Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 7, 2006

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, February 7, 2006, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Bill Edgerton, Jo Higgins, Eric Strucko, Jon Cannon, Calvin Morris, Vice-Chairman and Pete Craddock. Absent was Marcia Joseph, Chairman. Julia Monteith, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia, representative for David J. Neuman, FAIA, Architect for University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Bill Fritz, Development Review Manager; David Swales, Watershed Manager; Francis MacCall, Senior Planner; Claudette Grant, Senior Planner; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Ron White, Director of Housing and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris 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. Morris 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 – February 1, 2006.

Mr. Morris deferred the Review of the Board of Supervisors Meeting until next week due to Mr. Cilimberg's absence.

Consent Agenda*:*

Approval of Planning Commission Minutes – September 13, 2005
SDP 2005-0125 Kenridge – Critical Slopes Waiver request (Steve Tugwell)

Mr. Morris asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull the item from the consent agenda for further review.

Mr. Edgerton asked to pull SDP-2005-0125, the Kenridge matter, for discussion from the consent agenda.

Motion: Ms. Higgins moved, Mr. Craddock seconded, that the consent agenda be approved excluding SDP-2005-0125, Kenridge.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0. (Commissioner Joseph was absent.)

Mr. Morris stated that the consent agenda has been approved.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he was a little frustrated with the staff report on Kenridge, but he thought that they had gotten that solved. He hoped everybody got copies of the actual layout with the critical slopes shown. There is a large scale map up there. The shaded areas are the critical slopes. As the staff report notes the Commission recommended against approval of this at our hearing last fall. It subsequently went to the Board and they did approve the rezoning. The Commission is looking at the preliminary plat, which for approval requires a waiver of disturbance of critical slopes. He was troubled when they saw this the first time with the density that was being proposed and the apparent disregard for the critical slopes. I think some of the other Commissioners were as well. I was hoping that someone could tell him from staff's perspective whether the Board expressed any concern in their review of the critical slopes.

Mr. Fritz stated that he got with Claudette Grant, since he was not actually at the Board meeting, to determine if they came up with issues. It does not appear that they came up with any comments.

Mr. Edgerton stated that it was not even discussed.

Mr. Fritz stated that there was no record of it.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he did not think it would be appropriate for the Commission to make a recommendation without seeing the information, which was why he asked for it. He asked if any of the other Commissioners had any concerns.

Mr. Craddock stated that he would like to ask a procedural question since the Board of Supervisors has already approved the rezoning.

Mr. Fritz stated that this one was slightly different than the special use permit the Commission heard recently. This was a special use permit. So it still has other uses. The applicant can revert to the by right uses. Whereas, in the other case they were stuck and had a rezoning and an application plan that was what they could do. But, yes, it was a special use permit. What he was saying is correct that it was approved by the Board of Supervisors with a concept plan. This is in general accord with the concept plan. The critical slopes were shown and discussed. It was in your staff report. It did not get an action because the Commission had recommended denial of the special use permit. And hindsight, they should have asked the Commission to take a second action on the critical slope modification to either approve or deny it. In the event the Commission could have recommended denial of the special use permit, but approved the critical slopes modification subject to Board approval or they could have denied both and then the Board could have taken the modification up as an appeal. But, as it happened it simply did not happen. That is why the request is back before the Commission.

Ms. Higgins stated that there were critical slopes shown on the plan that they saw. But, there are issues that are in the staff report: the internal parking, storm water management and affordability. But, really the real kicker on this that they had an extensive conversation on was the affordability issue and how to address it. They were still in policy issues. She assumed that the Board had the final say in that. But, she would also say that with respect to the critical slopes consideration that these critical slopes are not associated with any streams or stream banks or protected areas. The concept plan was changed and reduced from 88 down to 60 units. It was always assumed that the slopes in those areas would be disturbed in almost any plan that they had seen. So that was the findings.

Mr. Fritz stated that those were staff's findings in the special use permit, also.

Ms. Higgins stated that the Commission had a minor discussion about that, but it was really about the other issues that obviously the Board has approved. So I would say that it would be consistent to approve the critical slopes.

