Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 25, 2003

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, February 25, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were William Finley; Jared Loewenstein; Rodney Thomas; Pete Craddock; and William Rieley, Chairman. Absent from the meeting were Tracey Hopper and Bill Edgerton.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development; David Benish, Chief of Planning & Community Development; Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney; Stephen Waller, Senior Planner; Scott Clark, Senior Planner; and Margaret Doherty, Principal Planner.

Call to Order And Establish Quorum

Mr. Rieley called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Rieley invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – February 12, 2003

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on February 12, 2003.

- The Board approved the South Pantops/Dennis Enterprises zoning map amendment and special use permit. The only change in the rezoning was that there was an area of vegetation to be undisturbed on the lower side of the development of the office building on the western side sloping down to the adjacent vacant parcel. The owner asked that the Board not require the entire area to remain undisturbed because of the potential that they would have in developing their site of needing to fill in some of that lower area. After looking at that and considering the limits of what that fill would be and how it would affect the intent of having that area left undisturbed, the Board agreed to allow some disturbance. The Board did not allow the entire area because the upper area in particular was very important screening for the development of the office building. The Board did allow the lower area to be disturbed. That condition was modified in the Board's decision. Otherwise, it was approved as you recommended.

Consent Agenda

SDP-02-107 Habitat Services Garden Center Site Plan Waiver – Request for approval of a site plan waiver to allow a garden center with a contractor's storage yard for landscaping. (Stephen Waller)

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes – January 14, 2003 and January 21, 2003

Mr. Rieley asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull any item from the consent agenda.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of the consent agenda.

Mr. Finley seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0). (Hopper, Edgerton - Absent)

Public Hearing Item:

SP-02-66 Central Telephone Co. of VA (Sprint) Amendment PWSF (Sign #28, 29) – Request for approval to allow the attachment of an array of panel antennas on an existing tower serving personal wireless service facilities by amending the conditions of an existing special use permit. This application is being submitted in accordance with Section 23.2.2.3, which allows microwave and radio-wave transmission towers and their appurtenances by special use permit. The property, described as Tax Map 61, Parcel 129C contains approximately 1.366 acres, zoned CO. This site is located on the south side of Rt. 631 (Rio Road East), approximately 1/8 mile east of the intersection with Rt. 29 North, and near Fashion Square Mall. This property is located in the Rio Magisterial District, within the area designated as Neighborhood 2 by the Comprehensive Plan. (Stephen Waller) ***APPLICANT REQUESTS WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION.***

Mr. Rieley stated that the applicant has requested withdrawal of the application. He stated that since it was a withdrawal that they did not need to open the public hearing.

Mr. Loewenstein recommended approval of the applicant's request for withdrawal of SP-02-66, Central Telephone Company of VA.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0). (Hopper, Edgerton – Absent)

SP-02-16 Old Trail Golf Club Amendment (Sign #44, 76, 93) - Request for special use permit to allow a public golf course with clubhouse in accordance with Sections 10.2.2.4, 13.2.2.4, and 16.2.2.4 of the Zoning Ordinance which allow for "swim, golf, tennis, or similar athletic facilities." The property, described as Tax Map 55, Parcels 84C, 84E, 102, 103, 103F, 83 and 71, contains 207 acres, and is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on Rt. 250 (Rockfish Gap Turnpike), approximately 0.5 miles east of the intersection of Rt. 250 and I-64. The property is zoned RA Rural Areas, R-1 Residential, R-6 Residential, and EC Entrance Corridor. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Density in the Crozet Community and Rural Area. (Scott Clark)

Mr. Clark presented the staff report. (See the attached copy of the staff report.) This proposal is for an 18-hole public golf course in the Rural Areas on the western edge of Crozet's development area. On January 28th, the Commission voted to approve this use with conditions. However, subsequently they learned that several of the adjacent property owners were not properly notified of that hearing. Therefore, the second hearing was required. In addition, at the January 28th hearing the Commission requested that staff develop an additional condition to address buffering on an adjacent land parcel, which was requested by landowners. Since that time, the applicant and the neighbors have worked out a solution that is reflected in the conditions of approval. Other than that there have been no changes in the circumstances, and staff again recommends approval with the conditions.

Mr. Rieley asked if there were questions for Mr. Clark. There being none, he opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant would like to address the Commission.

