Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 11, 2005

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting, work session and a public hearing on Tuesday, October 11, 2005 at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Bill Edgerton, Chairman; Rodney Thomas, Calvin Morris, Jo Higgins, Pete Craddock and Marcia Joseph, Vice-Chair. Absent was William Rieley and David J. Neuman, FAIA, Architect for University of Virginia.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Margaret Maliszewski, Design Planner; Juan Wade, Transportation Planner; Ron White, Housing Director and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Edgerton called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Edgerton invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting moved on to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – October 5, 2005

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on October 5, 2005.

Public Hearing Items:

ZTA-2005-008 Entrance Corridor - Amend Section 30.6.2, Application, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code, to add that segment of State Route 631 (East Rio Road) from US Route 29 North easterly to the Norfolk Southern Railway tracks, as a highway upon and along which an entrance corridor overlay district is established.

AND

ZMA 2005-016 Entrance Corridor - Amendment to Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code to amend the zoning map to establish an entrance corridor overlay district upon each parcel of land contiguous to that segment of State Route 631 (East Rio Road) from US Route 29 North easterly to the Norfolk Southern Railway tracks, from the edge of the State Route 631 right-of-way to the greater of either: (1) the full depth of each parcel, as that parcel existed on October 3, 1990; or (2) to a depth of 500 feet. This proposed amendment would not affect the general usage and density range authorized by the applicable underlying zoning district regulations for each parcel. (Margaret Maliszewski)

Ms. Maliszewski summarized the staff report.

- This is a proposal to amend the Entrance Corridor Overlay Zoning District Section of the Ordinance by adding a segment of East Rio Road from Route 29 North to Norfolk Southern Railway Tracks. This request originated with the Architectural Review Board back in May, 2005. The ARB asked the Board of Supervisors to request a reclassification of East Rio Road to an arterial highway and to establish it as an Entrance Corridor District.
- The Board of Supervisors supported that request. In July, VDOT notified the County that the segment of East Rio Road had been changed to an urban minor arterial. The Board of Supervisors approved a resolution of intent in August to establish that segment as an Entrance Corridor and to change the zoning map accordingly.
- The State enabling legislation identifies two criteria for Entrance Corridor roadways:
  1. Arterial designation, and
  2. The roadway must be a route of tourist access to historic areas or historic buildings. That proposed segment meets that criteria as well.

- Establishment of this section of Rio Road as an Entrance Corridor would apply the EC regulations and ARB review to new development along the corridor, but that new development does not include the review of single-family residential development.
- The properties included within the Overlay District are those parcels that are adjacent to the road for the full depth of the parcel and any portion of a non-adjacent parcel that falls within 500 feet of the right-of-way. Those criteria apply to the parcels as they existed in 1990 when the first Entrance Corridor Districts were established in the County.
- An attachment was included as part of the staff report and it was also included in the notification letters that went out to the property owners. It provides more detail on that ARB review process.
- The map of the affected area is on display.

Staff has received a number of phone calls after the notification letters went out. Those were primarily questions for additional information and clarification on the proposal. Yesterday, staff received one letter on the proposal. Copies of that letter were distributed to the Commissioners this evening. That letter expresses a lack of support for the proposal. (Attachment: Letter dated 10/6/05 addressed to V. Wayne Cilimberg from Andrew Boninti, President of Rivanna Realty & Investment.)

Mr. Edgerton asked if the Commission recommends approval of this proposal if the regulation would apply to projects already in the review process as Mr. Boninti asked in his letter.

Ms. Maliszewski stated the two proposals that Mr. Boninti was talking about in his letter was a special use permit amendment that was under review for a veterinary office, which was across Rio East Court from the Alltel Building. The request is for an enlargement to an existing building. The other item that is under review is on the parcel adjacent to that, which is a subdivision. The subdivision is really not an issue because the ARB does not review subdivisions at this point.

Ms. Higgins stated that there might be other items under review such as site plans or building permits. She asked when the proposals would become subject to the new regulations if adopted by the Board. She asked if that means that something already submitted is excluded.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that part of that would be the effective date that the Board might apply to it.

