Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 21, 2003

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, October 21, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Room # 241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Rodney Thomas, Vice-Chairman; Bill Edgerton; William Rieley, Chairman; William Finley and Jared Loewenstein. Absent was Pete Craddock. Mr. Finley arrived at 6:20 p.m.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning & Community Development; Susan Thomas, Senior Planner; and Greg Kamptner, Assistant County Attorney.

Call to Order And Establish Quorum

Mr. Rieley called the meeting to order at 6:08 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

SDP-2003-189 Broadway Court Final Plat Private Road Request – Request, pursuant to Section 14-232 (A, 2) of the Subdivision Ordinance, for authorization to use a proposed travelway as a private road to serve 4 lots. (Tax Map 077, Parcel 40C2) (Francis MacCall)

SDP-2003-072 ACAC Four Seasons Gym Major Critical Slopes Waiver – Request, pursuant to Section 4.2.5.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for the disturbance of critical slope. (Tax Maps 061X(1) & 061X(2), Parcels 4A & 4B) (Francis MacCall)

Mr. Rieley asked if any Commissioner would like to pull any of the items off of the consent agenda for discussion. There being none, he asked for a motion.

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

Mr. Edgerton seconded the motion.

Mr. Rieley established that a quorum was present.

The motion carried by a vote of (4:0). (Finley, Craddock – Absent)

Public Hearing Items:

ZMA-03-05 The Meadows Expansion Amendment (Sign #94) - Request to rezone 26.843 acres from PRD, Planned Residential Development to PRD, Planned Residential Development to allow the addition of 40 new dwelling units at The Meadows residential community. The property, described as Tax Map 56, Parcels 14C and 14C1, is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on Rt. 240 (Crozet Avenue), approximately 1/4 mile north of the intersection of Crozet Avenue and the Rt. 250 West (Rockfish Gap Turnpike). The 1996 Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Plan designates this property as Neighborhood Density Residential [3.01 - 6 DU/acre) in the Community of Crozet. (Susan Thomas***) DEFERRED FROM THE SEPTEMBER 30, 2003 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING. APPLICANT REQUESTS INDEFINITE DEFERRAL.***

Mr. Edgerton moved for acceptance of the applicant's request for an indefinite deferral for ZMA-03-05, The Meadows Expansion Amendment.

Mr. Thomas seconded the motion.

The motion carried by a vote of (4:0). (Finley, Craddock – Absent)

Mr. Rieley stated that ZMA-03-05 was granted an indefinite deferral.

Work Sessions:

Final Informational Work Session on Crozet Master Plan (Susan Thomas)

Ms. Thomas stated that this was the fourth and final "informational" work session on the Crozet Master Plan. She noted that the Commission's future sessions would follow a facilitated format, in which the Commissions' specific comments and suggested revisions to the plan would be discussed and considered. She pointed out that the facilitated sessions would focus on modifying Section One or the Crozet Community Guide, which was a mini version of the entire master plan. She noted that one approach was that the rest of the document could be referenced in the Comp Plan with a lot of the detail not officially being made part of the Comp Plan, but only there as reference material for those who are interested. She suggested that this would be a very good starting point for looking at language that might be adopted directly in to the Comp Plan as an alternative to using the entire document. The entire document is lengthy and has a different style to what is in the current Comp Plan. Staff will provide additions, revisions or changes that might be appropriate in the first chapter to the Commission. One suggestion was the addition of the road template, which they talked about at the last section that included the maps and the matrixes. Staff will provide some recommendations for the Commission to think about.

Mr. Loewenstein questioned how much to put in as Comp Plan language itself and how much to leave out since it would have a profound impact on how this would develop and whether it would develop successfully. He stated that this issue could be one of the biggest decisions that they have to make.

Ms. Thomas noted that the style of this document was a little bit different. She stated that the Community Guide sort of encapsulates what you find in the rest of the plan. She stated that Chapter One needs to be condensed because it was a little redundant.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that it depends on what degree of specificity that you want in the Comp Plan. He felt that was a pretty significant topic for thought and discussion as they go through this looking towards the ultimate product at public hearing. He suggested that the Commission be very careful in making this decision.

Mr. Rieley agreed that it was an important decision if they elect to concentrate on the Community Guide as the insert into the Comp Plan. He stated that in reference to what is left, it means that the Commission needs to look very carefully at that section to make sure that it includes the things that we think are important. He admitted that strategy has a great appeal to him because his uneasiness with this as a Comp Plan document has to do with that level of specificity. Also, a lot of the concern in the community that he has heard focuses around the degree to which this proposal was adopted as a specific document rather than as a general guide.

