changes. He said that during this meeting DISC II would go through the document and consider each item in sequence.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Strucko stated that the first item on the agenda was the approval of the minutes for the February 19, 2002 meeting. He noted one change on item #3 where the sentence reads, "He said that he believed that DISC II should keep an eye on the regulatory changes, keep an eye on the Master Planning process but take a back seat to the actual implementation." He asked that "keep a back seat" be deleted and replaced with "to take a passive role in the actual implementation." He noted that his view was that the DISC II Committee would make the recommendations to the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and the community in the master planning process. They would actually do the implementation work and DISC II would be there to answer questions and participate as they see fit as a passive role.

Mr. Runkle pointed out that he did not make any comments.

Mr. Watson noted on page 3, the minutes said that the Planning Commission was assuring that regulatory changes were being accomplished. He stated that was not quite a true statement.

Ms. Echols stated that they were overseeing the regulatory changes to make sure that they go through the process.

Mr. Strucko agreed with Ms. Echols. He asked if there were any other changes.

Mr. Runkle moved for approval of the minutes with the subject changes.

Mr. Strucko seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

The minutes were approved with the recommended changes.

Ms. Hobbs suggested that DISC II go through the staff document page by page.

Mr. Strucko stated that Ms. Echol's document is ten pages long. He invited Mr. Rotgin to be an active participant since the document contained his suggestions

Pete Craddock arrived at 5:16 p.m.

Mr. Chuck Rotgin stated that his company was very supportive of the concept of the mixed-use concept that evolved from the twelve principles. Most of them were adopted. They certainly desired to see the Rural Areas protected. One of the ways to protect the Rural Areas was to make development in the designated growth areas happen. Mr. Rotgin said that he was not trying to readdress the things that DISC looked at over the last three or four years. He said that he was trying to come up with Comprehensive Plan language that represents the vision of the governmental bodies, which will then lead to the appropriate ordinance amendments being written. He stated if the vision is not right, then the ordinance is not going to be right.

Mr. Rotgin said that his intent was to put on the table items that need to be addressed. He acknowledged that he and Don Wagner have arguments to back up the things that have been done. He pointed out that they were not trying to reinvent the wheel. He said that, from the development side, they hoped to share information on how the language as proposed will not be workable.

Mr. Rotgin continued saying the idea or goal ought to be to come up with a vision statement that reflects what the original goal was of the Board of Supervisors. DISC's charge was to come up with ways that would encourage development in the growth areas, particularly infill development, so that we could stop growth in the Rural Areas. He noted that it really was an issue of single-family development. Since land developers were running out of lots in some of the communities in the growth area, the percentage of single-family dwellings have increased in the Rural Areas during the past year. This trend has continued in the first quarter of this year by 60 percent of all single-family permits were single-family dwellings in the Rural Areas. He said that was not a trend that we want to continue.

Mr. Strucko stated that one of the facts that they all knew was that the Neighborhood Model was added to the Comprehensive Plan and was voted on and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. He said that there is some language in the Land Use Plan and other sections of the Comp Plan that need to be changed to become consistent with the Neighborhood Model. The implementation strategy required changes to the Land Use Plan. He said the Board recognized that they created the inconsistencies between documents when they created the Neighborhood Model. That is what has triggered this whole series of events.

Mr. Strucko stated that they all agree that the prototypical design for the Neighborhood model was **a** plan and not **the** plan. The model neighborhood itself is the five minute walk around a center. The drawings and renditions show the application of the twelve principles. All neighborhoods don't have to be perfect circles in order to achieve the principles of the Neighborhood Model. Mr. Strucko said that what was more important was the twelve principles. The DISC I committee pushed that the development community would have to work with these twelve principles as best that they could to create innovative neighborhood design involving the twelve principles, but did not have to look like a perfect circle. He stated that the committee could react to his statement, but as a member of the DISC I committee, he remembered the deliberations in this fashion.