Mr. Kamptner stated that right now, the way the ordinance is written, it would apply on the date that the Board adopts it. Therefore, any pending applications that have not yet been approved would be subject to the new regulations. So if the Commission and the Board do not wish the ordinance to apply to those projects, then the ordinance could be amended to either delay the effective date or insert a grandfathering clause, which would allow any existing applications to come in under the old regulations. There are two ways to address it if that is an issue.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that one thing to note, too, is that there are a couple of places where a project could be under ARB review. The site plan process is one area that requires ARB review. Ms. Maliszewski referred to a special use permit for this one development, which will then turn into a site plan after the special use permit approval. But, that special use permit is going to set certain elements of the development, such as building location. Therefore, there are things that won't really be subject to an ARB change if that happens. Ultimately, there can also be building permit aspects that could be subject to ARB review. That is at another point in time.

Mr. Edgerton stated that the special use permit, which is actually an amendment to a previously approved special use permit, would be subject to ARB review if this is passed.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that special use permits are not subject to the review of the ARB, except as an advisory body.

Ms. Higgins questioned the map because it starts at the railroad, but it does not clearly follow the 500 feet. She asked how it would affect Belvedere since during that review the Commission did talk about the commercial area being more towards Rio Road as opposed to inside the development. If she was reading the map correctly, the railroad tracks seem to be a demarcation and did not go back 500 feet back. She asked if that was on purpose. In other words, if you took a segment of road and went 500 feet

back on either side is there a reason that it is excluded. She felt that it was kind of glaring. When the future Meadow Creek Parkway is tied into Rio Road where it ties into McIntire Road it would be more of what she would envision as an Entrance Corridor and would actually tie in at the entrance of Dunlora. But, this stops at the railroad tracks. She was not expressing a problem with it, but felt that when it was originally explained to the Commission it was kind of that thought of Meadow Creek Parkway.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that was an ultimate arterial designation that could occur, but it is not a designation that currently exists.

Ms. Higgins asked what the designation for Meadow Creek Parkway was as proposed.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that he was talking about the ability to use it in the Entrance Corridor provisions as a designated route. Right now according to VDOT's input, they have only designated it as arterial at this point to the Norfolk Southern Railroad.

Ms. Higgins stated that the reason that she brought this up was to meet the criteria for tourist access to historic buildings it would be from point A to where those historic buildings are or the City/County line. But, they are not taking it to the City/County line like the other Entrance Corridors, such as Rio Road West. She felt that they were doing something to just take a chunk to go from point A to point B and it does not clearly meet this intent because it does not take you to the historic building.

Mr. Kamptner stated that it takes it as far as VDOT's arterial designation allows it to go. At the bridge the road narrows down to two lanes. He assumed that was a factor in VDOT's analysis.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that he would anticipate that when Meadow Creek Parkway is built the arterial designation will extend beyond the bridge on Rio Road to the point where Meadow Creek Parkway takes off. It will go down to the by-pass along Meadow Creek Parkway.

Ms. Higgins asked what Meadow Creek Parkway's designation is as proposed.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that he believed that it was considered a minor arterial, but he could not verify that. He pointed out that these roads are not finally categorized until they are complete. He felt that was anticipated.

Ms. Higgins felt that they were premature because that piece is such an important link to what the justification seems to involve.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it went as far as it could go, but it does not get you to the ultimate designation.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there were other questions for staff.

Mr. Cilimberg asked to pick up on one thing that Ms. Maliszewski included in the staff report that he felt was important type of information to include, which is the budget impact. There is the implication of the addition here having additional staffing requirements that our fees don't really cover right now. So he felt that it was worth noting that there is additional time that staff will have to spend. Our staff is fixed, but there are new reviews that will result from this particular EC Overlay. It is a number of which staff does not know, but certainly that is a factor ultimately in what they might have to ask the Board for. He felt that it was more of a matter for the Board to decide upon. In our administration and review process, the ARB's Entrance Corridor review of site plans is an additional element in site plan review. Staff has tried over time to talk about any impact of housing affordability that might result from a zoning text amendment. As mentioned, single-family development is not subject to the EC Overlay. But, any multi-family development would be. Staff is not aware of any specific effort on housing affordability that results from the EC Overlay District and the process with the ARB that is part of the site plan review. Those are things that they typically try to address with zoning text amendments.