Gaylon Beights, owner of the March Mountain Properties who were the owner of the property and the golf course, stated that he was present to answer any questions that they might have. He stated that he would not repeat the speech that he made at the previous meeting.

Mr. Rieley asked if anyone else would like to address this application.

Kathleen Jump, resident of Crozet, stated that she has been working with the master plan efforts that the County is undertaking in Crozet. Along with her neighbors and residents, she thought

they had put 1,000 or more hours into a plan that was kicked off in January, 2002. They were still trying to schedule a meeting, which had been cancelled due to the snow. The Old Trail makes up the western part of the high-density growth area of Crozet. Old Trail is the name of the golf course and the planned residential area. The golf course is a foundation on which the residential area is being built. She stated that in Crozet they take the masterplan seriously. She felt that it was important to have a coordinated comprehensive planning effort or a blueprint to look at what is going to happen in Crozet so that they can get some sensible sound planning. They need to be able to see what is happening in conjunction with what is happening next door. In light of this, they need to consider the golf course along with what is going to happen next door to the golf course. To look at one piece of this as though the next piece were not going to come along, she did not see the wisdom in this action. It seems that it would be like building a two-story house, but not recognizing when you build the first story and putting in the infrastructure that you are going to have a second story come right along after. There may be things that a two-story house would require that you do not know in a one-story house. Many of the issues that she felt that the masterplan was trying to address in Crozet, such as connectivity, the best location for roads, the volume, the traffic patterns and any environmental concerns are certainly going to be different if you were to look at the whole picture. She felt that the masterplan is an effort to look at the whole picture. Respectfully in this case, she would like to point out that looking at one piece of this does not seem to be the wisest course. She stated that Old Trail will come, but she felt if they could look at it together that they would end up with it being a better plan.

Dick Grant stated that he lived on the edge of the growth plan and the golf course. He pointed out that he had sent the Commission a letter some time ago of which he would read due to the time limitation. As an owner of an adjacent property, he fully supports the plan for a first rate public course near the western border of the Crozet designated growth area. Having grown up in a small town with a public golf course about one mile away, he remembers many long summer days of fun and learning the game on that course. This facility will provide the people of Western Albemarle with moderate, wonderful recreational opportunities for families and young people in particular. The golf course will also serve as a buffer to further rural sprawl outside the growth area. When this project was first announced, much of the course would have been inside the growth area. He stated that they were talking about 15 to 20 acres at the most, which was 5 percent of the total activity is inside the designated growth area. The developers have had to modify their plans and purchase extra property and take extra planning time to put almost all of it outside of the growth area. He hoped that the extra planning time that has been taken to accomplish this will not be extended further and will now proceed at full speed. He stated that the applicant has wonderful plans and ready to build. He pointed out that he could see not see any reason for the masterplan to hold this up any longer. He asked the Commission to please pass the request tonight.

Karen Maupin stated that she would repeat what she said at the last meeting on January 28th. She stated that they live on Half-Mile Branch Road and are speaking as residents of Yancey Mills, which is adjacent to the golf course. They will be directly affected by the growth of Crozet and are very concerned about how it will affect their neighborhood. As a resident of the Yancey Mills neighbohood, they certainly favor the golf course. The other residents that they have spoken to also favor the golf course. Mr. Beights has listened to the neighbors concerns and has been
forthright in answering their questions about the gold course. Mr. Beight's plan seems to make sense in preventing pollution and traffic in the afternoon in this area.

Tom Golky, resident of Crozet and Yancey Mills, stated that their property was not only adjacent to the proposed project but it was surrounded by the proposed project. He stated that they have four children who are excited about the project because it would have five miles of walking trails and jogging trails and offers golf. The land to be developed is a beautiful farm. With the plans for Crozet over the next five to ten years, they were going to give up a lot of the beauty and stress the resources of the County. He stated that they support the proposed project of Old Trail, as it will provide public recreation, golf, walking, running trails and green space. This seems very

consistent with the County's initiatives and desire to preserve the beauty and the resources of the County. The project will benefit the residents of the County without being at the cost of the residents. As this area of the County is developed, these amenitites and these mixed-uses will be greatly needed to maintain the character and beauty that currently exists. He thanked the Commission and stated that he hoped that they saw the wisdom in the project and support it.