Motion: Ms. Higgins moved, Mr. Cannon seconded, that SDP-2005-0125, Kenridge Critical Slopes Waiver request be approved.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:1. (Commissioner Edgerton voted nay.) (Commissioner Joseph was absent.)

Mr. Morris stated that SDP-2005-0125, Kenridge Critical Slopes Waiver Request, has been approved.

***Regular Items**:*

SUB 2005-0355 Keswick Subdivision – Final Plat: Request for final plat approval to create 49 lots on 167.445 acres. The property is zoned RA, Rural Area. The property, described as Tax Map 80 Parcel 8, is located in the Rivanna Magisterial District off of Club Drive in the Keswick Subdivision just off of Black Cat Road [Route # 616] approximately 1 mile from the intersection of Black Cat Road and Route Richmond Road 250 E. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area.
(Francis MacCall)

Mr. MacCall summarized the staff report.

- This is an application that the Planning Commission has reviewed the preliminary plat back in April, 2005. There was a specific condition with that approval that the Commission looks at the

final plat. That is what is before the Commission in the application, the final plat. One of the other conditions spoke to being in compliance with SP-2000-33. With regards specifically to condition #4, which is Attachment C, that basically states that the applicant demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Director of Engineering and Public Works or the Planning Commission that the existing central water system approved under the permit listed provides adequate well water to serve all of the off set lots as well as the existing improvements and associated uses and platted lots without compromising on site and adjacent off site well water supplies. A Tier IV Ground Water Assessment has been completed and is also a part of the report. It was found favorable with regards to no affecting those adjacent properties or the existing wells. David Swales, the Ground Water Manager, is here and can answer any questions. The applicant is here if the Commission has any further questions. But, with a positive finding regarding compliance of condition #4 of the SP-2000-33 the final subdivision plat may be approved administratively.

Ms. Higgins stated that this was basically under the new rules. Therefore, she suggested that they have the Ground Water Manager come up and give the Commission some background information.

Mr. Morris invited David Swales to address the Commission.

David Swales, Ground Water Manager, stated that staff requested the Tier IV Ground Water Report. At Keswick they pumped two wells at hand position, which is basically full valve at wide open at about 100 gallons a minutes between the two wells. They had 7 observation wells, which is more than is required by our ordinance. None of those off site observation wells showed any water table depletion during the test.

Mr. Edgerton asked how they measured that.

Mr. Swales stated that they measured that with level meters, which are level loggers depending on the brand. It is a pressure gauge that is in the water in these wells that takes real time measurements of the water table. One of them that was on site went down 2 feet and quickly recovered while the pumping was still going on showing that there was adequate water there. Between the wells off site not showing any deflection and the wells that were pumping maintaining their pumping rate the full 72 hours, their consultant and I agreed that there was both adequate water for the subdivision and it was not affecting off site wells.

Ms. Higgins stated that there was a letter in the report about the 2001 approval. She asked if this was an expansion of the existing well system. How does this fit into the overall Keswick approval. Item #5 on the original approval in 2001 said if a central water system must be expanded to meet the future existing demand. So this was going to be an expansion of the existing.

Mr. MacCall stated no. If it was an expansion it would have had to go before the Board of Supervisors. This had already been looked at with the Department of Health permits that are referenced in the report. It was already discussed during that special use permit review and approval. But, this was not an expansion of the central water system.

Ms. Higgins asked if it was a new water system.

Mr. Edgerton stated that it was the old one.

Mr. MacCall stated that it was on existing central wells.

Ms. Higgins asked if this went through the test of what exists now.

Mr. Swales stated yes, and that the capacity was not increased on the site.

Mr. Craddock stated that at the end of the letter that he had sent to Mr. Malure, it says as well as contingency plan comment. What is a contingency plan?

Mr. Swales stated that the contingency plan would be to come to the Planning Commission and the Board and requesting another well. If these did not proof to be enough water they would have to request, he believed, by special use permit permission from this Commission and the Board before any additional well. They have acreage and what's probably a favorable site to provide that if they had a need for it. But, that would be left up to the Commission and Board. So that is their contingency plan if they need more water.