Mr. Edgerton stated that if the Commission recommends approval of this should they make some mention of the additional staff needs or the staff impact.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it was left up to the Commission, but staff just tries to make the Commission and Board aware of the issue. That is something that is going to be part of what the Board has before them.

Mr. Edgerton opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it was actually a resolution of intent of the Board that was in response to an ARB request. Therefore, the Commission does not need to open the public hearing for the applicant because staff has represented them.

Mr. Edgerton invited public comment from other members of the public.

Wren Adler stated that he had some comments and clarifications. He owned property on East Rio Road and went through the approval process in the early 1990's, which quite frankly was a very trying thing. For what it is worth, he would like it to be noticed that to put a burden like this on an average citizen is really inappropriate. He bought a property for $80,000 at the time and then spent $30,000 just to get it through the approval process. He felt that there was something off some where. He pointed out that there was nothing unusual about his lot, such as drainage issues or anything. Basically, what he was asking for was their consideration in the future for people that live here and would like to get into business. His analysis after he went through this process would have been that they wanted to discourage as much as possible that somebody from the community could develop business roots. That is just for the history of the area. He noted that this was the first notification that he has received about the Entrance Corridor proposal. He agreed with Ms. Higgins' comments in that he did not understand why it was limited to the railroad and that since it does not go anywhere that it does not make sense to do this at this time. The second thing is that there is property beyond that which is very substantial in size that is probably going to be redeveloped in the near future. He felt that it should fall in the Entrance Corridor regulation if that was something that is adopted for the front end. The other thing is that in the 1990's there was a staff member that had an incredible amount of power and the Planning board basically submitted to that person's opinion. It just created an incredible amount of trouble. He felt that development has to be balanced with what the public wants. He opposed requiring a certificate of appropriateness for this area because it gives too much power to the County.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there were other members of the public that would like to address the Commission.

Neil Williamson, representative with the Free Enterprise Forum, stated that he counts 21 Entrance Corridors, and with this proposal 22. He would love to have the sense of the Planning Commission on how many road lead in. Where do we stop? If it is every road leads in, then why are we not putting these Entrance Corridor regulations on everyone. It seems as though the application of these regulations continues to expand. They have heard the discussion that it will likely expand staff and the demands on staff. It will likely elongate the approval process for anything that is in that Entrance Corridor. The Entrance Corridor program began somewhere in the late 1970's and was to make it nice for when you were coming in and going out of the area. There is something to be said for that, but there is something to be said when there are two signs next to each other from different businesses that are being argued by what color red they are allowed to use and the ARB is dictating that one has to use the same as the other. Somewhere things have gone a little out of the way. He really would like to know what the Planning Commission believes is the right number of Entrance Corridors and the right level of scrutiny to these applications. He thanked the Architectural Review Board members because he has sat through some of their meetings and anyone that sits on that board has the tip of his hat. They look at a lot of stuff and do the best job they can in applying it, but he felt that the push was towards more detail and more scrutiny where it may be easier to lay off the scrutiny and allow some of this to occur in a nice manner, but without the government telling you exactly what it should look like.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was anyone else present to speak on this matter. There being none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter before the Commission for discussion and a possible action.

Mr. Morris agreed with Ms. Higgins in that this is premature because the road goes to nothing historic right now and he did not think that it applies.