Mr. Strucko then began reviewing the document provided by staff. He began with the first item under the heading, Discussion of the Rotgin Changes, Articulate the Neighborhood Model, One of Several Alternatives for Development. He said that as a member, he was always of the opinion that it was the twelve principles that superseded any recognition of the neighborhood in the document or the drawing or any photograph, but that the twelve principles was the key element. He said we need to encourage developers to innovatively deal within those twelve principles. The Board and Commission acknowledge that not every one of the twelve principles may be applicable to the site. That is discretion of the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors in whether to grant exceptions to those rules. In terms of creating a model that had the flexibility within in which the development community can move was the always the intent. He asked for other committee to speak up if they disagreed.

Ms. Hobbs noted that on page two in the middle of the second paragraph it states, "But, not every development needs to be a mixed-use development if a variety of uses to which a neighborhood can relate is located nearby." She asked how far "near by" was and if it had to be within the little circle?

Mr. Strucko stated that this one acknowledged the fact that most of the vacant sites within the designated growth area have existing development in place and any new development has to happen in relation to that be done in proximity. If we talk about affordable housing, he said if there is an unfavorable amount of existing affordable housing within an existing proximity, does the new development have to have a component of affordable housing. He noted that he did not have the answer, but it was up to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to make that determination. He said that the DISC committee acknowledged that there might be a circumstance where an existing development adjacent to a proposed development might have an impact on what happens on the proposed site. The Board of Supervisors has that exception. This body acknowledged that the adjacent development would have an impact on the proposed development.

Mr. Runkle said he agreed with some of what Mr. Strucko said, but that the language was causing some of the problem. The word "form" means different things to certain people. The word "form" is used interchangeably in the Neighborhood Model. To some it implies a rectilinear pattern where lot sizes are defined and so forth. He felt that there needs to be some clarification. He said the application of the principles in a balanced and rational way is needed and yields whatever application form it yields. He said that does not specifically mean any given type of pattern, although some of the principles of the Neighborhood Model are in conflict. He said the more interconnective the systems become; the less sensitive we potentially will be in the terrain surfaces. He said that there is not a great deal of clarity right now about which of these principles have priority. He said that we need to prioritize principles. Mr. Runkle continued that there needs to be some type of language that relates to prioritization of the principles and how they fit in the context of the whole. The other thing, he stated, is that in the commercial area in Forest Lakes there is a lot of infrastructure in the ground already that is based on what the design perimeters and philosophies have been, and yet there are no buildings on those sites. He wondered if he will have to tear the infrastructure structure out of the ground that already exists. He asked if there should be some language in this document that some consideration be given to vocation of

existing infra-structure. From a rational standpoint, he felt that the Commission and Board would make those considerations but he was not sure if this document should recognize that there were some transitional issues like the ones he described.

Mr. Werner stated that the Neighborhood Model was adopted as a vision statement. He stated that what DISC II is having is a discussion about how a developer takes a given site and pounds all of the principles into that one project. He said that was not what the intent of the model was. He said it is the cumulative impact - the net result. That is the language that needs to be introduced into this document. For instance, the staff report says in the second paragraph that not every development will be mixed use. He noted that one development might be a store that slips in between two existing structures. There will be no open space and the developer will not be able to solve all principles of DISC, but they will integrate into an urban fabric, which is a vision. He stated that DISC II needs to be very clear. It is very frustrating to continue talking about DISC singularly as a project. He said the site plans that come in on new projects show nothing about the adjacent parcels, but only for the site that is being worked on.

Mr. Gaylon Beights arrived at 5:29 p.m.

Mr. Werner suggested that there should be a net density that everything works towards. He said that, last evening Mr. Edgerton made a comment about Albemarle Place that "this is what we want." Mr. Werner said if we want something, let's say it. He felt that the Commission should get away from the single site context and get back to the master plan vision. The cumulative impact of the Neighborhood Model would be the ultimate result.