Mr. Craddock stated that if five years down the road if they need more water, then they have to come back.

Mr. Swales stated yes, that was his understanding.

Ms. Higgins pointed out that a couple of years ago Peacock Hill did some additional wells and that condition did kick in.

Mr. Morris asked if there were any further questions for staff. There being none, he opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward and address the Commission.

Richard Carter, attorney representing Keswick Corporation, stated that he would be very brief. The water test was done. The results ended up so that when this phase of the subdivision is completely built out they would have an excess of 10,000 gallons per day of water. That is when these 48 lots are all built out. At the way that Keswick sells these lots and the price that these lots are they are looking at probably 5 lots a year or 6 lots a year. So this could be a 7 to 10 year project before they are built out. At that time they would still have 10,000 extra gallons per day. Ms. Higgins and Mr. Craddock are correct in asking if we wanted to expand the system what we would do. What would be our contingency plan? We would have to come back here. As you know from other hearings that you had over the year and maybe some of the newer members don't, we have what is called a ring fence agreement so that they cannot expand any more than where they are. This was an agreement that was entered into by Piedmont Environmental Council years ago. So this as far as residential lots is pretty much it. We think that we were the guinea pigs with the Tier IV. We were naturally nervous. But, they were very delighted with the end results. We also have water people here tonight. Our water consultant is here if the Commission wants to hear from him. We have engineers here and we have representatives from Keswick. He would like at this point in time to take any questions that you might have and reserve any other time for rebuttal in case some other questions come up later.

Mr. Morris asked if there were any questions for the applicant. There being none, he invited public comment from any one else that would like to address this matter.

Michael Peoples, and adjacent resident, stated that he spoke last time. First he wanted to touch real quickly on what Mr. Swales and Mr. Craddock brought up about the need for additional water supply in the future. It was his understanding that in order to get approval for the final plat Keswick needed to figure out what their water requirements were period. It was not today. It was not for 49 or 48 lots or whatever the numbers are. He noted that he had heard two numbers already again today, but, for this actual project. Now they are talking about if they have to come back in the future. That strikes me as kind of odd. Another thing that has not been mentioned is the fact that although yes they did pass a Tier IV water test one thing that has not been mentioned is that it is not actually the existing well system that they had when they came up before you for the preliminary. One of their wells got shut down by VHD for e-coli and they had to dig a new well. He guessed that was allowed under their existing special use permit because they are allowed to have three wells. One of the questions that I wanted to ask was whether or not the new well that was dug was the same size as the old well that got shut down or was it bigger or at the same capacity. He did not know. But, so that is one thing. Some other issues that were addressed during the preliminary were that they needed to identify every lot and either identifies it as an actual lot or as open space or as residual or something. He did speak at length earlier today with staff and apparently tax map/parcel 106 has been taken out of the subdivision portion. So now it is just kind of sitting there by itself. So it is no longer considered part of the subdivision. His concern now is what does that mean. What is it? The last thing is that he still has some confusion over the vesting issue. This came up during the preliminary. He knew that a new law was passed a couple of months after the special use permit in 2001 was issued. But, when you read the zoning ordinance one of the first things in the

zoning ordinance says do not read anything into the zoning ordinance, but read it because this is what it says. So for this panel or for anybody else for that matter to assume that a new law changes the responsibilities for someone to vest that special use permit is wrong.

Mr. Morris asked if there was anyone else that wanted to address the Commission. There being no one, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back before the Commission.

Ms. Higgins stated that based on the questions that the adjacent property owner has asked it is my assumption that a replacement well, of course, has to be tested and when they talk about size it is really not about size, but it was about capacity. But, that would probably not be in the purview of anything. She asked if staff has any background information on that. If they had three wells and if they had a problem with one, would replacing them not be an expansion issue but an existing situation.

Mr. MacCall stated that he could not comment on the size. But, the applicant might be able to do that. But, because of the contamination they cut off the supply to that well. Therefore, when they dug the new well there is still just three wells. Therefore, it was deemed that it was not an expansion of the system. But, if they were to come back on line and want to reactivate the fourth well, they would have to get the Board of Supervisor's approval for the expansion of the central water system.