Ms. Higgins stated that she drove up and down the road about six times today. There are a couple of significant developments that recently came to the Planning Commission, such as Kenwood Station. The style and architecture of Kenwood Station almost suggests that obviously an architect was involved and she did not think it was unattractive. There is the Real Estate III building that was redeveloped. The market has made this area become something that architects design and try to achieve to attract people. After driving up and down she looked at some of the harder ones that don't blend with the neighborhood and felt that they are older and will come in for redevelopment. Based on the demands of staff and the demands of the tax dollars for people who might want to put business roots into the community, the way it is inconsistent with other Entrance Corridor designations in that it is a piece of a road, even though she did not know it was Entrance Corridor number 22, there has been a recent staff report about reducing time in process, the overlay that staff has and personally she has many things that are of a level of importance compared with what is going on being the number one, cluster development in the rural area, and if any staff is added and they have a choice to make that she felt that the component would be better served when Meadow Creek Parkway is in its development stage and is actually going to be built. Then, she felt that the County's priority should weigh it in as a priority. What is going on there now is functioning well. Sometimes she felt that the ARB as a goal does a very good job of aesthetics, but she has expressed her concern about aesthetics above function. Sometimes the time in process ends up being excessive and subjective and it ends up being expensive as a result. That valued engineering is not considered as maybe when you weigh in paved areas and landscaping that would conflict with utilities and things like that you sometimes see things twisted around in trying to satisfy some conflicting rules. But, the bottom line is that costs are increasing almost weekly right now with the state of economy and it is a burden for development to bear, which how that affects affordable housing is that as prices of development increases, the people who have to shop there will have to pay increased prices. So she was just not willing to support something that might add staff in an area where she thinks that staff does an excellent job with what they have. But, she knew they were stretched. If she had to make that decision she would not apply that towards this particular road at this particular time. If they were to consider it, she felt that some level of grandfathering for things in process probably should be considered. She felt that an effective date that was dropped on someone that might be almost at site plan approval or almost at special use permit would leave staff in a real catch-22. ARB input sometimes affects a whole layout regarding the location of the building on the site. It is always a struggle to come up with the best design. It is a shame to say that it applies to someone and require a certificate of appropriateness when maybe they did not have that input from the beginning. Time in process, costs and these other facts make her not support this particular section as Entrance Corridor #22 on the list.

Ms. Joseph stated that she did not have a problem with it. She felt that it makes some sense going from Route 29 out on to Rio because it is the corridor that people travel to get into the city and to approach some of the historic properties. She pointed out that the Entrance Corridor was first adopted in 1990 because they had to wait until there was enabling legislation from the state to be able to do that. The state talks about this being tourist routes and they lead you to different important historic properties. She disagreed with staff about needing more staffing because this is not that long of a segment and she did not know if there are that many more properties that would justify another staff person to take care of just this one segment. Across the railroad tracks she was not that concerned about Belvedere because Belvedere was coming in as a Neighborhood Model. If they want that area commercial, then it will be covered by a Code of Development. She supported the request. She felt that what was going on in this area reflects some good decent architecture. In the past she has responded to the level of detail that is involved with some of the review, and that is not anything that they can do anything about. That is something that only the Board of Supervisors can do something about. Therefore, she could support the proposal.

Mr. Edgerton supported the approval of the request, but recommended adding some sort of grandfather clause for the projects that are already in process to continue on as if this did not exist. But, with that caveat he would support the approval of the proposal.

Mr. Craddock agreed with a lot of things brought out by Ms. Higgins and Ms. Joseph, but felt that it would be prudent to have some type of grandfather clause added in the approval. He felt that East Rio Road is a moving target and that now is the time to designate it as an Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Morris in that it was premature and not necessary to have it at all right now.

Ms. Higgins felt that architects do a good job in designing buildings without governmental control.

Mr. Edgerton stated that sometimes some coordination is necessary.

Action on ZTA-2005-008:

Motion: Ms. Higgins moved, Mr. Morris seconded, that ZTA-2005-008, Entrance Corridor Amendment, be deferred until Meadow Creek Parkway has been built from the end of the arterial designation to the City/County line and then it be considered at that time.

The motion failed by a vote of 3:3. (Commissioner Rieley was absent.) (Commissioners Thomas, Morris and Higgins voted aye) (Commissioners Joseph, Edgerton and Craddock voted no.)

