Albemarle County Planning Commission
September 9, 2003

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, September 9, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Rodney Thomas; William Rieley, Chairman; William Finley; Pete Craddock; Bill Edgerton; Jared Loewenstein and Tracey Hopper, Vice-Chairman. Mr. Edgerton arrived at 6:10 p.m. Mr. Craddock arrived at 6:15 p.m.

Other officials present were David Benish, Chief of Planning & Community Development; Susan Thomas, Senior Planner; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner and Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney.

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.

Consent Agenda

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes - July 15, 2003.

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

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

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

Item Requesting Deferral:

ZMA 000-009 North Pointe PD-MC (Sign #97, 98, 99) - Request to rezone 269.4 acres in the Entrance Corridor (EC) zone from RA Rural Areas to PD-MC with special use to allow a mixture of commercial and residential uses with a maximum of 893 residential units, approximately 664,000 square feet of commercial and office space, a 250 room hotel, and approximately 177,000 square feet of public/semi-public uses. The proposed residential density allowed by this rezoning would be approximately 3.31 dwelling units per acre (gross). The property, described as Tax Map 32, Parcels 20, 20a, 20a1, 20a2, 20a3, 22h 22k, 23, 23a, 23b, 23c, 23d, 23e, 23 f, 23g, 23h, 23j and 29i is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District north of Proffit Road, east of Route 29 North, west of Pritchett Lane and south of the Rivanna River. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Regional Service, Office Service, Urban Density (6 - 34 dwelling units per acre) and Neighborhood Density (3 - 6 dwelling units per acre) in the Hollymead Community. (**APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO OCTOBER 14, 2003)**

AND

SP O2-072 North Pointe Residential Uses - Request for special use permit to allow residential uses in accordance with Section 25A.2.2.1 of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for residential uses in a PD-MC Planned Development Mixed Commercial zoning district. (Elaine Echols) **(APPLICANT REQUESTS DEFERRAL TO OCTOBER 14, 2003)**

Mr. Rieley opened the public hearing for ZMA-000-009 and SP-02-072 for North Pointe and asked if anybody would like to address the Commission on these two applications. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Commission. He pointed out that one motion would be sufficient.

Mr. Loewenstein moved to accept the applicant's request for deferral of SP-02-072 & ZMA-000-009, North Pointe to October 14, 2003.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Rieley stated that SP-02-072 and ZMA-000-009 were deferred to October 14, 2003.

SDP-98-110 Riverbend Deli & Bakery – Final Site Plan Extension Request - (Tax Map 078, Parcel 17D2)

Mr. Edgerton arrived at 6:10 p.m.

Mr. Rieley stated that Mr. Fritz has an item of new business to bring before the Commission.

Bill Fritz, Development Review Manager, stated that they had a project called Riverbend Deli and Bakery that was approved almost five years ago. The project was located in the Pantops Shopping Center on Riverbend Drive on the vacant parcel between Taco Bell and the bank. The project was approved for a 3,200 square foot retail building. The applicant is requesting a 30-day extension on the site plan since the site plan expires tomorrow. The applicant has made a good faith effort. In moving forward, the applicant has had some issues that have prevented him from getting his footings in place before tomorrow, which would vest the plan. The applicant has given staff a construction schedule, staff has talked with his builder, and he has posted the bonds. Therefore, staff has every reason to believe that it will be done within that time. There are no changes to the ordinance that staff can identify that would affect anything. The property is flat and the applicant has received Architectural Review Board approval. Staff can support the applicant's request for a 30-day extension.

Mr. Rieley asked if there was any prospect that this will need more than thirty days.

Mr. Fritz stated that from talking with the applicant, he did not anticipate the need for any further extension because the thirty days would be fine.

Mr. Thomas moved for approval of SDP-98-110, Riverbend Deli and Bakery, for the 30-day extension as requested.