Mr. Loewenstein stated that they could conceivably choose to relanguage some of this if there were any things that they wanted to get in here beyond what is in the community portion. He suggested that this should not necessarily go to the level of specificity that some of this takes in the Comp Plan and was unsure of how he felt about the Community Guide.

Ms. Thomas stated that there was some design elements in the plan that the Commission would definitely have to decide how they feel about them. There is only one map and it is the historical

map of the plan. There is an awful lot that would have to be brought forward, but it probably would not be the narrative as much as the design element.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that staff would provide suggestions of things that are in the document that need to be part of a Comp Plan Amendment. The Commission could decide their comfort level then.

Ms. Thomas stated that staff will provide that information to the Commission, but suggested that the Commission study the current Community Guide. Staff will provide the suggested modifications to the Commission the previous week to the meeting. Staff suggests November 11th, November 18th and then December 9th as the potential public hearing date. She noted that they would not be sure if they would be ready for the public hearing on December 9th. The revised Community Guide would be available on November 4, but would be based on what the Commission already has.

Mr. Thomas asked that the work session be separated from the meeting if they had a full agenda.

Mr. Edgerton stated that the facilitated session would have more meaning if it were held separate from the regular meeting.

Mr. Loewenstein agreed.

Mr. Finley arrived at the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Ms. Thomas stated that the second item concerned the resolution of intent that the Commission adopted September 30th to consider the amendment of the boundaries of the development area. That requires conversation, public testimony, public hearings and all of that. There is room on the November 11th meeting, not at 4:00 p.m., but under a regular time slot. Depending on how the Commission feels about it, staff would prepare a staff report, which they would receive the previous week, dealing with analyzing and weighing some of the factors involved in taking out the southeastern quadrant of the development area and adding in what has historically been the old downtown. There are various reasons such as redevelopment, watershed protection, etc. Staff asked if the Commission feels that could be accomplished on November 11th.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was unknown concern or resistance from the community on this. He pointed out that the Commission has not heard much about this.

Ms. Thomas stated that this issue arose out of the community's feeling that not enough attention has been paid to integrating all the parts of what people feel is downtown. It came a little late and staff received some criticism about sort of overlooking the downtown area. Then when the consultants began to fully look at the fringe area, which was to the north, they found that there was a lot of area that staff thinks of as being downtown Crozet. At that time they began to see the reasons for adding that area in to the area. At the same time or perhaps earlier, Warren Byrd's team identified a lot of constraints dealing with the southeastern quadrant. She stated that she would never say that there wouldn't be those who object, but she felt that from a participant's general standpoint that this was a well-received recommendation.

Mr. Edgerton asked about the owners of the land that would be taken out of the growth area.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that she had heard from two people, with one person being very positive about it and the other person was interested in a development potential for the southeastern quadrant. There are definitely different opinions. There is another landowner on the western edge on the part that would be removed who has historically wanted to be out of the development area and has expressed that sentiment on a number of occasions.

Mr. Edgerton asked if this item was put on the November 11th meeting if there was adequate time for the meeting to be advertised and to notify the public.

Ms. Thomas stated that it would. She pointed out that the current development area line was at the dam for Lickinghole Creek.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the advertisements would have to be done for the next two Mondays if the hearing was held on November 11th. He asked Mr. Kamptner if the amendment has to be completed when they advertise the hearing.

Mr. Kamptner stated that they would have to have a draft that was available for public review. It could be revised as they go through the days leading up to the hearing. Those revisions need to be available for the public to review.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that they would shoot for the 11th of November. If staff runs into problems, then the hearing could be held after the 11th. He asked if the Commission was interested in going ahead and getting this done as soon as possible.

Mr. Rieley and Mr. Edgerton both felt that was reasonable.

Ms. Thomas stated that staff would aim for November 11th and take care of the publicity. She pointed out that the resolution of intent was worded that this was for purposes of modifying the boundary only and not necessarily for the land use recommendation component. Because you have not fully vetted and weighed in on the plan and the map, etc. and the colors on the map and the area need to be added, for instance, might not be right now what you will ultimately want them to be. Therefore, if and when you modify that boundary what staff would talk about was how that area would operate. That area was pretty much a developed area, but not entirely. She pointed out that people could always develop under existing zoning. It would be in the area of rezoning or special use permits if they happen to come in during that little window of time when the Commission has not yet made a recommendation and the Board has not acted on the final colors on the map. The Commission might not take action because it would be imminent that the plan was going to either be adopted as is changed, etc. She stated that the ConAgra area did not get as much attention as some other areas in the community. The owner of ConAgra at that point was still trying to lease it as a food processing facility. She pointed out that was the intention of the owner for the freezer building on the north side of Route 240. Staff contacted his representative a number of times and told them that they would love to wrap them into this process and asked if there was a way that they would like to participate with them. They had a couple of cordial meetings but they did not have the level of involvement with that owner that they had from others. The plan acknowledged what is there. At a future date if and when that ConAgra area redevelops there will probably be the need to go through sort of a mini planning process or a process that involves some community participation where staff goes out to do a detailed plan. She felt that staff could do that hand in hand with the applicant if they were ready to make some changes.