Ms. Higgins asked if staff could give them some background on lot 106 that he has referred to.

Mr. MacCall stated that lot 106 was on sheet 15, but sheet 7 of the plat. Between the preliminary approval and the final, the applicant came in and provided a combination plat that combined all of the existing parcels that had been presented to us in the preliminary and created one large parcel that is represented in this application. That is what they are then subdividing. They then just a portion of 106 and made it basically part of lot 70. The combination is what did that. They took a portion of lot 106 and added it to what is now considered parcel 8. That meets the requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance and they are permitted to do that. It is basically a boundary line adjustment that they basically did not include in this subdivision 106, which was originally shown on the preliminary plat as a residue that staff had questioned that they needed to address it being that certain number of lots, which they had since done that by removing only a portion of that to add to this and leaving it as the parcel that it was in existence minus that small corner.

Ms. Higgins asked how does that affect the count and what is the excess.

Mr. MacCall stated that it just went down one lot from what they originally looked at. He thought that it was 50 in the preliminary and it is not 49. If you look at the very top of the page it says that there is an existing 20 foot right-of-way. It never had road frontage in the first place. So they were not making it any more non-conforming. It already was non-conforming because it did not have public street frontage. They were not changing that alteration. So that was not a requirement that they actually have street frontage for that lot. It was just part of the review in meeting that regulation outlined in the ordinance. But, they still did have access to the public street by the 20 foot access easement. It goes onto page 17, which is sheet 8. The applicant pointed out that lot still did have access.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was a driveway.

Mr. MacCall stated that there was nothing on that parcel currently. So there is no kind of driveway.

Mr. Edgerton stated that what now is lot 70, the 2.4889 acres, was a part of tax map 80, parcel 106.

Mr. MacCall stated that if you square off the rectangle on the end that was the portion that was taken off of 106

Ms. Higgins stated that what he was saying was that the plat had been reviewed and that is not an issue because it is no less non-conforming and it is not part of the special use permit because it is excluded.

Mr. Fritz stated that if there was ever anything proposed on 106 it would be a new review. If it was subject to the special use permit conditions, it would have to comply with those and any concept plan

there. If a portion of it is not subject to the special use permit, and this goes with this parcel or any other parcel, then it would have to go through its review and a 20 foot right-of-way would not be adequate. They would need to do a private road analysis or a public road analysis. It would be new business before you. It is either a portion of it or all of it is subject to a special use permit.

Ms. MacCall stated that it is. The original special use permit limited in this whole entire Keswick subdivision he believed 122 lots. The 49 addition to the existing lots brings it up to 120.

Ms. Higgins stated that she understood why the adjacent property owners are questioning that because it looks like it is immediately adjacent to their family property. But, it is staying in a large parcel scenario. If anything happens there will be notice to the adjacent property owners.

Mr. Cannon stated that he had a question about what the water test means. It sounded very persuasive with their technical detail. He just wanted to make sure that he understands what they show. It says here that the summary is that the tests would be designed to show that the water available on the site could support the use as approved by the special use permit and not compromise on site and adjacent well water supplies. He assumed that means including not compromising well water supplies of adjacent properties.

Mr. MacCall stated that was correct.

Mr. Cannon asked if that means if adjacent properties were developed at the same density as is proposed to develop this property that those properties could be assured of adequate water to meet the new demand. He asked if that means no compromise existing on site uses or does it include not compromising future possible on site uses that would be comparable in density or demand to it.

Mr. Fritz asked that Mr. Swales answer that question.

Ms. Higgins was not sure if Mr. Swales understands how this works. But, the Tier IV assessment required this to be covered under the special use permit. It is my understanding that they are not expanding the well system. But, with this many los they might not have had as good results. They might of have had to. That is why there is a provision in the '01 approvals that says if they can't meet the demand then they would have to come back through the Health Department and the Board of Supervisors. But, they did not have to do that because of the results and the way he understands it from Mr. Carter, it is not only have they met it for the current, but for all of the lots would develop and still have 10,000 gallons per day.