Mr. Finley seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (6:0). (Craddock - Absent)

Work Session:

CPA 2003-04 Crozet Master Plan – Review and discuss the Crozet Master Plan. Elements to be addressed at this session include a discussion of the land use plan, specifically the Maps and Site Development Guidelines. (Susan Thomas)

Mr. Edgerton arrived at 6:15 p.m.

Ms. Thomas stated that the items for discussion tonight were the existing and new centers, which had been referred to in the past as the Land Use Plan component and also the development guidelines in Section 3 of the plan. She suggested that the Commission open the plan to page 46 and pull out the folded map on the right so that it was opposite the matrix on the left. She walked the Commission through this section to get the Commission's informational questions on the table. She asked that they take page 49 out of the book, which was the Master Matrix, and place it above the other matrix and the map in front of them for easy reference.

She recapped the process that led up to the production of this map. As a part of the existing condition analysis, which would be the characteristics of the land of Crozet as it exists today, the consultant started by mapping what they called the dendritic spine of Crozet. That included the Lickinghole Creek system and Moore's Creek. It included the tributaries, the steep slopes, the floodplain areas and all of those fingers that contribute to Lickinghole Creek as it flows towards the Lickinghole basin. The green colored area on the maps includes this area. Next, the floodplain areas and the steep slopes became incorporated with the Lickinghole system and that became the potential preservation area for some very good topographic and environmental reasons.

At the first community meeting the citizens were asked to identify on these base maps the built and the natural activity centers or the focal points of the community. There were eight groups of citizens that provided this information to the consultants. The consultants came back with the existing map of the center that shows the activity points. She pointed out that there were a lot of working maps that did not end up in the book. The consultants overlaid some ideas about new centers on this map and came up with the three alternatives (the Woven, the Banded and the Triangulated) for the framework plan. The banded in the middle emphasizes downtown. The public comments included keeping the downtown the heart of the community to make sure that it does not lose energy to the edges or other parts of the community and to keep the development away from the corridors as much as possible. Actually, the final proposed plan went much farther than the banded did because it really removed all of the development from Route 250 other than what is existing. The consultants worked from those three alternatives and went to the framework plan next. The framework plan looked more like the current process summary map. Although it is a very familiar map to the community and was very useful during the process, it does not really give us the specific guidance that you get from the Place Type map. That map goes into much more detail in terms of the recommendations that reference the Neighborhood Model. The consultants looked to the Neighborhood Model for guidance in a number of areas, but particularly in defining the place types. The Neighborhood Model uses the concepts of fringe or edge, general center and core as bands of intensity. Other terms include district (single use place/type), and CT (Crozet transect). The consultants expanded on the four zones in the Neighborhood Model and came up with more of a differentiated hierarchy that was better tailored to the variety in Crozet. The result was a hierarchy of place types. The hierarchy extends from the more rural kind of settlement, which they call a hamlet, to the mid-intensity neighborhood to the most intense. There are three purple areas that are intended to be employment districts. These employment districts include the existing ConAgra, the existing lumberyard and the area in the middle of the Old Trail development.

There is a concept in the plan called a Corridor, which was an area that already has a certain character. There is no way to make a neighborhood out of a corridor because it already has a very linear development pattern or there are other reasons for preserving the character of that area as it has already begun to develop. In the case of Corridor One, you have a very beautiful entry as you leave Route 250 and head north towards the heart of Crozet that was called an arboreal gateway or a green tunnel entrance into something that becomes increasingly more urban. When you reach downtown Crozet you are in a fully urban area. To the northeast you come in from Route 240 from Charlottesville, and right before you get to the ConAgra Plant the concept there is that you go through a very green lined kind of space until you reach the big buildings and the industrial type of development. That is another place type in the diagram. Each

place type, whether it is a hamlet, a neighborhood, or the one downtown, is further composed of a hierarchy of zones or areas whose functions flex depending on where they are. For instance, you could have a CT-3, which was an edge area that might function differently in a neighborhood than it would downtown. The master matrix attempts to add some detail to the rather simple matrix that is opposite the place type map.