Mr. Kamptner stated that another motion was needed.

Motion: Mr. Craddock moved, Ms. Joseph seconded, that ZTA-2005-008, Entrance Corridor Amendment, be recommended for approval.

The motion failed by a vote of 3:3. (Commissioner Rieley was absent.) (Commissioners Joseph, Edgerton and Craddock voted aye.) (Commissioners Thomas, Morris and Higgins voted no.)

Action on ZMA-2005-016:

Motion: Ms. Joseph moved, Mr. Craddock seconded, that ZMA-2005-016, Entrance Corridor, be recommended for approval.

The motion failed by a vote of 3:3. (Commissioner Rieley was absent.) (Commissioners Joseph, Edgerton and Craddock voted aye.) (Commissioners Thomas, Morris and Higgins voted no.)

Mr. Edgerton stated that the tie votes were a defeat of the motions to recommend approval of ZTA-2005-008 and ZMA-2005-016, Entrance Corridor, which would go to the Board of Supervisors on November 2 with no recommendation.

Ms. Higgins noted that some of the Commissioners felt that there were reasons not to add this section of East Rio Rd to the EC overlay district as follows:

1. Based upon a review of the current development along this section of road, the appearance is as if ARB standards have been used. Architects & developers are doing a good job as the market dictates. If it's not broken, why fix it?
2. This section is inconsistent with the other (21 EC's) in that it does not connect through, but stops at the RR.
3. It does not meet the criteria for tourist access to historical buildings possibly until Meadowcreek Pkwy is constructed.
4. There is staff impact. There are so many demands for staff involvement that it doesn't seem that adding governmental controls for this purpose is beneficial.
5. The Board recently tasked staff to identify ways to reduce time in process and ways to streamline this. This is adverse to that goal. ARB review adds time to many reviews including site plans for layout, landscaping, lighting, building exterior elevations and signage. In addition, there is time added in process for rezonings and special use permits.
6. Timing of the new requirements - If this is adopted and imposed; there was consensus that a clause should be added to cover this. Considering that plans may be under design and/or in process, a date that the new requirements will be imposed on applications received after a specific date. (I suggest July 1, 2006)

Work Session:

ZTA 2005-009 Affordable Housing Policy Implementation - Work session to discuss proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan to implement affordable housing

strategies. (Ron White)

Mr. Cilimberg stated that if it was the pleasure of the Planning Commission, they might want to start with input from a member of the Housing Committee who made the recommendations that they were considering. Then staff could discuss the specific points of the staff report.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to request Dave Paulsen of the Albemarle Housing Committee to speak first.

Ron White, Albemarle County Housing Director, asked to recognize two members of the Housing Committee that were present. The first is Josh Goldsmith, Chairman of the Housing Committee, and then Dave Paulsen, who was the past Chairman. He stated that Mr. Paulsen would like to address the Commission.

Dave Paulsen stated that he was speaking on behalf of the Albemarle County Housing Committee and the Affordable Housing Policy Advisory Committee. He felt they were also the staff of the County's Community Development Department because they have been working on this for 18 months to come up with concrete steps to use to implement the County's Affordable Housing Policy. He was pleased to report that a consensus among this wide diverse group has been achieved and they believe that they do know implementation steps that will work to increase the supply of Affordable Housing for Albemarle County. By way of a little bit of background, the County approved the Affordable Housing Policies in an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan in February, 2004 recognizing that with any policy that the devil is in the details. The Board of Supervisors appointed what could be termed a Blue Ribbon Committee to figure out how to implement it. This Committee was made up of developers, home builders, lawyers, housing advocates, realtors, mortgage bankers and others. In short these are people who are actually in the trenches out there producing and financing in the housing community. They think that they really have a wide and diverse group that came together and reached a consensus on how to move the ball forward. Subsequent to the Advisory Committee's six month of work, the County staff has reviewed and honed these recommendations. Then they got together with County staff, Housing Committee and the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee and ironed out their differences and submitted their findings to the Board of Supervisors. Staff has since been empowered to act on a few of those recommendations of an administrative nature such as better data collection so that they could more specifically target what the need is in the community. Also, they are revising the home buyer counseling program so that they can target better on how to have a better chance of owning a home at some point. There is some disparity unfortunately between those that they have been counseling and those that could actually get into a house at $175,000. Therefore, they started a home buyer's assistance program. They are now coming before the Planning Commission for a second time to request their support of all of the work that they have done by acting on three recommendations that require amendment or clarification of the existing Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance. First, starting with the Comprehensive Plan it is important to note that the requested amendments that they are seeking are not substantive in nature. They are trying to clarify that the plan that is already there will make it easier for developers and staff to work together to actually implement the plan.