Mr. Rieley asked if anyone else would like to speak. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Commission for discussion and possible action.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of SP-02-016, Old Trail Golf Club Amendment, with the conditions recommended by staff as follows:

1. The facility shall be in general accord with the plan titled "Old Trails Golf Club", prepared by Roudabush, Gale & Associates, Inc., dated October 21, 2002, and revised December 16, 2002, subject to these conditions.
2. The applicant shall construct a road to serve the golf course, built to public road standards and running from Route 250 to the property line at the northern edge of Tax Map 56 Parcel 14. The road shall follow an alignment consistent with the Crozet Master Plan once adopted.
3. Private club memberships shall not be required for access to or play on the course.
4. There shall be no outdoor lighting of the course or of the practice area/driving range.
5. No new residential development shall be permitted within the "Limits of Golf Course indicated on the plan titled "Old Trails Golf Club", prepared by Roudabush, Gale & Associates, Inc., and dated October 21, 2002, and revised December 16, 2002.
6. The existing house known as Mountain View shall not be demolished.
7 The club house, restroom building, and maintenance facility shall be located within the Albemarle County Service Authority jurisdictional area.
8. No portion of any structure, excluding signs, shall be located closer than 50 feet to any residential or rural district. No parking area or loading space shall be located closer than 20 feet to any residential or rural district.
9. All landscaping around the clubhouse, restroom building, maintenance facility, parking area and other facilities shall include only native plants identified in the brochure "Native Plants for Conservation, Restoration, and Landscaping: Piedmont Plateau," published by the Virginia Department of Conservation & Recreation.
10. Vegetated areas of the facility outside the tees, greens, fairways, roughs, cart paths, and access road shall remain in their current states (if wooded) or be revegetated and maintained in native plant species. These species shall be selected from the brochure "Native Plants for Conservation, Restoration, and Landscaping: Piedmont Plateau" and/or "Native Plants for Conservation, Restoration, and Landscaping: Riparian Forest Buffers," published by the Virginia Department of Conservation & Recreation. Species identified in the "Riparian Forest Buffers" brochure as being native only to the Coastal Plain region shall not be used. Management of these areas shall maintain them in native plant species. Non-native plant species shall be diligently removed from these areas. The applicant shall submit a letter from the Thomas Jefferson Soil & Water Conservation District stating that the plantings required, have been established to the District's satisfaction.
11. The applicant, upon the request of the County, shall provide verification to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Development that the site is in compliance with the specifications contained in Conditions 9 and 10 regarding the landscaping plan.
12. Stream buffers in pasture at the date of this approval shall be revegetated in accordance with the schematic titled "Minimum Standard for Hole Crossings in Existing Pasture Areas", dated January 15, 2003, and prepared by Jerry Kamis. The design of the stream crossing on hole 12 shall be deemed to be in general accord with the plan titled "Old Trails Golf Club", prepared by Roudabush, Gale & Associates, Inc., dated October 21, 2002 and revised December 16, 2002, and shall use a minimal sight line subject to a mitigation plan to be approved by the Department of Engineering and Public Works.
13. Irrigation water for the golf course shall come only from surface water impounded on existing ponds on the site.

14. The dams and outlet structures on the two ponds on the site shall be repaired and upgraded to the satisfaction of the Department of Engineering and Public Works.
15. The course shall secure Department of Engineering and Public Works approval of a natural resources management plan. This plan shall address wildlife conservation and habitat enhancement, waste reduction and management (including hazardous material storage and spill containment), energy efficiency, water conservation (including water-use reporting and efforts to protect streamflow in Slabtown Branch), water quality management (including runoff management for the clubhouse area, monitoring, and reporting), and integrated pest management. The applicant, upon the request of the County, shall provide verification to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works that the site is in compliance with the specifications contained in the plan.
16. Grading shall be carried out in general accord with the conceptual grading plan titled "Preliminary Grading Plan," prepared by Gene Bates Golf Design, and dated January 9, 2003.
17. Cart-path stream crossings shall be built in general accord with the drawings titled "Wooden Cartway Crossing Plan" and "Wooden Cartway Crossing Elevation."
18. Neither the green for hole 14 nor the fee boxes for hole 15 shall be located less than 25 feet from the property line.