Section 4 contains the appendixes. The second attachment is a chart called the Crozet Development Areas Statistics, which was intended as a guide for distributing commercial space including retail, residential units and institutions throughout the community. The idea is to try to achieve both the built-out population and the jobs with some of the supporting commercial that they want under mixed use in the Neighborhood Model. They might need to have some targets to aim at because often developers will come to us and ask how much do I have to do. This would give us some targets and the neighborhood numbers would correspond to this. Staff has discovered a couple of errors. Neighborhood number 3 should be Neighborhood 2, which would be ConAgra, Steve Runkle's development site. The other error was that the number 4 was left off the plan where Neighborhood 4 is shown.

Ms. Thomas discussed examples of how the matrix could be used. She discussed the framework plan describing the various neighborhoods and where they were located on the map. She said that there is a good explanation that prepares you for the guidelines starting on page 27, which was a summary of the master plan recommendations. In particular, on page 42 it orients you to what is going on and describes the various domes under hamlet, neighborhood and downtown along with corridor and the natural environment. She asked if there were any questions. She proposed taking a couple of properties and walking the Commission through the system and see what the map says about them.

Ms. Thomas used the Old Trail property belonging to Gaylon Beights as an example to show how the Place Type map would work on that property. Mr. Thomas asked if there was already access to Jarman Gap Road coming through that property from Route 250.

Ms. Thomas stated that the original farm had a couple of access points to Jarman Gap Road. She stated that her understanding was that this property has been purchased and the access was probably not going to follow one of the original farm roads. They purpose to build a new road. She pointed out that there were a lot of ways to get into that farm, but not all of them were usable for public roads.

Mr. Finley stated that staff had stated that the developer would come in and ask what he had to do. He asked if the developer would be able to look at the codes and ordinances and know what he would have to do.

Ms. Thomas stated that one of the good things about this plan was for the developer who, for instance, comes to staff and says, "Well what kind of form is acceptable or what would staff, the Planning Commission or the Board support?" There is a lot of material here, but what ultimately gets adopted for guidance depends on exactly how the Commission incorporates this material into the adopted plan. She noted that the Commission might propose to only adopt portions of this, but she felt that it would give someone a lot of guidance. This would give the private sector something to work with that could be helpful. The ordinance is another matter because staff is still making all kinds of regulatory fine tuning changes to the ordinance to implement the Neighborhood Model. That is kind of a parallel tract to make sure that we can do it.

Ms. Echols stated that the ordinances that staff is working on right now do not follow this pattern because what is shown in the Crozet Master Plan represents a new way of thinking. Staff is currently working on ordinance amendments to help development area by-right developments come into conformity with some of the principles of the Neighborhood Model. The amendments will be coming to the Commission soon. The Neighborhood Model-zoning district and the alley

ordinance changes have already been adopted. The new ones that are coming on board really modify our existing regulatory pattern. She pointed out that the Crozet master plan was very different in terms of land use and how it might be regulated.

Mr. Finley stated that on page 22 it talks about by-right development. He stated that he was trying to understand what they were saying there. It sounds like they are saying that they were going to establish some zoning and then they need their ordinances, codes and so forth. Then the developer, having all of this in hand, may by-right build and do what he is allowed to do without coming in for work sessions, meetings and so forth. He asked if that was what they mean.

Ms. Echols stated that the Consultants were setting up some different ways to implement this particular plan. One way to implement the plan for by right development would be to adopt zoning which reflects what is shown on the plan. The County would need to change its development standards so that what comes in by right would be in keeping with the Plan.

Mr. Finley asked at what point does land get zoned.

Ms. Echols pointed out that rezoning all of Crozet was one option and it was a decision that would have to be made a little bit later on because there are different ways to implement the plan. The different possibilities on how this plan could be implemented have been laid out in the implementation section.

Mr. Finley asked how different were the land uses now than when they began. He said that if he lived in Crozet it would be possible to have one land use today, but after this is all over to be in a different land use.