Mr. Strucko directed the committee back to the text under review. He said that the Board of Supervisors adopted the language that reads on the bottom of page two in italics and that the language is already a part of the County's Comprehensive Plan. He said that the adopted language supports a change in the form of urban development from what currently exists and acknowledged that the Neighborhood Model and twelve principles report represents that change. He noted that the Board was not talking about an option. He stated that the twelve principles represent all of this change and we have to acknowledge that. .

Mr. Watson stated that the words also say that the principles are a guide.

Mr. Strucko read the statement, "However, it is recognized that as individual proposals are considered all of the following standards may not be applicable to any specific proposal, but, rather those proposals will need to considered in a more global context, particularly as they relate to the mix of uses." He asked if the committee supports that kind of language change?

Mr. Riley said that he agreed.

Mr. Strucko asked if they were in general agreement with the addition of the second "however" sentence?

There was no disagreement made.

Mr. Strucko said that the Neighborhood Model has a form of development anticipated. It is not a menu item. The Neighborhood Model as depicted is a form and the twelve principles should remain as the represented change in affordable development.

Mr. Werner stated that he inserted a word in the third line from the bottom where it says to achieve that density, to say to achieve that net density, the form of development must change and that net results should be a form and must be more urban and less suburban. He asked that it state the ultimate result and not just the result. He pointed out that density is not being used properly here. When you build a house you increase the density in the growth area, he said you

have not quite met your net density yet. You have not met your build out potential yet. The numbers need to become real. There needs to be something subjective.

Mr. Runkle asked if they have consensus that the application of the principles is what was desired and not a given pattern of development or geometric pattern of development. He said the word "form" is going to mean different things to different people. He asked what does that term mean to the Neighborhood Model? Each situation in terms of physical form is different. He said there needs to be some clarifying language included as to what that term means as it relates to the Neighborhood Model and these principles. He said if you apply those principles in any given situation you might get an entirely different end result in terms of physical form. He said he preferred to put something in the document that defined "form" as the physical condition or the desired built environment that results from the application of the principles. He said that application of the principles does not look like a specific picture.

Mr. Rotgin noted when you say Neighborhood Model, the way this document reads, you are talking about a rectilinear style and that being the only option that is available.

Mr. Rieley stated Mr. Rotgin's statement was factually incorrect. He said there are illustrations within the Neighborhood Model of a variety of applications. In fact, he said when the Planning Commission was talking about the vision, he thought there was too much variety of design in lots of cases. There are a variety of illustrations of these principles showing that there are various ways these principles can be applied. He noted that he has never read or looked at this document thinking that there were twelve principles on one side and the Neighborhood Model somewhere else. He thought that the illustrations were simply illustrating ways in which the twelve principles were applied. The Commission took out lots of illustrations at the Planning Commission level because they thought some of the illustrations were overly prescriptive. He said that this is an issue the Commission wrestled with a lot and he was comfortable with the final product. The document did not stipulate that the rectilinear grid system was the only possible way, but used the illustrations to show there were ways that it can be used to interconnect roads.

Mr. Watson agreed with Mr. Rieley. He referred to the first question on page three. If he was reading this correctly, it says that staff does not recommend that the twelve principles be considered as an option.

Ms. Echols stated that the twelve principles characterize the form to which the County aspires.

Mr. Watson stated that was confusing.

Mr. Edgerton suggested substituting the wording to include the direction or the vision. When he looked at the twelve principles he did not see rectilinear. He noted that he had seen a lot of things that could work in a rectilinear situation. He pointed out that they had a work session coming up for a project that he felt was too rectilinear.

Ms. Hobbs supported what Mr. Runkle said since it is really important because he has said it for four years and Don Wagner went along with his idea of using the terrain effectively. The two sentences that Mr. Runkle said previously about applying the twelve principles with the terrain conflicts between the principles are important. She supported Mr. Werner's idea about the net density.