Mr. Rieley stated that moving the line was probably something that could happen fairly quickly, but beyond that the specific land uses that get applied within that is something that they could wrestle with.

Ms. Thomas stated that with so much of the area already developed, they probably would not make a lot of huge changes to the residential neighborhoods. The final item on the cover memo is just an attachment that staff was charged with some time back in preparing a strategy to ensure that all of the neighborhood master plans that are developed will have an implementation plan. Staff was thinking about Crozet, but this was a template that could be used for other neighborhoods that may have some different items. One thing that they were learning was that no two neighborhoods are going to have exactly the same kinds of plans. They will differ remarkably in scope and level of detail and types of recommendations and probably participation. This is one

that staff came up with that they were stimulated by the one in Crozet. Some of these things have already started. For instance, she had been designated at least on an ad-hoc basis as the neighborhood planner for Crozet. There is no community council yet, but it was something that staff wanted the Commission and Board to weigh in on. Some of these things will have to be done after the adoption of the plan. Other things are happening already. They have already had some meetings on the new library and how that might happen in the downtown area.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that several months ago as part of the County's overall strategic planning, this was identified by the Board as a priority. What this has given us is a template of strategies to use in each of the master plans. More specifically, now they were working on these elements in regards to the Crozet Master Plan. Ms. Thomas has already spoken to some of the things that are going on, as you are looking at the master plan itself. Out of the County Executive's Office there is a real focus on the infrastructure implementations and identifying how they are going to be able to address that. He pointed out that certain things get identified in the general land use plan as part of the Comp Plan, which might get into a CIP and start another planning process. This is much more about how to really get into a master plan and begin looking at how that master plan can get achieved. He pointed out that there are a variety of ways.

Mr. Edgerton stated that the bold statement in the third box down that says that in December 2003 the County will have a strategy in place to ensure the implementation of completed neighborhood master plans within each development area.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that has already been done. The strategy was what was listed below and was what we need to do with each plan. He stated that staff got that done early. The plan has been identified and has been accepted by the Board as part of the strategic plan. He stated that this was new ground that the County was walking into, which was a more active role. The Board is going to have to make some hard decisions in putting that into effect because it was really more of a connection with the community that has been master planned and more of an outreach effect in working with residents and businesses that was implied by these strategies.

Ms. Thomas stated that the original topic for tonight was downtown and local business and implementation strategy. She stated that downtown and the protection of the scenic corridor (Routes 250 and 240) were probably some of the earliest and most ardent sediments to arise during the course of the planning effort. The residents feel very connected to downtown and they want it to stay the heart of the community. There are a lot of challenges there because it was not very easy to get to downtown. That is where that theme where all paths whether it is a greenway trail or a road or a sidewalk lead to downtown because downtown is not going to thrive if you cannot get there. That is one of the reasons that main street, as a concept, arose because they needed some additional ways to get to downtown that also serve other functions. Another interesting point that arose very early in the planning process was that people remember Crozet as having been more diversified in a business sense than it is now. Of course, Albemarle County at that time was not as big and the County was not urbanized up Route 29. Therefore, Crozet may have seemed more of a commercially independent area. She pointed out that she could not verify that. There was real interest in allowing for more commercial diversity and more opportunity for people to live and work right in Crozet and not have to go somewhere else to work. From that standpoint, the purple color arose that is the employment district. Even though there was devotion to downtown as the cultural center of the community, there was a lot of people who acknowledged that even if you developed the whole downtown area that you would not be able to capture the 3,000 to 4,000 more jobs you would need to work from a transportation standpoint to keep traffic off of Routes 250 and 240. This is the place type map on page 46. The thinking was that there would be some other places where employment-generating activities would be facilitated or allowed. Over time if the lumber yard was to sell, that would still be looked at as an employment district although it would be a very mixed use district because they don't do things in such a segregated way now. The intent would still be to retain some of those jobs right there. In terms of the ConAgra area and the downtown, those concepts were fairly easy. Initially, the employment area was located closer to Route 250, and there were some real fireworks on design

day because there was the conflict between locating a potential employment area in a place where it could benefit from access from I-64 and be attractive to future uses and not overdeveloping what we are trying to retain as scenic corridor. Ultimately, it was moved more to the heart of the development and became more of a mixed-use kind of center surrounded by residential. Staff tried to allow for some options for future employers. She stated that the thought for Crozet was that the scale of the business would always be small. This was a positive part of the plan that did not seem to get a lot of resistance, but a lot of enthusiasm. She stated that the Crozet Community Association has appointed a Steering Committee of its own members to work closely on the implementation of the plan. The Steering Committee sent a letter requesting that the County work towards relocating the lumberyard so that area could be developed because it was critical to the construction of Main Street. That would be the parallel road to the Route 240.