Mr. Cannon stated that was all of the lots that they would develop on this particular track, and Ms. Higgins stated that was correct.

Mr. Cannon stated that he was interested in just understanding the extent to which they are able to certify that this will have no effect now or in the future lots and their ability to have adequate water. That is all.

Mr. Swales stated that is based on the fact that they pumped the two wells that are about 100 gallons per minute for 72 hours. During that time they had 7 wells being monitored with the water tables. Those 7 locations were picked and the consultant, ACI, Inc., with me looked around their end. They looked at the geogeologically of the area and selected sites that are in their direct hydraulic-geologic trend and on the east side and the west side. Given the practically that once you are off their property, it is difficult to get monitors. They were successful in getting five, which in my opinion is very good. Based on those 5, they were available and in making sure that they spread it out to look at the different east/west and their trends and towards populated areas. None of those wells went down any whatsoever. So what that is telling us is that during that time it was not drawing water in any measure able faction from the surrounding area. That is really just the fact of the matter at the timing. It was showing no evidence of taking water from adjacent properties.

Mr. Cannon stated that they could project that result long term with the expectation that this water use would not either on the near term or the long term detract from any water demand or water use on adjacent properties.

Mr. Swales stated that it was impossible to say it never will. Just like it is in our own back yards will our own well every run dry. Based on the pumping and all of the data, there is no evidence that it is taking water from adjacent wells.

Mr. Craddock stated that on this 10,000 gallons over capacity is for the whole Keswick Subdivision and it was not just for these 49 lots. It includes the club.

Mr. Swales stated yes, it does.

Mr. Cannon asked if there was some rule of thumb of the maximum density that can be supported by wells on the land and the landscape where they live. Is there some level below which you cannot go in terms of density in order to assure that there will be adequate supplies?

Mr. Swale stated that there was nothing that has a valid number. It would all be guess work.

Mr. Morris asked if there were any other questions or concerns.

Mr. Cannon asked what the issue was before the Commission tonight. He asked if the scope was just limited to whether there is adequate water supply for these 49 residential uses on this property.

Mr. Edgerton stated that was where they left it last time.

Ms. Higgins stated that the condition that requires them to proof that they have adequate water has been satisfied.

Mr. Morris asked what action the Commission wants them to take.

Mr. Fritz stated that they wanted them to find it in compliance with condition #4.

Motion: Mr. Edgerton moved, Mr. Strucko seconded, to find SUB-2005-0355, Keswick Subdivision Final Plat, in compliance with condition #4 of SP-2000-033; the final subdivision plat may be approved administratively.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0. (Commissioner Joseph was absent.)

Mr. Morris stated that condition #4 has been approved.

Ms. Higgins felt that it was worth saying that this assessment is the best that you can do considering that water availability is an extreme concern and this is the first of probably the ones to come in the future. There is no absolute guarantee, but for the best of the information available that this is a good thing to have implemented.

Mr. Morris stated that proposal has been approved.

***Work sessions**:*

ZMA 2005-018 Wickham Pond - Phase II (Sign #7)
PROPOSAL: Rezone 21.35 acres from RA - Rural Areas: agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (.05 unit/acre) to NMD Neighborhood Model District - residential (3 - 34 units/acre) mixed with commercial, service and industrial uses. Maximum number proposed residential units: Approximately 124. Approximately 41,000 sq. ft. commercial uses.
PROFFERS: Yes
EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Corridor General (CT4) - mixed residential and commercial uses (4.5 units per acre for SFD, sfa & duplexes) (12 units per acre for townhouses and apartments) (18 units per acre for mixed use). Urban Edge (CT3) - supports center with predominately residential uses, especially single-family detached (3.5-4.5 units per acre) (6.5 units per acre if accessory apartments are added for 50% of the residential stock). Development Area Reserve (CT2) and Preserve

(CT1) - development area open space preserve or reserve with very low residential density (1 unit per 20 acres).
LOCATION: Tax Map 56 Parcel 91. Between Route 240 and the C & O railroad. Approximately 2,200 feet from intersection of Route 240 and Highlands Drive.
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: White Hall
STAFF: Claudette Grant

Ms. Grant summarized the staff report:

- The area to be rezoned is located in Crozet between Route 240 and the C & O Railroad. The applicant is requesting to rezone 21.35 acres from Rural Area to Neighborhood Model Zoning District. They would like to allow approximately 41,000 square feet of commercial buildings and approximately 124 residential units, which would be made up of 64 condominiums, approximately 8 to 16 affordable units and 52 single family units.