Ms. Echols noted that the existing land use plan talks about density. The Neighborhood Model is about character and form, even though those words seem to mess people up, and possibly we need different words. We have quantitative information in our current land use plan that relates to density. She said if DISC thinks that there are some things that staff can work on to help introduce or clarify the character form confusion, they would be glad to do that. She suggested that they get back to first question. She asked if you believe that the twelve principles are the things that need to be applied to the development areas and to new development? She asked if

the group was saying, “if you are doing a new development, you do your best with the twelve principles and if you don’t meet them all, then you say why you can’t meet them all.”

Mr. Werner stated he believed there were two distinct discussions about the principles. He said there is a master planning process that is an enormous part of the Neighborhood Model. The discussion held was about what a developer needs to bring in to the process. In the absence of a master planning process there is one answer and after completion of the master planning process, there is another answer. The issue needs to be clarified. There is a master plan application and a pre-master plan application. For instance in Crozet or on Pantops, what should a developer do in the absence of a master plan? They don’t know what they will be integrating into. In Crozet there might be a reference point that offers a little bit of different guidance than something that would be built in Pantops. There are a lot of questions about this. If a developer submits his own creation, how does he know if he has hit these points? However, if someone brings in something with a master plan then that is a different picture.

Mr. Strucko asked if Mr. Werner wanted to insert something about the master plan?

Mr. Werner stated that he did not know how to insert it. He noted that these are two different issues. He said he did not want to dilute the value of the intent of the master plan in the growth area because if that was what this was about, how could a developer do something prior to the master plan.

Mr. Watson stated that the actual language adopted by the Board states: “The Board will adopt the Neighborhood Model as a building block for new development in the County and until the master plans are adopted for each development area, this report will provide the necessary guidance for approval of this development.”

Mr. Thomas stated that when the Commission was going through the Neighborhood Model, they specifically talked about this not being the but rather a Neighborhood Model so that developers could use their imaginations and bring something to us using the twelve steps to go by.

Mr. Runkle stated that he did not dispute the fact that the Commission said something during the deliberations that there is more than one way to do this and apply the principles on a rational basis. He said it would be simpler just to clarify things to say that there is not just one way to do it and use the model. He stated potentially there are multiple outcomes of applications of those principles. The goal is to seek the best outcome of the application of those principles once you are given the circumstances.

Mr. Strucko asked the recording secretary if she had gotten Mr. Runkle’s comment.

Mr. Runkle stated someone would still have to go through a public process for approval of a plan. He noted that his provision of how those principles would best be applied might get locked out through that process. He felt that it was still desirable to say that you don’t necessarily end up with the exact given picture of what something will look like starting out. The initial review comments are predicated on something like that.

Mr. Werner stated that they should know what the capacity of the property is before the review. They have no idea what the net result will be with a request for a higher density form.

Mr. Runkle noted that they should try to agree on the first question. He noted that they could come back to the other issues. He asked if they could agree and clarify what the word “form” means in this context.

Mr. Rieley suggested inserting a semicolon instead of a period to the sentence under review and adding a sentence along the lines that Mr. Runkle articulated a few minutes ago. He

acknowledged that there are multiple satisfactory combinations of applications of these principles and it was in everybody's interest to find sensible instruments.

Mr. Strucko stated that the issue at hand is whether the land use plan language is consistent with the more broad Neighborhood Model document with all of the drawings and the additions. When you just look at the land use plan itself, you don't know what "form" means and you don't know what your options are, he said. Mr. Strucko continued that the committee could expand the language in the land use plan but noted that he did not want to get into the very specific word or specific language because they had been at this for an hour now. He said the committee might have to reconvene if that was the angle or direction that they wanted to go. He felt that the entire development initiative steering committee effort was a two-legged stool where the Neighborhood Model and the twelve principles was one leg, the master planning process was the second and the ordinance and regulatory changes were the third. Absent any of those, the thing will fall apart he said. If the land use plan language needs to acknowledge that situation, then we will have to do some work to add it. It is almost a matter of cutting and pasting from the model document into this. All of the cross-referencing is done and everybody knows that there are multiple methods of achieving these twelve principles and that not every neighborhood is rectilinear with a one-half mile radius from a center.