Mr. Thomas asked if the County has talked with the owner of the lumberyard, Mr. Conley.

Ms. Thomas stated that it has come up and he has named a figure that would probably buy him out, but was probably more than their CIP this year. Certainly there was interest in making things happen that might be beyond the scope of what they could do as local government.

Mr. Thomas asked if staff anticipates a request for new zoning on the road between ConAgra and downtown. He asked what that was zoned now.

Ms. Thomas stated that there was a historic district that went from the western edge of ConAgra to the Great Value. It was a series of modest residential houses, which was largely owned by African Americans. Many of those houses date from about the same point in time. She stated that would be something interesting to think about. The other thing she often thinks about is that this plan will be updated at intervals. There might be a time in the future where there is a strong interest in redeveloping that stretch on the part of the property owners. She stated that she did not think that interest existed now. She pointed out that there was some property on the north on the south side of Parrot Creek, of which if you amended the boundary might make some really nice infill housing in a very good walkable location to downtown and the services. On the boundary amendments there are some very good new development opportunities up there. She felt that they had to be carefully done because of the drainage. The idea was that with the boundary amendment, they would be doing some stormwater management facility development that would remedy any existing problems. She pointed out that the Amoco abuts the drainage that flows into Beaver Creek ultimately.

Mr. Thomas asked if there has been any discussion of light industrial zoning or a computer manufacturer coming into this area.

Ms. Thomas stated that she was not sure if they talked about that specifically, but there were some suggestions for some new uses that could occupy Acme, ConAgra and potentially the lumberyard. There was a lot of interest in Acme because it was such a good building and had been sitting for so long. She stated that the discussion was more in a redevelopment sense rather than a new development. She pointed out that ConAgra had 800 employees, which would be a big chunk of those 3,000 additional jobs. Discussion was held on recapturing some character that was perceived as lost over time as Charlottesville began to dominate in the employment and commercial sense. There is a real desire for people to be able to do some of the things that they are doing in their homes or other commercial spaces and do it in the downtown or business district.

Mr. Rieley asked how many employees does the lumberyard have?

Ms. Thomas stated that it was about 50 employees. She pointed out that downtown Crozet was a very restrained area and there was probably not a lot that they were going to be able to do about that. She stated that Section Two is all about implementations and strategies for development of the area in accordance with the master plan. On page 15, they start out with

what is currently programmed in the CIP. She stated that the library was one of the most immediate CIP items. Actually the library funding might be available before they had all of the details worked out for the library placement, design and programming. She pointed out that they might not be able to build the library at all, but that it was going to be a challenging project. Everybody loves the idea, but there is not a vacant piece of land waiting for the library in that area. Staff is going to have to work with owners because it will take a lot of private participation. The school site for the new elementary school will come with the Kessler Group's ConAgra project. They have pretty much agreed to that. The Commission will see that plan coming before them within the next six months or sooner. She went over the different allocations involved with the master plan.

Mr. Edgerton asked if anyone has looked to see if these allocations would be adequate to do the job.

Ms. Thomas stated that the library was considered to be a generous budget because the library had 18,000 square feet. That was based on a library study that was done some years back by Train and Spencer. The school figures are pretty accurate because Al Reasor devotes a lot of time with it. She pointed out that the Railroad Avenue sidewalk of $67,000 would not go very far and was probably all right. Personally, she felt that the sidewalk projects were shaky because you run into things like utility relocations and some easements, etc. She pointed out that the $200,000 per year for road projects was sort of a shared pot.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that money was distributed around potential design projects throughout the County.

Mr. Edgerton stated that money was not just for Crozet.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that all $200,000 could be devoted to this project. He stated that staff has actually made submittal for the balance of the funds necessary to get these projects done according to this plan based on the cost estimates that the plan provides. This was done so that everyone could see what those costs were. Whether or not the CIP will get adopted with all of them in there he did not know.