- This work session is planned to familiarize the Planning Commission with the project and to discuss several issues that would benefit from advanced input. The Commission is asked to provide feedback on the rezoning proposal and input on the discussion questions. The project is organized in 6 blocks.

- Block 1 consists of 16 single family residences with attached garages. Block 1 is actually adjacent to the existing Wickham Pond One. Block 2 includes 11 single family residences, and the garages would be accessed by an alley in the rear. Block 3 also consists of 11 single family residences, and would also be accessible by an alley. Block 4 includes 14 single family residences, which will front and have garages on the main road. Block 5 is located in the center of the development and has a 5,000 square foot commercial building that might be used for office or retail as well as 8 affordable dwelling units in a building across from the commercial building. Finally, block 6 is located at the front of the property. It consists of 4 mixed use buildings. The buildings would have 3 stories and face each. The uses would be retail and office on the lower level and residential uses on the upper levels.

- Generally speaking the development meets the Neighborhood Model principles with a few questions, which are the questions staff has asked the Planning Commission to think about and discuss with us.

1. **<u>Design and layout</u>**

   Is the design and layout appropriate for the development (Emphasis on Blocks 5 & 6)?

   Staff wants to know if these buildings that the applicant is proposing would be in keeping with what is on 240 and whether you think this is appropriate for 240.

   - The Commission generally agreed with staff's concerns regarding the design and layout proposal.

     The look, design, height and scale of the buildings would be different than what is currently located on Route 240.

     The renderings of the proposed buildings located in Block 6 are similar to buildings located in a small "downtown". The issue is that these downtown type buildings are located outside of a downtown.

     The Commission believes that the buildings in Blocks 5 and 6 are not appropriate to the setting in size, scale, and massing and should be setback further from the road and reduced in size and scale.

The Commission questioned the feasibility of sub terrain parking.

- The Planning Commission supports the proposed hedgerow.

2. **Residential Density**

   Does the Planning Commission find the proposal consistent with the Crozet Master Plan with regard to residential densities?

   In general consensus, the Planning Commission believes the residential density is in keeping with the Crozet Master Plan. The applicant is requesting a fewer number of units than what would be allowed at maximum.

3. **Mixture of uses**

   Is the mix of uses proposed in Wickham Pond Phase 2 appropriate?

- The Planning Commission was generally in support of allowing some commercial use, but that the commercial use should be pushed back into the site or have smaller structures. The Commission questioned if the commercial use was proposed as a center or just mixed use on the edge of the development area. The Commission questioned whether allowing 41,000 square feet of commercial located on the edge of the development area was too much.

4. **Mixture of housing types**

   Is the mixture of housing types proposed by the applicant for Wickham Pond Phase 2 appropriate? Generally speaking staff feels that is true, but would like to get the Commission's input on that.

- The Planning Commission generally believes that the mix of housing types is appropriate.

5. **Interconnections**

   Are the interconnections proposed by the applicant appropriate and do they meet the intent of the Crozet Master Plan? With that issue they do show that there is an interconnection on this site to Wickham Pond One. There is an interconnection to the west to a property. Something to think about is whether that interconnection should be lower on the site to connect more with the portion of the property to the west that has a development area. Right now the connection is shown into a preserved area. Staff is not sure if that is where that should be or if it should be located more in a development.

Ms. Higgins asked what staff meant by a preserve area.

Ms. Grant stated that it was designated as CT-1 or CT-2, which was preserve area.

Mr. Strucko asked if there was a stream on the adjacent property.

Ms. Grant stated that there was a house on the adjacent property.

Ms. Higgins asked what the difference was where it comes out and when she said moving it back into the property.