Mr. Finley seconded the motion

Mr. Rieley stated that he wanted to weigh in with a word of support on Ms. Jump's concern that as they move into areas where we are doing masterplanning that they need to be cognizant not to shut the door at a key moment on possibilities. He felt this was a case in which these is a compatible use with conditions that have anticipated a coordination with the Crozet master plan and have in fact left some possibility for the plan to be adjusted based on the outcome of the master plan. He pointed out that he was not at the last meeting and this was his opportunity to weight in. He asked that the vote be taken.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0) with the conditions as previously stated.

Mr. Rieley stated that the Board of Supervisors would hear SP-2002-016 on March 5th.

Work Session:

SP-02-65 Brown Auto Park (Structured Parking) (Sign #30, 31, 37) – Request for special use permit to allow a parking structure, as shown on a preliminary site plan, SDP-02-105, in accordance with Section 24.2.2.12 of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows for parking structures located wholly or partly above grade. The property, described as Tax Map 45 Parcel 68D4 and 68D6 is located in the Rio Magisterial District on US Route 29 North, on the northwest corner of Hilton Heights Drive and 29 North, in front of Sam's Club. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Regional Service in Neighborhood 1. (Margaret Doherty)

AND

SP-02-46 Brown Auto Park (Outdoor Display of Vehicles) (Sign #30, 31, 37) – Request for special use permit to allow a car dealership with outdoor display of vehicles in accordance with Section 30.6.3.2.b of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for outdoor storage, display and/or sales which would be visible from an Entrance Corridor. The property, described as Tax Map 45 Parcels 68D4 and 68D6, contains 6.16 acres, and is located in the Rio Magisterial District on US Route 29 N at the northwest corner of US Route 29 N and Hilton Heights Road. The property is zoned Highway Commercial HC. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Regional Service in Neighborhood 1. (Margaret Doherty)

Mr. Rieley stated that the first work session was relative to structured parking for Brown Auto Park and outdoor display of vehicles. He pointed out that the Commissioners might not be as prepared for discussion as they normally might be since the agenda said that this was to be deferred. Since this was a work session, he felt that they could go forward.

Ms. Doherty apologized for the errors in the agenda and staff report since they produced this very quickly upon the request of Jim Grigg. At the last minute, Mr. Grigg wanted to get this before the Commission before it goes to the Architectural Review Board on Monday. The site plan is in the process. There is a special use permit for the outdoor sales and display of vehicles. The ARB is doing that part of the review. Then there is the special use permit for structured parking in the site plan. Those applications have been through the Site Review Committee and staff is still in the process of producing the final comments for that for your anticipated hearing on March 25th. At this point most of the issues for the structured parking relate to the visibility from the Entrance Corridor. Again, they were relying on the ARB review of that. Staff did get some last minute comments from Margaret Maliszewski, Design Review Planner, which are included in your staff report. These comments give you an idea of some of the ARB's concerns. On page 5, staff has produced some questions for the Planning Commission. She pointed out that it would be great to get answers to these questions tonight to help staff with the rest of the review before completion of the next staff report. She asked that they disregard the attachment sent and replace it with the copy she distributed. That attachment is the previous site plan that shows the previously proposed entrance on Route 29. The current site plan, which was just distributed, removes that exit onto Route 29 and shows an exit onto Hilton Heights Road. The architectural site plan is a little different from the McKee Carson site plan that staff is reviewing. Staff intends to get all of these matters straight and in order before this is brought back to the Commission. She stated that if there were any questions that she would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Rieley asked if there were questions for Ms. Doherty.

Mr. Thomas stated that he had a question in regards to question # 1 to the Commission, which was does the Planning Commission consider a parking structure an appropriate use at this location. He asked if it was going to be solely a parking structure or a parking garage to house the products of the business.

Ms. Doherty stated that it would have sales and display. They will sell cars on the first floor with some display. Then they will have the sales offices and service of the vehicles. That building will be an auto dealership. Instead of displaying the cars on the parking lot, they are displaying them in a structure.

Mr. Thomas stated that the cars would not be displayed on the road.

Ms. Doherty stated that the top floor would be entirely open.

Mr. Benish pointed out that was one of the ARB's issues. He pointed out that as you come to the higher elevation looking across the top floor that there will be some visibility of the deck. He pointed out that the Commission would be looking at the use and the ARB would be looking at the aesthetic issues. The ARB is still in the process of reviewing this and will forward their recommendations back to staff and the Commission on how to treat this design from the visibility standpoint. The special use permit does talk about the garage or the deck parking use. This is an opportunity for the Commission to articulate the type of issues that you have with that type of structure.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a wall around the top edge of the building.