Mr. Rieley stated that VDOT has recently instituted a policy whereby pedestrian and bicycle facilities can be funded as separate items and don't have to associate with the road project. Obviously to get into substantial parts of that, the primary and secondary road programs were years out even on the most minor projects. Having looked at all of these kinds of things in CHART relative to the MPO area, that there are a number of people who have asked if the MPO was intended to deal with the urbanized areas. They felt that if Crozet was designated as an urbanizing area, then why couldn't the Crozet designation be a part of the MPO that would make some of these funds available for one of our most pressing urbanizing areas. He stated that there are good answers to that.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that back at the last revision of the urbanized area, they pressed very hard at the MPO to have Crozet included. They were going west with the urbanized area, but they were stopping at the Mechum River. It is in the regional transportation model, but it was not in the urbanized area.

Mr. Rieley felt that there was no advantage to not having this included in that area. Obviously, those dollars are tight too, but they were talking about spending $241,000,000 as opposed to what they could scrap together out of an ICETEA grant. What is the process? Is there a way that they as a Planning Commission can be useful?

Mr. Cilimberg stated that was an implementation measure certainly. He stated that he believed that the revisions to the urbanized area are made with each census. Whether there was an

intervening opportunity in the ten years to do that he was not sure. He noted that they could request that to be looked into.

Mr. Rieley stated that they raised this question at a meeting with Harrison on whether there was a mechanism that can be implemented. He asked if that should be listed as an implementation strategy and should we get it on the table and have public comment.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he would endorse that. He felt that there was an awful lot of precedent that was going to be set by this plan. If they have lots of pretty maps and good ideas, it was going to torpedo all other master planning efforts by the County. He realized that the decision was not going to be made by the Commission on how these funds are applied. He stated that as a Commission it was their responsibility to put that in the strategy and to push as hard as they could. He suggested that the Commission find a way to put in a lot of general language and push as hard as they can.

Mr. Rieley stated that it was potentially a way to get some more money. He stated that he did not know if the MPO would go along with this. He pointed out that CHART has added $6 million dollars to pedestrian and bicycle improvements, which was ten times what it has ever been before. This is an area in Albemarle County that money could really be used. The Eastern Avenue design and engineering and the bridge have a big price tag and they are discussed throughout as the highest priority. He stated that he had some questions about whether that is appropriate because of the price tag and what is at stake in the rest of the development area. He suggested that the Commission have a discussion about the priorities of the funding and implementations.

Mr. Edgerton asked if his point was that if they are not going to get funded for a while, then they would not get built for a while and therefore they should push for some of the other infrastructure sooner. He questioned what should be done if the bridge was going to cost four million dollars and they don't have that amount of money.

Mr. Rieley stated that if you put that design engineering in a reasonable escalator clause, then you would probably be looking at five or six million dollars. He noted that was a lot of money for a road that essentially leads right down to Route 250, which was the place that they were trying to direct development away from and not to it. He stated that there were advantages in serving those communities and continuing the access. Being an advocate of interconnectivity, he pointed out that when you look at that and where the originals and destinations and desire are and you look at all of the needs of implementing this master plan, putting five or six million dollars into something that crosses the stream that might not need to, it seems at the very least they should think about where it falls on the priority list.

Mr. Thomas stated that the road would give access to Route 250 and then Route 250 to I-64. The goal would be to get the people to I-64.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that so does Crozet Avenue.

Mr. Thomas stated that another access has been on the board for a long time.

Mr. Rieley stated that he worried that was the reason that it was a high priority because it has been on there for a long time.

Mr. Thomas asked if Route 240 should be improved.

Mr. Rieley stated that it seemed that a lot of the development in that area could be served to the north and to the west to take traffic downtown on Main Street, which was where they wanted it to be anyway. He stated that they could use Crozet Avenue to go east. If you were going east you would want to go Route 240. If you want to go to I-64 then take Crozet Avenue by some route,

which might be reasonable for at least a long time. It seems that taking that traffic down to a road that you don't want to be adding additional pressure on should not necessarily be a priority when they know they have so many pressing needs everywhere else to implement this plan.

Mr. Thomas stated that he felt that it was a necessity to put the bridge in to make sure that the entire Crozet area was master planned properly.

Mr. Rieley stated that he did not see six million dollars worth of value in that crossing. He stated that he would rather see the connection be made over or under the railroad track to get to Route 240 from that neighborhood, which would be a lot less expensive in making the connection. He stated that it was really the principle of what they spend now. He asked to which degree should this section on implementation deal with this priority?

Mr. Finley asked if there were priorities and if Eastern Avenue was the first.

Mr. Rieley stated that the Eastern Avenue was a very high priority. Also, in the original 13 pages that they were going to be looking at, on page 3 the major findings and recommendations for the number one roads was the two major north/south connector roads that will be required as baseline infrastructure development. That is the first thing listed under roads and that was obviously Eastern and Western Avenue. He noted that he raised that as a question of where does the money go first.

