Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 13, 2003

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, May 13, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Rodney Thomas; Pete Craddock; Bill Edgerton; William Rieley, Chairman; Tracey Hopper, Vice-Chairperson; Jared Loewenstein and William Finley.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development; and Tarpley Gillespie, Senior Planner. Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney, was absent.

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 - May 7, 2003

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken on May 7 by the Board of Supervisors. He pointed out that a presentation on the Crozet Masterplan final product would occur on Wednesday, July 9 at 3:30 p.m. in a joint session of the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission.

Consent Agenda

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes – April 15, 2003.

Mr. Thomas moved to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (7:0).

Work Session

ZMA-01-15 Martha Jefferson Hospital at Peter Jefferson Place - Request to rezone 106.92 acres from CO, Commercial Office to PD-MC, Planned Development-Mixed Commercial to allow for the Martha Jefferson Hospital and associated uses. The property, described as Tax Map 78, Parcels 20B, 20C, 20M, 31, 32, 71 and 71A is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Rt. 1118 (Peter Jefferson Parkway), approximately a half mile from the intersection of Route 250 West and Peter Jefferson Parkway. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Office/Regional Service in Pantops. (Tarpley Gillespie)

And

SP-01-56 Martha Jefferson Hospital at Peter Jefferson Place - Request for a special use permit to allow a hospital in accordance with Section 23.2.2.1 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for hospitals. The property, described as Tax Map 78, Parcels 20M, 71, and 71A is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Rt. 1118, (Peter Jefferson Parkway), and approximately a half-mile from the intersection of Route 250 West and Peter Jefferson Parkway. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Office/Regional Service in Pantops. (Tarpley Gillespie).

AND

SP-01-57 Martha Jefferson Hospital at Peter Jefferson Place – Request for a special use permit to allow a parking structure in accordance with Section 23.2.2.4 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for a parking structure located partly or wholly above grade. The property, described as Tax Map 78, Parcels 20M, 71, and 71A is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District on Rt. 1118 (Peter Jefferson Parkway), approximately a half mile from the intersection of Route 250 West and Peter Jefferson Parkway. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Office/Regional Service in Pantops. (Tarpley Gillespie)

Ms. Gillespie summarized the staff report, which covered all three applications. The Martha Jefferson Health Services Corporation has proposed a hospital and associated medical offices as part of a medical campus at Peter Jefferson Place. The proposal was initially submitted in October 2001, and a work session was held with the Planning Commission on March 26, 2001. The original staff concerns from that March 26th submittal were primarily concerned about the visual impacts, respect for the terrain, protection of open space resources, design of the central lineal park and the relationship of the supporting commercial uses to the hospital uses. The Planning Commission's concerns at that initial review revolved primarily around visibility, scale and the massing of the hospital, and the identification of protection of open space resources. The applicant's have totally redesigned the site in an attempt to address the previous concerns. The proposal will require the rezoning of 107-acre portion of Peter Jefferson Place from CO; Commercial Office to PD-MC with a proffered plan as well as two special use permits. One special use permit would be for the use of a hospital and the other for the structured parking. The applicant has requested this work session in order to receive Planning Commission guidance on the new direction and to identify any concerns prior to a public hearing. Staff has analyzed the project in relation to the previous issues that were identified with the Comprehensive Plan, the Neighborhood Model and in relation to the traffic and transportation. The Planning Commission is asked to provide guidance to the staff and the applicant on several essential issues related to these requests.

1. Should the applicant create a clearly defined urban boundary between the campus and the development area?

The applicant has chosen to maintain a campus-like landscaped character to the property. While staff ideally would prefer to see buildings oriented to and framing State Farm Boulevard, staff is willing to accept the proposal to maintain the campus style setting previously approved for Peter Jefferson Place. As an alternative, staff suggests that a low urban wall (stone or brick) may help to define the edge of the urban neighborhood and campus hospital setting. She asked how important this issue was to the Planning Commission. She asked if the edge treatment was a reasonable compromise.

2. Has the applicant adequately minimized the visual impacts by utilizing the existing grades on this site? Is their proposal a reasonable solution given their unique programmatic needs?

Much of the previous review focused on the visibility of the hospital. Visibility concerns are driven with the design of the sites. Improvements have been made in relation to visibility. The structure has been relocated into the hillside and the building mass has been broken into several planes. The Community Park has been sited to provide visual relief beyond the hospital. Overall, staff is very positive about the progress that has been made. Staff notes that a significant amount of fill is proposed in order to site the hospital where it is located on the plan. Staff questions whether the front wing of the hospital could be further recessed into the hillside which would further reduce the visibility. The applicants have explained that for internal circulation between each of the wings, since each wing must relate to the other, that additionally burying the hospital would eliminate windows for the patients beds on the front portion of the hospital. For those reasons, they feel that they have gone as far as they reasonably can. She asked if their proposal was reasonable solution given their unique problematic needs as a hospital.

3. Should the applicant provide phasing information for review as a part of this rezoning application?

The third question relates to the phasing of the proposal. This project is unique in that it has a 50 – 100 year build out period. The applicants are seeking flexibility in their implementation and phasing. Staff is unclear as to how each phase will stand-alone and address the issues raised during the rezoning process. Staff believes that a phasing plan to establish dates is important to this review. She asked if the Planning Commission agrees with staff that specific phasing information is important to the review and do you request that the applicant provide more detailed phasing information for the next review.

4. Regarding traffic and transportation, should the applicant make specific commitments to implement their Transportation Demand Management Plan as a part of this rezoning request?