Ms. Thomas stated that she thought that was true. For instance, if you take Neighborhood 7, it was potentially a farm and was RA or R-1 zoning and the Consultants are showing what could be a start of a new neighborhood with the center there. Therefore, the property could be much more intensive, more of a mixed use or an urban form. More dense housing and possibly some multi-family could surround the property. She noted that the yellow at the outer edge would be single-family. She pointed out that it would certainly represent a change from what is there today. Typically under our current regulations or policies, the property owner has to come forward and initiate the rezoning. The County has rarely rezoned as a result of a Comp Plan amendment with the exception of 1980 when the current Zoning Ordinance was adopted and downzoned in the Rural Areas. Historically, staff has not initiated the zoning change, but it certainly was one option if they felt that it represented the way to go. Staff always wrestles with having a plan that is really creative and offers a lot of opportunity. But, if someone decides to do a by right R-1 subdivision on 30 acres in the middle of a proposed neighborhood on the plan, then the County won't get that proposed neighborhood because it will be a much more suburban style of development. She pointed out that we could probably lose a neighborhood or two and still maintain the spirit of the plan. But if over time large sections of undeveloped land converts to a pattern that reflects by-right zoning as it is now, then she felt that they would lose much of what they have created here because it was probably a much lower level of zoning.

Mr. Finley asked what was comprehensive zoning.

Mr. Benish stated that it refers to a rezoning action for a larger area. It would be like the County's 1980 comprehensive rezoning when they rezoned large segments of area consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as opposed to one individual application at a time. He felt that was what they were speaking about.

Ms. Echols stated that staff wanted to help the Commission become familiar with the conventions on these maps before getting into whether you like what you see. Once the Commission decided what they wanted to recommend, then they could get into what is the best way to implement it.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that the built infrastructure map's mustard colored lines were just to show that they wanted to achieve a grid road pattern. This was to reinforce the point that when something comes in that they want a street system that works to disperse traffic, is walkable and in general consistent with the map's form. She pointed out that these roads were not specific and might not be a good alignment at all. She pointed out that next week they would get into detail when they talked about implementation strategies and transportation.

Mr. Rieley stated that one of the things mentioned several times is that the level of intensity within this redesigned master plan of the urbanized Crozet area is now, according to this plan, less than what it currently is by-right.

Ms. Thomas stated it is not so much the level of intensity. If you went number by number by the population, then there might be less population taking out the southeast corner and adding that northern part. But, what the Consultants aimed for was the mid-point of the range that our current Comp Plan shows.

Mr. Rieley asked why that was so.

Ms. Thomas stated that what she said previously was not exactly accurate. What the Consultants did first of all was a by-right build out. In other words, if things developed at current zoning (at the middle or upper end) what population would that land accommodate. The figure was 12,225, which was close to the mid-point of the range that our Land Use Plan would give. She stated that partly one could say that figure was supported by what could happen by right and what our current plan aims for and that was a number that was used as a build out target. The plan does not show much of a reduction. Although she heard the consultants say that probably more population would be lost in the southern part proposed for exclusion than would be gained by incorporating the northern part, but she was not sure that she agreed with that. She stated that this area has not gotten a tremendous amount of attention because the whole boundary amendment issue sort of bubbled up about mid-point. The citizens seemed comfortable with it, but they did not dig into it as much as they did some other elements. She stated that she was not sure that it has been analyzed in total detail. The Consultants certainly looked at what the zoning is and what it could generate, but Ms. Thomas said she felt there was a lot of potential there.

Mr. Benish stated that there was a bit of a misconception on what we would actually achieve by right. He stated that usually what we achieve is at the lower end of the scale as opposed to reaching four dwelling units per acre, which was more of the mid-point. He said we would be lucky to get about 2 dwelling units per acre. That by-right calculation of the equivalency is a bit inflated on the by-right end because we would actually get a little bit less. He stated that in their general statements, in order to keep this simple, the Consultants have not really clarified that.