Ms. Doherty stated that the applicant was going to submit elevations, but noted that there were some profiles in their package. These profiles show you that the top floor is a parking lot.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a wall that went all the way around the front of it.

Ms. Doherty stated that this was a screen roof and that Jim Grigg would be happy to explain the architectural information in more detail. The purpose of this work session is for Mr. Grigg to present their plans.

Mr. Rieley asked if anyone has any questions for Ms. Doherty.

Mr. Craddock asked if they would review the questions afterwards.

Mr. Rieley stated that they would.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that he has some questions about the Design Planner's comments that may raise some broader issues.

Mr. Rieley asked the applicant to come forward to speak.

Jim Grigg, of Daggett and Grigg Architects, stated that they were working on the building designs for this project and also acting as the consultant on the site plan. Essentially, what the applicant was intending to do was to build an auto park on the property. His goal is to develop the facilities to sell cars for up to three different franchises potentially. The first phase of the project is proposed to be what is in your package, which he would call a 3-story structure or a building that has a basement and two levels of parking above it. He stated that the 3-level facility would operate on the ground level as 2 automobile dealerships, the mid-level would be storage and parking for inventory and the top level would also be a storage level for parking. If you look at the site plan, you realize that the site has about 60 feet of grade across it. The site is entered from Route 29 at elevation 400 and when you get up to the Doubletree parking lot at the top of Doubletree Lane, you would be at 460. There is a tremendous amount of topography across the site. In order to meet the needs of the applicant, they came up with this concept. This concept would allow them to intensely develop the site. The first building would provide about 30,000 square feet on the ground for two showrooms, service bays and all the normal support facilities that you have for a car dealership. There would be a level above the showroom where they would have more part storage and offices that are typical functions of a car dealership. This would double the height and space in the showroom and also double the height for the space for service bays. You would come into the site at grade 400 and enter the building at grade 410. The roof of that building is now at grade 432. About 22 feet up, you will come up the grade on a roadway and you can get onto the roof where there is storage parking for about 180 cars. He felt that almost all-180 cars would not be visible from the Entrance Corridor. If you go back and look at the site plan, you go on to the road system on the site, turn and go up parallel to Doubletree Lane and you get to grade 444, that becomes the third level of parking. The third level is actually at grade at the existing parking lot that is adjacent to it. It is also at the grade of all of the other parking lots that are around it. It is possible that some of that parking would be storage parking for one of the manufacturers which would be visible from Jim Price or that elevation on Route 29 when you are heading north. He submitted that location was fairly far away from it and by the time you figure out what you are looking at you will not even know that it is there anyway. He noted that it would not be terribly unattractive. The top level of the parking facility was about 100 feet wide in terms of depth and there is a tree line between the existing 60-foot parking lot and the rooftop or the third level of parking for storage. There will be a parapet wall around the entire parking level just as you would have for any parking facility. The site plan will provide parking for over 400 cars and they feel like 250 to 300 of them will not be visible from the Entrance Corridor which they feel is a heck of a feat for a car dealership. If you will look at where the building is sited, you will notice that it is as close to the road as you can reasonably make and still get customer parking and one row of display parking in front of it. They propose to relegate the vast majority of the parking for both the display and storage typical of a car dealership either to the roof or behind the building. They feel that will be positive. Phase one is the structured parking solution and then in phase two there will be a stand-alone dealership. At this point, they are not sure what it will be until the market study has been completed. There was one comment that the building should be closer to Route 29 than it was to further relegate parking behind it. They would

point out that what they were trying to do is to line up that building with the phase one building and don't think it would make sense to push it any farther south towards Route 29 because it would be an architecturally and unhappy solution to make it hard to figure out where you are on the site. He noted that all of the land is very expensive. Once the first building was developed eventually, there would be a building on that site. If that building were a car dealership, then the grade elevation for that dealership would be at grade 428. That building would have to have a double height space for showrooms and service functions. He pointed out that the parapet of that building will be 4 or 5 feet above the rooftop parking for the other one. Therefore, even if there is any concern about the proposed visibility of that storage parking on the rooftop of the large building, you simply will not be able to see it when the other building goes on the corner. The roof of that building will be substantially higher than that display parking. He felt it would be useful to the applicant and the process for the Commission to go through this list of questions. He primarily wanted to come before the Commission tonight because this was something just a little bit different and they have not seen this type of development in the County. He presented some colored boards for the Commission's review. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Thomas asked if he had a time frame for the second phase.