Mr. Watson stated that if DISC II could get out of the meeting by 7:00 p.m., that would be fine. He said DISC has spent five or six years on this. If they can't finish it today, then they would have to reconvene.

Mr. Strucko asked if they acknowledged that the twelve principles are the vision.

Mr. Werner stated that they are the vision for the comprehensive development area, but they are not the vision for every single developed area.

Mr. Strucko stated that there is a layover of traditional standards or community based standards that have to be acknowledged and followed as well with respect to this process.

Mr. Edgerton noted that in the ideal world it would be nice to have the entire master planning done before an applicant applies for a land use change. But
until that has occurred there has got to be some flexibility. He stated that he had a problem with the principle being optional.

Mr. Strucko asked that they move on to the next issue of vision and direction.

Ms. Echols stated that staff has enough information to handle items one and two.

Mr. Strucko dropped to the density question, which was located at the bottom of page three. He read staff's statement aloud. Staff believes that density is discussed sufficiently in the version recommended by the Planning Commission. If there is a need for more language relating to density, it is not problematic to the staff to pair it with words supporting greater capital investment.

Mr. Runkle stated that he had three comments relative to density. The first one was that he did not think that the adoption of the Neighborhood Model and the principles necessarily leads to an increase in density. If you read this language, he said, the implication is given that it will. He felt that it would be a better chance that density would increase if they were able to build in more desirable places. But it was not automatic. Density is going to have to be driven by market preferences, economic factors, enabling regulatory changes and so forth, he said. So the fact that the principles are adopted does not mean that density will change. It will change the function of product types and product mix. It might go from garden apartments to mid-level apartment or high rises. He continued that if the market desire change from 70 percent single-family houses to 30 percent, then density will change. It needs to be made clear in this document the factual terms of what the expectations should be. Mr. Runkle said the second thing is that they talked a

lot in DISC I about what was the relationship between the rural area policy and development area policy. Our charge was to develop the area policy he said. That is fine, except today between 40 and 65 percent of the single family detached product is going into the rural areas. If one of the goals of this Comp Plan is to relieve development pressure on the rural areas, then it has go to be recognized that certainly in the short run there would be a decrease density in the development area. This would be because all people wanting single family detached property would be moving into the rural areas. Therefore, density would go down and not up as a result. There needs to be some recognition in what is the desired joint goal here and what is the likely impact of that he continued. It is going to be extremely difficult in the short term to cause people to live in the development areas and change the product type he said. It was unlikely that he could move someone off of five acres with a detached house into an apartment.

Mr. Werner noted that he understands the market, but that they still need to clarify the net density. They need to get away from the concept of higher density because all of the capacity is going to be used up. Everything does not have to be higher density. Everything has to integrate into the whole. The intent of this is about the net result. He suggested that they clarify the term density and what it is relative to.

Mr. Runkle stated that his third point was that from the perspective of the private developer there is a real Catch 22 here. Developers are concerned that increased density typically comes with increased off-site infrastructure costs, which very frequently is uneconomical for the project. The private developer has to keep balance in what he can afford to pay for off-site infrastructure or facilities in a contribution and still make the project work or he can't do anything. To a large extent Mr. Runkle said, that is what they are looking at for a number of projects today. With the early stages of the Neighborhood Model and pushing density, we are being asked to fund off-site infrastructure that's only partially driven by the project, at levels that make the project uneconomical. He noted that they were asked to provide funds for contributions to schools, improvements at intersections or a number of other options depending on the particular case. The higher the density, the greater those costs are. When you weigh that against the market demand, it can destroy the project. He noted that it does not mean anything if he cannot sell the higher density product.