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session to discuss proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan to implement affordable housing strategies. The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the affordable housing implementation recommendations and provided direction to staff. Ron White, the Housing Director, and David Paulsen, President of the Housing Committee, presented the affordable housing implementation recommendations that the Housing Committee has been working on and asked for endorsement from the Commission. Specifically, the Commission asked staff to go back and reread the minutes of August 2, 2005 as well as tonight's minutes for clarity, and then research and provide examples from other localities where the requested mechanisms have worked. The Commission discussed the recommendations, provided comments and suggestions and requested staff to set up another interim work session in order to bring back some additional information to the Commission prior to the public hearings being scheduled.

Six Year Secondary Road Plan – Work session to review and comment on the proposed Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements in the County. (Juandiego Wade)

Mr. Benish stated that they review VDOT's Six Year Secondary Road Plan every year. The County creates a priority list of road improvements, which they provide to VDOT. VDOT's six year construction plan is based on those priorities established by the County. Last year after the Commission reviewed the Six Year Secondary Plan the Board of Supervisors reviewed the format for that plan. The Board and staff agreed that the prior form for that priority list was too large. The Board felt it would be a better tool to have a focused strategic list of priorities. Therefore, the form of the priority list has been reformatted somewhat. Attachment A. contains projects 1 – 21, that essentially is the strategic priorities now. That is essentially the County's priority list. These are the projects that they focus in on implementing they hope over the next short to mid-term 10 to 15 years.

Mr. Edgerton asked what the difference was between the bold projects.

Mr. Benish stated that the bold projects were located in the development area. There is a lot of information on this sheet. What follows behind it is a technical document that is made up of all of the rest of the projects that had been on the priority list. But the real focus for the Board, staff and the Planning Commission is really to work towards those higher priority projects on the first page. Our goal this particular year is really trying to move the priority projects forward and get those projects constructed as soon as possible. Staff wanted to note one change in the priority list that is being recommended this year. That is the northern Free State Road project, which is now priority 9. Last year it had been prioritized as 5. There is a brief explanation of that in the staff report. One of the rationales for pulling that project back was that it allowed VDOT to release money to other higher priority projects to get it moved forward and get those projects constructed sooner. The northern Free State Road project is still considered an important high priority project. If you recall that is the renamed phase II of Meadow Creek Parkway. It is under review with our Places 29 Study. Coming out of the Place 29 work will be information and recommendations on what priority road projects to build. Staff feels that slight adjustment moving it down a little bit does not take it off the strategic list and it was still an important project. But, it frees up money in the short term to work towards completion of other projects ahead of it. Then staff will reassess when they have the recommendations from the Places 29 study. That is the one principal change on the priority list that the Commission has not seen before. He called attention to priority #11 on the list, which was Sunset Avenue, which was a concept for improvements to the Sunset Avenue Road Corridor south of town. It is a very important project that relates to other improvements that are being proposed as part of the Area B Study, which the Commission just began to look at. This is a very important completion of an existing road network that would tie into that ultimate network for Fontaine Avenue to Fifth Street. That is not new, but has been in their plan.

Ms. Higgins asked what RS is.