Mr. Grigg stated that they did not. One of the proposed manufactures would be doing a feasibility study this year and if the market will take their product, then maybe next year they would start construction.

Mr. Craddock stated that on one of the first plans there was a right in and right out onto Route 29. He asked why it was deleted.

Mr. Grigg stated that VDOT had a legitimate safety concern since they felt that when people came out there if they were trying to turn around and go back north that they would be working their way across the traffic while others would be trying to turn into Sam's and Wal-Mart. VDOT felt that there would be a criss-cross pattern that would be unsafe. VDOT thought that the in and out on Hilton Heights was all right. At that time the County staff stated that they did not concur with VDOT, but the applicant felt that it is needed for the customers.

Mr. Craddock asked if the in and out was about 30 feet from the traffic light. He pointed out that light really backs up for people turning into Wal-Mart. It would be dangerous if somebody blocked a lane or two right there.

Mr. Grigg stated that it certainly was not ideal and suggested that it might make sense to push it down the hill. He stated that there would be lots of times during the day that it would be convenient and to the extent that the traffic is thick, then you have another way to work your way up the hill to get back out onto Doubletree. He felt that two options were better than one in terms of letting the traffic filter back out into the road system.

Mr. Loewenstein asked if these elevations were the ones that the Design Planner has looked at.

Mr. Grigg stated that they were the same ones. One thing about the elevations was that they certainly were not final and they were confident that they could work with the ARB to revise or to develop the final elevations. What they characterize is the desire that the manufacturers will have to have icon entrances notwithstanding issues about color, which may or may not be appropriate in Albemarle County. The Chrysler Corporation all over the United States has a big half-circle arch that they like to use to mark the entrances of their front doors of their dealerships. Honda has a flat circle that they use at their dealerships. He asked if they could do something within the jargon of these dealerships with brick and pre-cast and other nice materials, but try to be respectful on some basis to what their goals would be.

Mr. Loewenstein asked if he had any comment on the remark from the staff report about concerns that the façade have more architectural elements that create a pedestrian feel on a more human scale.

Mr. Grigg stated that his opinion was that car dealerships have storefront systems that are 12 to 14 feet high that you use to create some type of entrance element to walk into. It could be a manufacturer icon entrance or it could be an omen present pediment that we see all over town or who knows what else. If the building had low roof elements over the services entrances and so forth, he was confident that the scale would be comfortable. More important was the fact that they have made it into two buildings rather than having one building that sets 300 feet long. They have two structures that are 140 feet long with a 20-foot slot of face between them that cuts back 35 feet. There are a wide variety of acceptable images that are workable. He noted that they would respectful to the guidelines in the Entrance Corridor and also try to work with the manufacturers.

Mr. Rieley stated that generally in going through the handout, he thought that was the best example of the kind of information that they ought to be getting at this level than anything that he has seen since he was on the Commission. He stated that it was a good example and showed the grades very clearly so that it was easy to make a relationship between the grades which was obviously very important for this. The elevations and the scale of the automobile are shown as well. He felt that this was a good model for that type of thing. He stated that the Commission asks people to look at structured parking to get automobiles into a more compact relationship, and this plan does exactly what they ask people to do so much of the time. He noted that he was enthusiastic about it with the way that it was banked into the hillside and meets grade on both sides with three-tiers for automobile storage. He felt that it was what they should be looking for. He noted that they always have to evaluate everything in the growth areas by the standard of the Neighborhood Model. They have acknowledged from the very beginning the issue of the Neighborhood Model and that there were certain things that get into that model better than others were. One of the things everybody often points to as a use that does not fit very well is an automobile dealership. It is just too big. It requires a lot of space for storage of automobiles. It seems that having buildings that have a reasonable scale to the roadway or to the other buildings that are in the area is more important than trying to shoehorn a pedestrian scale into something that does not really fit. He stated that he would rather have a good version of an automobile dealership than trying to make it look like something that it is not. He noted that he was really enthusiastic about this approach.