Mr. Thomas questioned if it should be put towards Jarman Gap Road as a higher priority than that since it has been there for a long time.

Mr. Rieley pointed out that road had ongoing development on it right now.

Mr. Edgerton asked staff if the yellow highlighted areas on page 19 was the ones that they have money allocated for.

Ms. Thomas stated that those were the priorities within each of those blocks. The consultants posed the question to the neighborhood. There was no vote taken, but from the discussion this would generally align with the neighborhood sentiments. Staff definitely heard about the Lickinghole Bridge and the library being considered as the two most immediate needs. The library is important because it will start the downtown revitalization and is such a symbolic investment step. The bridge was very important because it was so painful to try to make connections on the East Side of Crozet Avenue through the existing neighborhoods. She stated that people have looked at the Eastern Avenue connector as the best way to drain those neighborhoods. She pointed out that the Commission would be hearing about it when reviewing the Crozet Park Townhouse project, which was part of the western edge of the Shifflett farm, which was a by-right development. That project would not incorporate Eastern Avenue because it does not go quite that far, but the neighbors are beginning to voice concerns that everybody is going to go in on Tabor Street. Now if Main Street were a functional street, then you would have two connections. Main Street will probably take some investment beyond just the engineering because she did not know if it would be contributed to.

Mr. Rieley stated that it seemed that would be a higher priority.

Ms. Thomas stated that Main Street was definitely a central part of the plan.

Mr. Edgerton stated that the yellow on page 19 was the neighborhoods, noting that some of the items had no anticipated funding.

Ms. Thomas asked that they go back to page 16 to that category and suggested that they work together on this with the private sector. Some of these would be more private sector heavy than others. All of them would require a lot of coordination and partnerships. These are not straight

CIP items. Staff stated that the Western Park and the Eastern Park, provided that they get the land dedicated as part of the development proposal, are going to require substantial public investment. Staff has already requested the planning money way up front so that they will know what to ask for from the developer when the developments develop and mature. So it is not all-private sector money. The downtown park really would be a redevelopment of the square. The square is the area between the railroad tracks and the hardware store. She referred the Commission to page 72 to point out the location of the downtown park. Main Street could be very effective even if one block were built. If the lumberyard trucks could use the first block of Main Street, which would probably take the dry cleaners and the garage and maybe the small house to the south of that, then the trucks could quit using the square and go in and out of the new Main Street which would be designed to accommodate the turning movements that they need. Then the square could become much more of a pedestrian environment and a much more pleasant place and the traffic would flow well. She pointed out that the trucks could not turn in when cars were parked next to the railroad tracks. Fortunately, most of the trucks come in at night when there is no parking there. Just doing the first block of Main Street could change the dynamic of that. Mr. Connally sees the benefit of that, but he is not that enthusiastic about the rest of Main Street as it goes along the southern edge of his property. She talked to him about it and at the time he saw that there would be some real benefit there. It also might mean moving the light from its present location, which was so close to the stop sign, to a location where it would regulate the truck use further south on Crozet Avenue. That is a relatively small thing. Staff would expect to partner with the owner of the lumberyard on that because it mostly benefits him. It would benefit everybody in that the square would be a better environment. The consultant thought that should be something that he should contribute the bulk of, but it was something that staff would have to work out. The neighborhood parks were sort of open-ended. The greenway development is escalated and needs a little more money behind it to make it happen sooner. She pointed out that the greenway in Crozet provides a connection that might not be as appropriately or easily provided by sidewalks depending on how you feel about sidewalks along Route 250. The greenway might provide a way for Cory Farm people to get downtown without taking on the huge project of sidewalks right now along Crozet Avenue. That would be money well spent because so much volunteer work goes into it. The underpass is an interesting one because with Music Today moving to ConAgra, she felt that whole Acme/ConAgra area was going to become a lot more energized. Depending on what happens with it, that underpass might move forward more quickly than was anticipated originally because people from the ConAgra residential development that Steve Runkle was doing may really want to access those services. A lot will depend on what they are able to work out with the railroad.

Mr. Rieley stated that they have an at-grade railroad crossing there now with a parking lot on the other side of the tracks.

Ms. Thomas stated that she had not seen that one, but there was another at-grade crossing by that church. She pointed out that Steve Runkle had the right to use it, but she was not sure if he would. Staff is not sure about Main Street's extension. If the County was in the business of acquiring property, then this could happen sooner, but we have not heard that the lumberyard is enthusiastic about the continuation of Main Street in the easterly direction beyond that first block now. Mr. Connelly was worried about the fact that it would take up the space that they would use otherwise for stacking up lumber. There are no buildings there, but it is used. She felt that the other fear was just the sort of vegetated undisturbed buffer that would probably be lost if the road goes in.