The final question relates to traffic and transportation and specifically to their proposed Transportation Demand Management Plan. At this point, staff is still working with the applicant to identify possible solutions to the traffic impacts of the proposal. As part of their traffic study, they provided a Transportation Demand Management Plan, which proposes an 8 percent reduction in vehicle trips by promoting alternative modes of transportation. However, their study did not include any sort of implementation tools to ensure that 8 percent happens. Staff is currently working with the applicant along with VDOT, Rideshare and CTS to identify specific pools that could be used to implement the TDM. At this time it is unclear as to whether transit to the site will be provide by 2011. Therefore, that is going to be real key issue to implementing this plan. She asked if the Planning Commission agrees that the applicant should make specific commitments to implement their TDM. Finally, if there are any other questions or concerns, she asked that the Commission raise them tonight.

Ms. Hopper asked regarding the urban wall, if there would be enough room to allow construction on State Farm Boulevard.

Ms. Gillespie stated that the concept of the urban wall was to build a 2-foot high brick or stone wall to define the edge of the campus. She noted that an example was at University Corner where one side of the street had urban buildings and the other side of the street was a campus with a low stone wall.

Jim Haden, President of Martha Jefferson Hospital, stated that he had brought a team of individuals tonight to have a discussion with the Planning Commission tonight about their proposal. He pointed out that since their previous meeting a year ago, they have addressed a lot of the concerns and issues. He stated that the other persons included Ron Cottrell, Director Of Planning for Martha Jefferson Hospital; Bob Hughes, Landscape Planner from Atlanta; Andrew Dracopoli, representative with Worrell Investments; Valerie Long, from McGuire, Woods, Battle & Boothe; and Michael Matthews, of Matthews Development Company, Inc. for Real Estate Development Consulting Project Management. He stated that they would love to do a wall since it sounds like a wonderful idea.

Ron Cottrell presented a power point presentation as a means of explaining why Martha Jefferson needs to move and why Peter Jefferson Place is a great location for a community hospital. He presented the history of the site and the revised master plan.

Mr. Rieley thanked the applicants for a good presentation that had a level of specificity of which they could respond to. He thanked the applicants for all of their hard and thoughtful work that went into that. He asked for response from the Commissioners on each of the questions. The

first question was should the applicant create a clearly defined urban boundary between the campus and the development area and should the building sites orient or inframe State Farm Boulevard.

Mr. Thomas agreed that it does not have the aspects of the Neighborhood Model in it, but he agreed that the wall or the campus setting would be appropriate for this type of development.

Ms. Hopper concurred with Mr. Thomas. She agreed that there should be some sensitivity to State Farm Boulevard when they consider the building facades because there is no back. She noted that Staunton's parking decks were beautiful.

Mr. Loewenstein concurred as well that the idea of a low wall was an excellent one. He preferred the maintenance of a campus style setting. He noted that it provided a real amenity that could be enjoyed not only by the actual users of the facility but by the public as well. He stated that it was a nice location to have some open space of that kind.

Mr. Craddock concurred as well. He noted that one of the big things in this whole project was to have Martha Jefferson retain the uniqueness that it has presented on Locust Avenue as opposed to a big institutional hospital located in the city. He pointed out that he liked the campus setting, the wall, and the walkability aspects of it in a campus like setting.

Mr. Finley agreed with everyone, and pointed out that this was an ideal fit in the hospital facing the Community Park.

Mr. Rieley stated that he had one observation between the old plan and the new masterplan, in that it appears that the hospital site has been developed extraordinary and thoughtfully, but it made him look more critically at the fringe areas that are a part of the overall masterplan. There actually have been some changes in that as well that goes beyond the area designated for the hospital. He suggested that they keep looking at these fringe areas for further review if they continue changing.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that the request only covers part of the area since the whole plan is not going for a rezoning or a change.

Mr. Rieley stated that the next question was should the applicant provide phasing as part of the review for the rezoning application.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that the applicant should provide phasing as part of the rezoning review on a macro scale. He pointed out that to nail down the phasing schedule in a highly precise way would be difficult because of the tremendous changes that go on continually in the health care industry.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that the applicant has indicated that they are willing to take a stab at the phasing plan. At the very least, it would make sense to have an understanding of a target phasing. He suggested that when things occur down the road that would make those targets unrealistic that maybe they could come back and revise the targets. He agreed that the phasing should be done on a macro scale since the applicant could not be specific at this point.

Mr. Finley stated that he agreed with Mr. Loewenstein's statement that a general phasing plan should be provided. He questioned why the applicant should be required to come back in the future to update the phasing plan.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he made that suggestion in hopes that the applicant would continue to have an open dialogue with the community about what is happening.

The Planning Commission discussed and responded to the questions raised by staff to provide guidance on several key issues related to the newly revised application plan for the Martha Jefferson Hospital at Peter Jefferson Place. The Planning Commission took no formal action. In summary, the Planning Commission applauded the applicant's response to their prior comments and suggestions and responded favorable to all of staff's questions.

Mike Merriam, Director of Facilities Planning and Construction of the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, stated that the applicants have worked very cooperatively with them for years to address the concerns about this huge development. He noted that they were happy with the progress that they have made on this site development and in particular the development of the linear park. He asked that the development be as sensitive as it could be to the visibility from Monticello while maintaining its usefulness and purpose for which it is being developed. He asked that the vista and viewshed from Monticello be protected.

Old Business

Mr. Rieley asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Rieley asked if there was any new business.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that there would be a meeting on Thursday, May 22 of the Proffit Community Association at the Evergreen Baptist Church concerning the truck traffic on Proffit Road. He asked staff to investigate the Board of Supervisor's prior action on whether the restriction on the truck traffic was by the number of axles or the weight of the vehicle.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m. to the next meeting on May 20, 2003.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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