Ms. Buttrick referred to Mr. Runkle's second point, it seems there is little if any reference to the larger picture of the rural growth area. She said the point that Mr. Runkle made was important, even if not in the same box as the growth area density. She suggested that they get that larger picture more underscored here because it was one of the fundamental reasons that the Neighborhood Model was adopted.

Mr. Strucko stated that he thought he had read language that mentioned that the purpose of DISC was to alleviate the pressure of development in the rural areas. He was not sure where that particular language was located.

Ms. Buttrick noted that in one section it discourages sprawl development in the infill development policy.

Mr. Strucko asked if the committee supports adding language that a point was to alleviate the pressure of development in the rural areas?

Mr. Watson stated that exact language was already in there.

Mr. Rotgin stated that the addition of our higher density/higher quality was just an attempt to reinforce the concept that new development doesn't have to take a rectilinear form. From his perspective, he felt it was not necessary to add language about the rural areas in the document.

Mr. Strucko asked if everybody was comfortable with that statement.

Mr. Rieley asked about the concept of the public infrastructure investment.

Mr. Strucko noted that this issue was coming up soon. He noted that the questions today were all about the master plan and not about DISC. DISC is trying to give people tools to create an attractive environment of higher density, but it is not at all about what that density should be as a lot of people are saying. He asked that they go to the top of page four, and said that the next issue talks about the regulatory changes. This was one of the legs of the stool, the regulatory changes, he said. He asked if more words relating to supporting regulatory changes should be added to the Comprehensive Plan? Staff said they had a problem with the concept of incentives, he noted.

Mr. Rotgin noted that Mr. Runkle mentioned the concept that higher density often brings along with it higher costs. In order to encourage a developer to undertake a higher density type of development, some of the costs need to be offset so that the developer knows what the market will be. In the current ordinances there are many disincentives to accomplish any type of development. The incentives that he was thinking about were in coming up with some by-right uses so that the extra costs associated with trying to develop a neighborhood in accord with the Neighborhood Model, particularly an infill location, can be offset. This would take away the risk of the developers spending lots of money and then get to the Board of Supervisors to find that the neighbors are against the project.

Mr. Strucko stated that DISC always said that one of the main incentives to developers and builders was to streamline the approval process through the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors so that they have demonstrated clearly that the twelve principles have been met. We acknowledged the fact that there is a financial cost to dog this kind of development.

Ms. Hobbs stated that it seems that the County needs to step up and put a little more in some of these things. The County would get a return on its investment because it would have a better-looking Albemarle County.

Mr. Strucko noted that capital improvement programs have to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan with the master plan, the regulatory changes with everything else. He noted that they could suggest that the County do more with capital investment.

Mr. Runkle suggested that they get rid of the line in the document that talks about increased costs.

Mr. Edgerton noted that master planning is a growing experience for the County and the developers. One of the problems with the by-right type of the approval process is that your regulations have to be very specific. This makes it difficult to have flexibility. You can't have it both ways. There has to be a way to explore what can and cannot work. A lot of times in reality the developer does not have a choice to discuss what is happening around the project. Are there other incentives to by right development?

Ms. Echols stated that one of the things that DISC I talked about is changing the regulations to get rid of the conventional look and feel and to create something that is more urban. The next thing was to work on the master plan. We were not going to get into more density "by-right" until they knew what the infrastructure costs were to support it. There was actually a method to the madness here. We change the development regulations one step at a time. There was a real concern that if the County opened everything up to more density all at once without dealing with the infrastructure costs that we find after the master planning process, we overwhelm what we've got. It may not be articulated that way, but this idea is what I recall DISC saying about the order of business.

Mr. Strucko asked if DISC II wanted to clarify the incentive to mean the public process or whatever process you have to go through in the County government and the various commissions and board.