Mr. Loewenstein concurred with Mr. Rieley about the documentation of the staff report. Overall this project is very well done. It really does relate to many issues that the Commission has tried to grapple with for a long time. An automobile dealership is a use that is a difficult piece to fashion to work with other uses. He stated that an excellent job has been done with this. He stated that if this is done as they hope it will be , then this might become a model as a way that automobile dealerships here might look in the future. Overall, this is going to be a great improvement.

Mr. Rieley stated that it was a lot better than 20 acres of asphalt.

Mr. Thomas agreed with both of them. He felt that the use of the topography is great. He noted that the ARB was worried about the site.

Mr. Finley agreed with everything that has been said and was very impressed with the proposal.

Mr. Craddock stated that the parking lot made sense and that it also has a connection into the parking lot at Doubletree.

Mr. Rieley asked if they want to go through each of these questions in order to give as much feedback as they could.

Mr. Rieley stated that question number one was does the Planning Commission consider a parking structure an appropriate use in this location.

It was the consensus of the Commission that the parking structure was a good way to deal with this automobile dealership.

Mr. Rieley stated that question number two was does the Planning Commission agree with the Design Planner's comments. He noted that his answer was for some of them.

Mr. Loewenstein questioned in bullets 1 and 2 on page 4; the bullets appear to be self contradictory or mutually exclusive. He asked for an explanation.

Ms. Doherty pointed out that she was actually speaking to two different levels.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it was the mid-level and the top-level.

Ms. Doherty pointed out that it was best shown on the colored version.

Mr. Loewenstein asked if the next bullet means that the visibility is expected to be the greatest for the rooftop parking or just the general visibility of the structure itself.

Ms. Doherty stated that she thought it was visibility of the parked cars for the sales and display.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that he assumed that she felt it was a good thing because of the remarks that were made about redevelopment and reuse.

Ms. Doherty stated no because she did not have staff's comments about reuse and redevelopment. She noted that she was actually saying that the addition of the pole lights would increase the visibility, which is a negative thing. It will easily identify this area as a parking lot and increase the noticeability from a distance, which is all negative.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that his question about the last bullet was an applicable remark in this particular case.

Ms. Doherty stated what she thought was happening here was that the Design Planner is responding to her ARB application. She is forming her staff report for the ARB and responding back and forth between the applicant and herself. This is coming out of the blue for the Commission. She felt that the applicant was making the point that they are mitigating the visibility by putting in our standard landscaping. She is saying that the standard landscaping that we require in the parking lots on the ground is not going to mitigate the visibility of those cars parked up on top. In the last perspective they are showing the required landscaping on the top parking lot and she is also talking about that.

Mr. Thomas stated that the third bullet raised questions about where the visibility is expected to be the greatest. He noted that he had a question about the elevations. He asked what the elevation would be at Carrsbrook Drive and just north of it. He stated that was probably the highest point of the northbound lane.

Ms. Doherty stated that she did not know that. She pointed out that staff does not have a perspective from that.

Mr. Craddock stated that it was probably similar to Doubletree Road.

Mr. Thomas noted that that it seemed to be the worry of the ARB on the northbound lane to the stoplight.

Ms. Doherty stated that the main concern was that the full build out of the site from that hill looking down will be the phase two building, the surrounding parking and on top of this building such that most of the site may appear as parking. She noted that everything that they were doing was attempting to mitigate that.

Mr. Rieley noted that he was less enthusiastic about phase two than phase one because of that. Phase two was a much more conventional car dealership, yet it was limited somewhat by the scale of the site. One of Ms. Doherty's comments was a discussion about additional screening for the top level of the roof under relegated parking. The last sentence states that the structure should be enhanced with roof elements or roof landscaping to screen the top-level parking as much as possible. He felt that there were many ways to do that. It is very expensive to put plants on top of a rooftop. He wondered if something as simple as making the parapet wall 5 feet instead of 4 feet would do anything. He pointed out that this was something more in the ARB category. He hoped that the ARB would not target this with many little fixes when it is the big picture that matters. He preferred that it remains simple and not make it appear to be something that it was not. He stated that they had received comments on all of the Design Planner's comments. He asked if there were any other comments. He asked if the Planning Commission agrees with the Planning Department's recommendation to remove the right out onto Hilton Heights Road. He asked what VDOT's position was on that.

Ms. Doherty stated that VDOT and Engineering both recommend approval on the exit onto Hilton Heights as proposed.