Mr. Rieley stated that was an interesting issue and the degree to which this plan can accommodate a range of densities was an important one and retain its integrity. It seems that most of the buildings in the red area are mostly three and four story buildings instead of one and two story buildings. It seems that could be done well and the fundamental integrity of this general strategy does not have to give way necessarily.

Ms. Thomas stated that it was interesting that when they reached the framework plan point, a certain group in the community came forward and really wanted a redevelopment plan for downtown. Staff pointed out that they were going to pay attention to all of downtown, but the initial focus was what was technically inside the development area. Staff quickly realized that was not the way that the community looks at it since they look at downtown as a whole. Once the

consultants found out how important downtown was they really got with it and stressed strongly how key the library project was for that downtown block. It is not just getting the library there. It is demonstrating that the County is making a commitment to the downtown and in its form creating a more urban place, which will encourage others to do the same. She thought that it was a wise choice and one that the community was very interested in.

Ms. Echols stated that she wanted to add some points to what Ms. Thomas was talking about in terms of what the plan shows and what you were talking about in terms of density. One of the things that the Neighborhood Model was striving to do was to provide a higher quality place where people wanted to live in a more dense area or more intensively developed than the suburbs. The consultants pointed out that the way that you make it happen is to make sure that what people see from where they live are some natural areas, some green space or those things that make them feel less crowded. The neighborhoods, especially with the stream valleys going through them, establish places that are unique and sort of contained so that people can actually see nearby something that is open. The openness gives them at least visual access to the things that they value most in a rural kind of setting. To the extent that we can get more density towards the core of the neighborhoods, we could probably accomplish what we are looking for in terms of having the development areas be those places where we want to have development occur.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that greenways along the roads entering Crozet to the downtown area add a lot to this area. Some of the rural roads may never have sidewalks, but the staff wanted to provide them in the appropriate places so that people going downtown would have several alternatives to getting there.

Mr. Rieley stated that one could make the case that the best way to enhance the quality of the development is to design carefully and well and densely in those areas that will be populated and to preserve very rigorously those areas that are the network that knits it together. He stated that he wanted to play devil's advocate. If we look at this not from the perspective of Crozet, since this was a very internal process to Crozet, but from the perspective of everybody else that pays taxes in the County, this pattern that they think is superior and very defensible is also more expensive. It brings with it enormous demands for infrastructure that they don't have any means to pay for right now. So it is a big bite. He stated that he was trying to figure out what the argument is when someone asks what the tradeoff is. It is great for Crozet to get this entire infrastructure and to get their same level of development reordered into a pattern that is better for everybody. But if this is being paid for by people all across the County and the density ends up being the same, where is the equity in that.

Ms. Thomas stated that they could measure the rate of residential development in Crozet versus its surrounding rural area as a benchmark. She pointed out that she understood his point. If more development were flowing to Crozet this would be more attractive. She noted that it would not flow without the supporting infrastructure.

Mr. Rieley stated that if the funding is going to follow the planning, there is going to have to be a strong justification for it that making Crozet wonderful in and of itself may not be enough.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that was a very accurate statement and he worried that even if there is something more than that then some of this money is going to have to come from outside the community as well. When you talk about transportation infrastructure, you have implementation and some of that implementation is actually beyond our control like the budget of the Commonwealth to assist in these things. He pointed out that he was really concerned about having a really great idea and not being able to pay for it. He stated that he liked what he saw in front of him, but was worried about their economic ability to bring it all off.

Ms. Echols pointed out that some of these things shown on the Plan, the County was going to have to do anyway, regardless of the by right development or the new form. She felt that several

of the capital projects have been in the works for many years such as the Lickinghole crossing and the Rt. 240/Rt. 250 connector. Whether the County adopts a new plan, the old plan or just by right development, the 240-250 Connector has already been anticipated and it costs a pretty big chunk of money. Staff has not totally programmed the full construction costs into the CIP, but they have certainly been anticipating it. In some ways you have to look at what the County would have to be doing regardless of the form because some of the infrastructure that has not been built yet is still is essential for the community.