Mr. Werner agreed 100 percent and felt that it dovetails into the next question.

Mr. Strucko stated that the next topic dealt with infrastructure.

Mr. Rotgin suggested that the line read: "It is important that the ordinance revisions are designed and written to be user-friendly and that they contain appropriate incentives to encourage the desired higher quality, high density forms of development anticipated by the Neighborhood Model."

Mr. Strucko asked if staff actually felt it was appropriate to place further emphasis on the need for capital investment. He noted from all of the comments, they were all in agreement that we could hammer the County a little bit more on planning the capital improvements better and dedicating money to the designated growth areas. He asked if there were any changes or comments.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that phasing is a critical component of the master plan.

Mr. Loach asked that staff obtain a legal opinion on whether language concerning infrastructure in relation to phased development could be placed in the Comp Plan. He noted that this could be very helpful in situations when VDOT is unable to complete road improvements in a timely fashion. He pointed out that Greyrock in Crozet was a classic example of development on a road that could not support the traffic.

Mr. Runkle asked that they create a balanced playing field because the costs for developing in the growth area were rising and making it cheaper to develop in the rural areas.

Mr. Rotgin suggested that the sentence on the bottom of page four in the third line end after the words "infrastructure improvements?

Mr. Strucko asked if DISC II was satisfied with the capital infrastructure comments. He asked that they move on to the next topic of the designated growth area boundaries.

Mr. Runkle stated that the Committee needs to study how the expansion would relate to the rural area development.

Ms. Hobbs noted that it does not make sense for one side of Hydraulic Road to have public sewer and the other side not to particularly because it is located in the County's watershed. She favored expanding the area to include this area so those septic fields are not put in the watershed area particularly for the trailer park and the churches.

Mr. Strucko asked if the existing language was strong enough?

Mr. Watson noted that the last vacant land study was done over three years ago and should be updated. He noted that from the past study, it appeared that there were not a lot of large parcels left in the growth area to be developed He opposed expanding the growth area except on a case by case basis. Future recommendations for expansion should be evaluated with the updated studies.

Mr. Thomas stated that they need to review where they want new growth to go.

Mr. Werner felt that this language was not necessary because the Comp Plan is reviewed every five years. He suggested that the County accelerate the GIS mapping to get it on line so that

more accurate information is available. He asked that they check with Tex on the schedule of this.

Mr. Strucko moved on to relegated parking and whether it should be optional.

Mr. Runkle stated that in commercial development there is some confusion on what relegated parking is and what is it relegated to? The net result is sometimes worse than using the conventional approach to parking. There is some existing infrastructure in the County where it might create some problems. He did not oppose the overall concept, but felt it should be applied on a case by case basis.

Mr. Rotgin noted that sometimes it is not reasonable to require regulated parking.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that there is a valid point in reviewing development area boundaries. He noted that there are places and areas that need to be taken out of the development area.

Mr. Werner suggested that the word "capacity" be included in the language.

Ms. Echols noted that, due to the lateness of the hour, the rest of the discussion would need to be postponed.

Mr. Strucko noted that the consensus was to not change the language as it was in this section. He stated that they would not be able to finish this today since they were only on page five of the ten-page document. He asked when the Board of Supervisors would hear this?

Ms. Echols stated that the actual date has not been set. She asked if they would like to schedule another work session for next week.

Mr. Strucko stated that he would not be able to attend the May 30 meeting.

Mr. Werner suggested that everyone review Loundon County's web site since they just did a zoning text change that discusses open space.

Consensus was reached that the next DISC II meeting would be held on Thursday, May 30 at 5:00 p.m. Staff will notify the members of the location.

Mr. Rotgin asked when the minutes would be circulated with the changes.

Ms. Echols stated that she would be out of town and would not be able to get the minutes back before the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m. to their next meeting on May 30th.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon Taylor, Recording Secretary)