Mr. Rieley asked if the Planning Commission has suggestions for the applicant as to the site design and the building elevation issues raised throughout this report. He pointed out that they already have given some of them. He asked if anybody wanted to add anything about that. He asked if they had any concerns that were not addressed in the staff report.

Ms. Doherty asked what their comment was on number 3.

Mr. Rieley stated that everybody was happy with the current proposal if it meets VDOT's and Engineering's standards. He stated that they have been through the list.

Mr. Benish clarified that the Commission indicated that there was a little bit more concern with the second phase of the development. He pointed out that the sales and display proposal of the request before you are for both sites and not just for phase one. He suggested that if the Commission had any comments about phase two, that it might be useful for them to address those issues tonight.

Ms. Doherty stated that for instance moving the building up one row of parking towards Route 29.

Mr. Rieley stated that it seemed that aligning the buildings makes sense. There is a lot of parking in front of phase two and it looks a lot more like a conventional automobile dealership and less like phase one. He felt that was too bad because phase one was so good. There is not quite as much slope to the land and it would be more difficult to do that kind of structure, but he would like to see more of that type of parking structure. This is what happens when it is not inside. It ends up with a great sea of parking on the outside. He stated that he wished that phase two could be made to look like phase one as much as possible. He thought a bigger version of that is what they would expect on the other side with a bunch of retaining walls lacking this approach.

Mr. Craddock asked if there would be a retaining wall behind phase one.

Mr. Rieley stated that he did not think so because it would meet right up to the grade so you would drive right in on grade to the rooftop.

Ms. Doherty stated that there was a retaining wall in phase two.

Mr. Craddock asked if the project would get any extra sediment traps for oil or gas since it was so close to the reservoir, or if it would just be the standard.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that actually this would not drain to the reservoir, but it would have to meet requirements along the surface area.

Ms. Doherty stated that there would be underground treatment.

Mr. Rieley stated that Engineering would look at that at the site plan level.

Mr. Grigg stated that when they get finished with the final site plan, the building was actually going to move 20 feet south or closer to town. He stated that they could not make that determination until they did some more preliminary work on the stand-alone dealership on the corner. Now they know that they can move it 20 feet, which would help the grade conditions a lot. The property was very steep. They will have a retaining wall as you come out of the building at the far north end, but it will not be any more than ten feet high. It will also lock the building into the site.

Mr. Rieley asked if the building itself was the retaining wall.

Mr. Grigg pointed out the location of the retaining walls would not be noticeable.

Ms. Doherty noted that the 20 feet likely eliminates the possibility of the little employee plaza. She felt that was a discrepancy between the two plans.

Mr. Grigg stated that they would be able to meet that need at another location on the site.

Ms. Doherty noted that on phase two there would be two rows of display parking and then a row of customer parking. There will be three rows of parking.

Mr. Grigg stated that they were trying to bring the 10-foot strip of green space into the site 50 feet, and every 120 feet it would have the effect of breaking up the parking.

Mr. Rieley suggested getting them closer together. He stated that it appeared that the impact of phase two would be greater than phase one. He stated that it was a good project.

In summary, the Planning Commission held a worksession on SP-02-46, Brown Auto Park (Outdoor Display of Vehicles), and SP-02-65, Brown Auto Park (Structured Parking). The Commission responded to some questions raised by staff, but did not take an official action. The Planning Commission will hear the requests on March 25th.

Community Facilities Plan - Discussion of Update of Community Facilities Plan. (David Benish)

Due to inclement weather, the Commission unanimously agreed to postpone the worksession on the Community Facilities Plan to next week.

Old Business

Mr. Rieley asked that the Commission bring their Committee membership listing up-to-date for 2003. He noted that one recent change was that he would replace Mr. Thomas on the CHART Committee.

Mr. Loewenstein asked that his name be spelled correctly.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of the Planning Commission's membership listing for 2003.

Mr. Craddock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (5:0). (Edgerton, Hopper – Absent)

New Business

Mr. Benish stated that on March 11th at 4:00 p.m. at City Hall that there was going to be a presentation on the MPO's study of Route 29/Hydraulic Road/Route 250. The City will provide dinner at about 5:15 p.m. He noted that the Commissioners would need to be back at the County at 6:00 p.m. for their regular meeting.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m. to the next meeting on March 4th.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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