Joint Albemarle County Planning Commission/Disc II Meeting
June 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 Thursday, June 20, 2002 at 5:00 p.m. in meeting room #235, at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

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

Staff present were David Benish, Chief of Planning & Community Development; and Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development.

Other members of the public present were Marcia Joseph, Don Wagner, Chuck Rotgin, Rick Hill and Cecil Sears.

Mr. Rieley, Vice-Chairman called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 5:25 p.m.

Mr. Strucko, Chair, called the meeting of Disc II to order at 5:25 p.m. He noted that since three Planning Commission members were present that it was a joint meeting.

Mr. Rotgin stated that he had brought two guests. He introduced Rick Hill who was a consultant from Charlotte, North Carolina who was an expert in neo-traditional design. He introduced his second guest as Cecil Sears who was an economic consultant with Roundtree Associates of Richmond. He pointed out that he had retained Mr. Sears to do some economic feasibility work. He noted that they would be happy to answer questions particularly as they relate to the applicability of the Neighborhood Models with areas like Charlottesville with a relatively low population.

Mr. David Benish stated that Elaine Echols was not present today due to an illness. He noted that the blue sheet was Attachment A and reflected all of the changes from DISC II as of 6-6-02 without any strikeouts. He noted that the green sheet was Attachment B and reflected the strike out items with the changes shown in gray. As an introduction, he understood that they have gone through the entire document with the exception of Pages 28 & 29, Attachment A (page 26, Attachment C) Should the paragraphs that are proposed for deletion

actually be deleted. Mr. Rooker questioned whether they should actually be deleted. Staff comment: These paragraphs were deleted because they seemed to promote the more conventional form of commercial development than the Neighborhood Model. The only item that staff recommends retaining would be a reference to the need for using shared access points for developments along major collector roads and arterials. He noted that staff feels that they are either redundant or not consistent with the Neighborhood Model principles. These issues or five points were not relevant for residential. For commercial, as a minimum it was stated that staff felt that was a pattern of development that the Neighborhood Model was no longer encouraging.

Due to time restraints, the minutes were condensed to note the actual changes and a lot of the dialogue was omitted.

- On Page 28, #2 take out "should" before is encouraged.
- On Page 28, under Residential Development Design keep items 1 through 5.
- On Page 27 and 28 leave the language as it was without the new proposal under Residential Densities and Relationships to Other Land Uses.
- On Page 23 of the green copy (Page 19 of the blue), consensus made to keep the sentence, "To help achieve infill, an inventory of undeveloped and underdeveloped properties within the County's urban neighborhoods, communities, and villages which are available for development should be updated annually."
- On Page 20, number 8 of the green copy; staff recommended deleting the reference to the edge of the village.
- On page 23, change "existing development of RA" to "existing character of RA."
- On page 23 of the green copy, bottom bullet, consensus formed for "Promote a mixture of uses for new development and redevelopment."
- On page 20 of the blue copy, add the words model and equally to the second sentence in the middle paragraph to read: "However, it is recognized that as individual proposals are considered, all of the principles of the Neighborhood "Model**"**, listed as the General Land Use Standards, below, may not be "equally" applicable to any specific proposal. All proposals will need to be considered in a more global context, particularly as they relate to the mix of uses."

Marilyn Gale, representative for the Design Review Council, stated that their biggest concern was the application. She noted the document as an overview was something to go by, but their biggest concern are the exact application and she did not know if anybody was going to be able to tell them exactly how that would be handled. She noted that a lot of it depended on the ordinances that were enacted. She asked how as land planners and designer these thoughts and desires are going to be implemented and what type of unexpected problems would they run into. She pointed out that unintentionally there might be problems

that are created. She acknowledged how hard it was to get these written, amended and approved and they knew that they would not be going through another amendment process any time soon. She stated that it would have to be applied before they could see how it was going to work. In that regard, they were hopeful that there was going to be some ability to interpret some of the things that were said in here in a manner that is sensible. She stated that they were concerned with the site planning stage ad how the guidelines are going to be implemented and what some of these things mean when they are actually applied. An example is the percentages for residential and some nonresidential area. She asked how this was going to be filtered down to the Zoning Ordinance and the Zoning categories and who would make those interpretations. When they submit plans, she asked what type of documentation would they need to back themselves up.

Mr. Rieley stated that the intention was to make the process more predictable and, therefore, easier for developers.

Ms. Gale stated that their other concern was their clients and what the County's expectation would be. She noted that there was a big gap between what is here and then what is designed on paper. She stated that she would love to have the opportunity for someone within their group to do sketches and have them looked at so that they could all get on the same tract. She pointed out that this was a very dramatic change.

Mr. Rieley stated that an important point was to get feedback early without an enormous investment. He pointed out that currently the preliminary site plan has a check list that is several pages long and is expensive. He suggested that they work on mechanisms to improve that process in dealing with those issues.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Neighborhood Model is an open book with the twelve principles to use for guidance and was not the law.

Mr. Benish stated that this matter would go to the Board of Supervisors on July 3rd which was a day meeting that started at 9:00 a.m.

Mr. Strucko asked if the Board would take public comments.

Mr. Rotgin stated that the Chairmen indicated that it would be a work session, but that could change. He stated that the language that discussed relegated parking was on page 21 of the blue copy. He asked that someone comment on the definition of relegated parking and describe what is the side and rear. He felt that was a big issue.

Mr. Rieley stated that on page 11 that it indicated that the preference would be for the parking lots to be located on the side and rear of the buildings.

Mr. Benish stated that there were determinations to be made on corner lots and on small lots, which would be made by the Zoning Administrator. He noted that you would have to look at that particular development's pattern of development.

Mr. Rotgin stated that it would be helpful if they could come to the County early on with sketches before they spent a lot of money on plans.

Mr. Rieley stated that they were strongly encouraged to come in with conceptual plans, but still to be able to understand the grading and the lay out of the building. He pointed out that a couple of years ago the Planning Commission made a list of the things they wanted to see on a special use permit application or a rezoning. He felt that would be helpful.

Mr. Rotgin expressed appreciation for the work sessions and all of the work that the staff has done.

Mr. Benish stated that staff would identify the areas that need to be changed in the Subdivision Ordinance and then ask Mr. Kampter to review them.

Mr. Strucko stated that the Board of Supervisors would review this issue on July 3rd.

The meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Recording Secretary)