Mr. Benish stated that RS stands for revenue sharing. He pointed out that it was a dollar per dollar match. He pointed out that the Strategic Plan was page 1. The inventory of potential projects was next. Next would be the Rural Rustic Road Paving Priorities and then the regular paving projects. There is a separate listing of the unpaved road projects. He pointed out that the projects were listed in priority order, but staff can add a number to them. The last page is referred to as the technical addendum for the strategic priorities, which relates to the first page. It is some of the data and information that helps staff rate those projects. This is the information that staff uses to help establish those priorities that includes the type of project, the traffic count, and what plan has been identified. Staff only does it for the strategic list that is page 1. He pointed out that staff actually has a map from last year that they have not updated yet. At the next meeting staff will provide a map and focus in on the strategic priorities of that first page. One project that he wanted to point out on the unpaved road list or regular list was a change that was being proposed this year to prioritize Rio Mill Road & Dickerson Road. One of the purposes of that is to create a parallel road that can act as an alternative to using 29. It does look like they will be able to move, according to VDOT, to the development of the Rio Mill Roadway in December, 2007. Dickerson Road is a little more complicated and there are some difficult vertical curvatures. There are also on Dickerson Road two bridges. One is Steel Span Bridge over the North Fork of the Rivanna Bridge and a one land bridge over a tributary. Both are in a very large flood plain. The paving portion of the road is doable. But, those bridge projects could be fairly expensive projects. VDOT is going to be studying the

ability and the options to do those projects over the next year or two. That is another advantage of flipping these projects so they can get a better handle on that. He pointed out that the cost estimates were for construction costs and not right-of-way.

Mr. Edgerton asked if condemnation was being used, and Mr. Benish replied no, that it was not.

Mr. Benish noted that was the overview of what the Commissioners had. Staff plans to set this on the October 25 Planning Commission meeting. With this overview, if the Commission has any questions staff would be happy to answer them. Normally, the Planning Commission makes comments that are forwarded to the Board via the Commission's minutes. He asked if there are any projects missing that they feel are important to consider that they should please notify staff.

Ms. Higgins questioned the traffic count on Jarman's Gap Road of 2,500 cars per day.

Mr. Benish stated that staff would get with VDOT on that issue. He pointed out that some of the projects do not have traffic counts. Staff will try to focus in on the technical addendum on the last page.

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on priority lists for road improvements. Staff presented an overview of the Six Year Secondary Road Plan for 2005-2011, which is VDOT's Plan for the allocation of road construction funds for a six year period. The Commission's discussion focused on identifying what additional information and/or clarification is needed prior to the final work session. The Commission asked staff to provide a map that includes the area around the road improvements being considered and to put the priority list in numeric order. The next work session is scheduled on October 25 at which time the Commission's comments will be taken. Staff asked that any comments or suggestions be forwarded to staff before the next work session. Staff will make the necessary adjustments to the County's Priority List and then pass their recommendation on to the Board of Supervisors.

Old Business:

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

New Business:

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was any new business.

Regarding his email to Bill Fritz requesting that the Commission be in the loop to receive correspondence, Mr. Edgerton asked if the other Commissioners wanted that or not. One of the problems that they have with getting the staff reports a week before the meeting is that the signs are posted to advertise these projects and the public comes down and does their homework. The public is a couple of weeks ahead of the Commissioners and start to ask questions before they have the information.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that in the past the Planning Commission's approach has been that they want to respond after they see staff information. Therefore, if people are calling them in advance they have taken the position that it is better to be able to say that we hear what you say and when we get the staff report and see the information and comments of people, then they will be in a better situation to address what they are raising. So based on that staff has not tried to burden the Commission with advance information, but send it out all at once. If there are any questions, staff will be happy to receive the Commissioners phone calls or provide advance correspondence.

It was the consensus of the Planning Commission not to receive copies of everything and they asked that staff notify Mr. Fritz.

Mr. Thomas stated that on Thursday night he was going to attend the Carrsbrook Homeowner's Association on North Town Center. He asked if anyone from staff would be there.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested that he call Bill Fritz of Current Development.

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. to the October 18, 2005 meeting that begins at 4:00 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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