Mr. Rieley stated that the County has taken a less than aggressive approach to condemnation of land for public access, but that might have to change.

Ms. Thomas stated that there were lots of areas where that would be an interesting situation. She stated that pages 20 through 26 in narrative form address other implementation strategies. There are a couple of them that she wanted to bring to the Commission's attention so that they could be thinking about them for the November 11th session. In the very first paragraph on page

20, strategy for business and community economical development, there is a recommendation for a small business development. She stated that based on the Planning staff's experience in trying to fill these inquiries and assisting people, that it seems like this would be a very good idea. She noted that it was not a promotional thing, but more of a coordination/liaison. She felt that it should be just one person who can track something from start to finish and does not just encounter it in a small phase. She noted that many people ask what the incentives would be for developing the old ConAgra and she refers them to Tom Foley. She stated that it would be very helpful to have just one person designated to answer those questions. It seems like this would be a good thing to coordinate things from start to finish.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that would require an additional person or a redesignated employee who has some specialized knowledge to work with businesses. He pointed out that this would require some thought because the County has never done something like this.

Ms. Thomas stated that one of the strategies for developing some more affordable housing is to do the accessory units. She pointed out that the City has a lot of those. She stated that Ms. Echols, who works more with the ordinances, was concerned with the idea of selling these granny flats or accessory units because then you have really created a substandard lot. She stated that they would have to make sure that they wanted to do that. She pointed out that they could be used as a rental opportunity. She asked that they spend some time reviewing the strategies alone on page 21. One thing that staff was hearing about was number 6. There is a new law in Virginia that allows public/private partnership for educational purposes. It has been suggested that it might help with the library project development to have created a foundation to work with both public and private interests. Some of these strategies will not happen, but others we might want to look into, but staff would be able to tell the Commission a little more on this one after tomorrow's meeting. On page 22, it contains strategies on how they might modify their land development review process, which would be helpful to have Ms. Echols involved in. Some of them talk about developing a zoning code for Crozet and others talk about beefing up things that we already have like developing under Entrance Corridor. Historic districts are suggested in downtown Crozet and Yancey Mills.

Mr. Finley asked if under the master plan if there would be new zoning.

Ms. Thomas stated not necessarily because it depends on what the Commission recommends and the Board actually adopts. Generally, they have not rezoned as a result of Comprehensive Plan amendments, which is technically what this project is. The only exception is the 1980 down zoning of the rural areas. They generally allow things to unfold in a more incremental fashion where the property owner comes forward and requests a different zoning based on what he wants to do. There is a good argument to be made that the biggest hazard with the implementation of this plan is what could happen by right because there is a lot of different zoning out in Crozet. In fact, two of the projects that you might be seeing are Valerie Fields, a Gaylon Beights project and Crozet Park Townhouses, which are by-right developments. So if the by-right zoning is implemented in the heart of what was suppose to be a hamlet or a neighborhood and it was R-1, R-2 or R-4 zoning, then it is not going to look like what the master plan is envisioning it. It might not be so terrible in not having it right here, but if you get a dominos of a number of by-right projects then you can't move the hamlet or neighborhood center around any more because everything has been developed in that quadrant. Then you could argue that you have lost the opportunity to do some much livable and walkable creative things. She stated that it was a real dilemma. She stated that this section would be discussed in the facilitated sessions and staff would come forth with a recommendation for the Commission's consideration.

Mr. Rieley stated that normally they don't have a public comment session at work sessions, but they have four people here and if anybody would like to weight in on this or give us things to think about during the intervening weeks they would be happy to hear from them.

Tom Loach stated that they had talked about the funding of the bridge versus the tunnel. He noted that the consideration was generally to take off some of the pressure because Hilltop was the western connector and was only a small street going out through Tabor, which was the only exit out for that side. Then everything else would flush out through Western Ridge. That was why they needed to get those connections made to north/south as soon as possible. He felt that more than the money is the timing. He asked how you time these things. He stated that they call them the trigger points that would start the funding cycle in process so that the infrastructure met the development as it came. It always seems that if you really believe that they are going to develop, then it seems that it was more cost effective to fund infrastructure early for things you have to plan on rather than to do it more when it becomes much more expensive to coordinate this with the developers. On your last comment about rural areas, that might be problematic and you will see that in the upcoming Wynn Ballard that was going to be a by-right development. They have spent a lot of time and effort on that whole western corridor. Therefore, he suggested that maybe on the upcoming master plans rather than to get to a level of such specificity that they identify those areas and only spend the time and effort where you know something is going to happen, and then be more generic in the other areas. He felt that there was going to be a lot of planning time spent that was wasted.