Mr. Loewenstein pointed out that is true if the County can pay for it.

Mr. Benish stated that right now the 240-250 Connector was a project that was assumed to be a public cost. Overall, the eastern avenue would be a public/private shared project in the sense that major developments would essentially build significant portions of it within their development. The crossing of Lickinghole Creek, as an example, has been in the CIP for about three years with the request for designing it at about one-half million dollars. We want to have the project designed so that when other segments of that roadway are constructed, we can make the connection over Lickinghole. This year staff is making the request for construction funds, which is a logical progression of this CIP. There isn't significant funding yet for the project to be fully funded. For example, there is $100,000 of the $500,000 requested for the design work that is in the CIP as of right now. The Board will need to augment that money for that one project in the CIP if we want the design to progress.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that the library has practically accrued full funding in the CIP.

Mr. Benish stated that it depends on how specifically you go through this. There are greenway projects, a half dozen capital projects related to parks that are in the Crozet area and five million in '05/06 that as the CIP moves forward that funding is planned to be available for the park. You have to understand that the Board only adopts the budget of the CIP in one year and they approve a plan that assumes that funding as they reach that budget year.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that he was mainly concerned with the road network, which was where they would really come up against major problems.

Mr. Benish stated that there was not significant commitment to the construction, but there was a commitment for planning and design work to essentially have a plan on the shelf to assist and facilitate with the construction with development projects, but that is insufficient too. They are trying to identify as they work through this plan and the CIP process what monies will it take to implement this plan. Again, this is one-tenth of the same effort that we should be doing for all of our development areas. You need to keep in mind that this is a micro picture and they have just started breaking it down one by one. This plan does not overly intensify the development that can be accommodated under the Comprehensive Plan mid-point assuming a by-right style of development. But in fact the character of the development does support additional densities. What it takes to do the form that we want County wide is going to make us have the same questions to ask for the same program that they have to put forth for all of their development areas. What they were really talking about was implementing the Development Area Plan, which was to try to get as much development that they could in the development areas.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that it was important from the public's perspective to have an understanding of what is trying to be accomplished and how the economic aspects of it add up.

Mr. Benish stated that you have to break it down that this is one-tenths of our development area and a commitment has to be made to all of our development areas.

Ms. Thomas asked the Commission to turn to page 15. They asked the consultants to move this strategies for development up because they felt that a lot of people would be interested in that.

There is a list provided. The first part is what is already programmed in the CIP. The second one is what is not in the CIP, but would probably involve public funding. She pointed out that some of that might get some private contributions depending on what happens. The third one is sort of a blend. She noted that the consultants might be a little more optimistic than staff about what we could get, but they are probably right that there will be opportunities for contributions. That is one reason why not to rezone because you have the opportunity to get some contributions from private developers.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that some funding could come from proffers.

Mr. Benish stated that staff's intent would be to try to implement the plan through the CIP based on the recommendations of the resulting plan that they adopt. He discussed the specifics of the CIP process.

Mr. Edgerton stated that they need to work on incentives for the development community to buy into this master plan. He hoped that they could come up with some kind of collaboration with the development community. He suggested that the Commission prioritize these areas as to their importance.

Ms. Thomas stated that they have no assurance that the developer wants to do this.

Mr. Edgerton stated that it would take a lot of courage for a developer to develop a site without a lot of the pieces in place. Therefore, if they gave the developer some reasons to be brave, then they might find someone more sympathetic to the plan.

Ms. Thomas stated that there would be a work session next week on The Meadows. They were coming in to amend their existing zoning to allow more units. Under this plan they are shown as CT-4 when you step back from the gateway. They are in a corridor and not a hamlet. She discussed the matrix and how it would have helped her work with the developer on the type of development they were looking for.

Mr. Rieley asked how generally you could adopt the graphics part of the packet and still have the textual part of this matrix be a useful tool to help you get what you really want to get. It was not making something look exactly like a plan that was not done at that level anyway, but to get the overall pattern that would work well.

Ms. Echols stated that part of the answer to his question depends on what the Commission would recommend for adoption in terms of the map. She pointed out that the Commission was not talking about the specific land uses tonight. It was possible that the Commission might recommend that there be changes to that map that are perhaps less specific or perhaps show things a little bit differently than what is on there right now. That may be one way to deal with having the potential problem of locking people in to something without providing a lot of opportunities. Another thing that has to be considered is the size of the project that comes in for review. If they were to get all of the Old Trail development at one time or all of the development along Eastern Avenue at one time, that would be a different type of review and relationship to this matrix than if you just got The Meadows to come in. Staff hopes that there will be tremendous flexibility with this map so that as long as the basic concepts are provided with a development, the major road networks are retained along with the idea of the centers, then the plan could flex some. But if the Commission has issues with the way that the centers are shown on the plan, then that is worthy of a discussion.

Ms. Thomas stated that everything was in play. She said she was trying to help the Commission understand how it works tonight before they potentially change it. She stated that there were some controversial connections shown through some existing neighborhoods. She noted that it was difficult to try to make connections in an area that was already developed. She stated that

the road grid pattern was just to indicate that they wanted a good connective system when these properties come in. She pointed out that the bridge and library were the two things that the public felt were really important.

Mr. Benish stated that staff would be working to augment the monies needed through the CIP, but that the master plan needs to be moved forward for adoption.

Mr. Edgerton asked if the adjustment of the growth area have to include the northern part. He asked if that would have to be done as a separate action before this can be adopted.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that issue came up at the last work session. Staff wants to get a little more direction on that. The next work session is on September 30th and that was something that they could bring back to them if the Commission wanted them to. She pointed out that if the boundary adjustment were done prior to the adoption of the master plan it would be much easier to program the funding that needs to happen right now. She stated that they had things going into Parrot Creek and Beaver Creek Reservoir that are less than ideal simply because it has really not been addressed, but it still has all of the run-off issues that any area would. It would also allow them to do a better job of the downtown redevelopment because one-half of it is on the north side of the tracks. She pointed out that County policy was to direct public money to the designated development areas.

Mr. Rieley asked if there was any reason why not to move on the boundary adjustment issue.

Mr. Benish stated that if it was the general consensus of the Commission, then the resolution of intent could be forwarded to the Board.

After discussing the issues, it was the consensus of the Commission to have staff draft a resolution of intent to consider adjusting the boundaries and to bring it back for review on September 30th.

Mr. Benish stated that the next work session would be on September 30th and staff would provide that information to the Commission.

In summary:

Staff pointed out the key points/major themes that came out throughout the process include the following:

- Reinforce the idea of Crozet as a series of existing and proposed centers.
- Honor existing downtown as Crozet's principal center.
- Make all (many) roads (and paths) lead to downtown.
- Honor existing natural systems.
- Encourage interconnectivity and walkability.
- Make neighborhoods walkable, compact, with the potential for mixed uses and diverse housing types.
- Identify places for new public facilities.
- Identify multiple employment centers.

- Honor the history of Crozet.

- Maintain rural/parkway character of eastern portion of 240 and 250.

Staff reviewed the following elements: an overview of the Master Plan review process, the general organization and format of the Plan, public process summary used to develop the Plan, guiding principles and major themes, open space/preservation area network as a connected landscape (Green Infrastructure Map), and fringe areas (Process Summary, Place Type Maps).

During this work session, the Planning Commission reviewed and discussed CPA-2003-04, Crozet Master Plan. The elements addressed by staff at this session included a discussion of the land use plan, specifically the Maps and Site Development Guidelines and the key points or major themes that emerged from the Master Plan process. The Commission held a discussion on the issues, but took no formal action. The Commission discussed possible adjustments to the development area boundaries of Crozet prior to the adoption of the masterplan, and asked staff to draft a resolution of intent for consideration. The next work session will be held on September 30th.

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. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m. to the next meeting on September 16, 2003.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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