Mr. Rieley stated that was a good point. He suggested when they start looking at the new master plans; they need to concentrate on the general picture, the transportation connections, the open space systems and the things that are not going to change. They should not spend quite so much time in the general development of guidelines and the location of the streets and buildings at that level of detail because it was expensive. It was not only expensive for the consultant and staff's time, but it was expensive for the people who donate their time to the process.

Mr. Edgerton noted that it builds up false expectations and lots of disappointments that kills the whole community.

Mr. Finley questioned what the fiscal impact would be.

Ms. Thomas stated that you could add up the numbers, but pointed out that all of those numbers are estimates. She stated that they don't know enough about some things such as the Lickinghole Bridge. She pointed out that staff does not know exactly where it would go, which would make a significant difference on what it would cost. Aside from that the plan is trying to be optimistic and hopes to do some things in partnership through a negotiated contribution by the private sector. That would mean a rezoning with some sort of proffer requiring a contribution. Staff could come up with a total and much of it would happen whether or not they have this plan.

Mr. Rieley stated that to lump all of those sums together and saying that this is the cost of implementing this master plan is not a fair way to do it.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that there was not a sure dollars and cents because over the longer term there is the question of what you would have gotten versus what the master plan can bring you for the investment that gets made. There is a return there that you would not simply be able to measure in dollars and cents. He suggested that the Commissioners might want to be thinking about the question of the Eastern Avenue and where that stands relative to other projects. That raises a good starting point at least. He noted that in that corridor there is the potential that they could get projects that would be very much in keeping with the master plan that would be very attractive. Staff would certainly hope that potential exists. It would be good to think that if those are coming across the table what are going to be the barriers to those projects that are otherwise a tremendous alternative to what might happen by-right. What those barriers are would begin to identify what might be the infrastructure priorities. He felt that Mr. Loach has made a very good point about the struggle that they have in dealing with the kind of projects that could occur in that area on the eastern side of Crozet and how to deal with the transportation impacts that they create. They could get some very good projects, but they were still going to have traffic impacts and simply relying on nominal connections to take care of them is not going to be enough. There

is going to be the need to look at the bigger infrastructure and its ability to support those kinds of projects should they get them and where it makes more sense to make investments that might allow us to achieve those projects. He pointed out that Hilltop Drive could not handle what might happen over there. There has got to be some priority put on some other alternatives or else they were going to end up building themselves into what they have in the northern urban area where they rely solely on one road, Route 29, to try to take care of most of the traffic. It does not work since the urban areas have not been able to successfully deal with the development and growth. If you look at successful urban areas, there are multiple corridors and multiple ways to move traffic. He pointed out that they have the chance to deal with these issues in Crozet to avoid making the same mistake.

In summary:
The Planning Commission held the fourth and final "informational" work session on the Crozet Master Plan. The Commission discussed and agreed upon staff's suggested review schedule for the upcoming sessions and that the editorial discussion of the Plan will take place in a more structured format, with Lee Catlin as facilitator. The next two facilitated sessions will take place on November 11 and 18, and if the Commission was able to complete the work in two sessions, the public hearing on the Master Plan will be held on December 9. A public hearing will be held on the Development Area Boundary Amendment on November 11. The Commission would then forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The discussion focused on the Downtown and Local Business, and the Implementation sections of the plan, which included the recommendations for implementation costs and strategies. The Planning Commission took public comment and provided comments and suggestions, but took no formal action.

Old Business:

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

New Business:

Additions to Batesville Agriculture/Forestal District – Requests to add four parcels to the Batesville Agricultural and Forestal District, in accordance with Section 3-203 of the Albemarle County Code, which allows for additions of land to Agricultural and Forestal Districts. The first property, described as Tax Map 71, Parcel 26C, contains 23 acres. The second property, described as Tax Map 71, Parcels 26B, 26B1, and 26B2, contains 82.75 acres. The properties are located in the Samuel Miller Magisterial District on Rt. 689 (Burch's Creek Road) approximately 0.6 miles from the intersection with Rt. 637 (Dick Woods Road). The properties are zoned RA, Rural Areas. The Comprehensive Plan designates these properties as Rural Areas. (Scott Clark) **PLANNING COMMISSION MUST ACCEPT APPLICATIONS.**

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the information that the Commission has tonight was basically just to describe the additions to the Batesville Agriculture/Forestal District that has been applied for. The first step in the process was for the Commission to accept the application. Therefore, that was what staff really needs the Commission to do tonight.

Mr. Edgerton moved to accept the application for Additions to Batesville Agriculture/Forestal District.

Mr. Loewenstein seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously (5:0) to accept the application. (Craddock – absent)

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

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m. to the next meeting on October 28, 2003 at 4:00 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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