Ms. Grant stated that it would be moving it more south on the property where the area is designated as a CT-3.

Ms. Higgins asked staff to have the applicant go through why the uses are located where they are. She felt that background information would enable the Commission to address the questions individually.

Mr. Morris asked if what she was saying was that once they went through the outline that they should then invite the applicant up to give an overview and then as they go through each individual question they could allow the applicant to comment. He asked that the applicant finish her brief, and then ask the applicant for an overview.

Ms. Grant continued to the next question, which has to do with affordable housing.

6. **Affordable housing**

   Is the applicant making appropriate provisions for affordable housing within the Wickham Pond - Phase 2 development? The applicant has indicated that they plan to provide 16 affordable units. Eight units would be in a multi-family building or an apartment. The other 8 would be in Block 6 at the front of the house, and would be incorporated within the other units that are located over the retail and office space.

7. **Off-site impacts and Proffers**

   Are the proffers submitted adequate to meet the impacts generated by this development? In this case the applicant has submitted 4 proffers. One of the proffers staff has indicated should not be included. Therefore, there are only 3 proffers. Therefore, the very first proffer is the one that does not need to be included because it is already a standard in the Neighborhood Model District.

In conclusion, there are other items that staff is still in need of information that are still outstanding and will be addressed by the applicant prior to public hearing which include:

- Storm water management strategies.
- Additional information on ARB review.
- Clarification of the parking analysis.
- Revisions to the application plan, and code of development.
- A traffic impact analysis.
- Additional information on use of gravity flow sewer.
- Provision of additional information on green space and amenities.

Ms. Grant pointed out that for tonight's purposes staff would like to get some input from the Commission in terms of the questions she just mentioned.

Ms. Higgins asked if they had no ARB feedback at this point, and Ms. Grant replied no that this has not gone to the ARB as yet.

Ms. Echols noted that had deliberately been done because the ARB Planner wanted to get some input from us as to what uses were appropriate and the massing on the plan before they start looking at the architecture. Staff wanted to bring it to the Planning Commission first.

Mr. Morris asked if there were any questions for staff before he asked the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he would like to urge the applicant to rather than just giving a general presentation to touch on some of the concerns and questions that staff had raised in the staff report and give his perspective of that. He felt that would make it more meaningful.

Vitto Cetta, representative for Weather Hill Homes, stated that this project was definitely located in the growth area. It was very much a Neighborhood Model project. They have done several properties in the Crozet area such as Waylands Grant, which has a lot of the elements that they are looking for in the Neighborhood Model. This proposal reflects very much what the Comp Plan has with this piece of land. It looks for two access points, which is provided. It has 3 zones. There is a Rural Preservation zone along this road. It gets to be a larger area. The higher density is towards the road and the lower density is to the rear of the site. The density is located all within that area. The rear portion of the site is single family detached. There is some front loaded and also some alley loaded. In the pictures that the Commission is not seeing tonight there are examples of Park Side in Crozet where they do have front loaded houses.

They prefer not to do that, but they are very careful to have fences to narrow that up. They recessed the garage doors. They have trellises over top of the garage doors to help soften the garage door look. All of the units have big front porches. So when you see the final pictures he felt that they would agree that it was a fine soft look. They are all detached on this portion of the site. In the growth area the densities are so high that so much that we all see is attached product. They wanted to get some detached product. The lots are small, but they think that it is an appropriate thing to do. The market very much needs it. The building in question is mostly in the CT-3, which really does not provide for commercial. There is a continuation of the road from Wickham One. They continued it on to the next property. On the Comp Plan they don't extend that road, but Ms. Grant and he thought that it should be continued. It looks like it is logical. To answer their question, the other line is an angular line. There is a stream in there. It is very limited on what can be built on that site. At most it would be about 10 homes on it. It is mostly going to be left as a natural area. You will also notice that even the land to the left as you go into Western Ridge is left as green space.

Mr. Cetta pointed out that the property was almost all pasture. There are trees at the fence line. There is a pond, a railroad and Route 240. It is all RA zoned beyond it. So this piece right in here is a CT-3. All of this is left open. In Western Ridge they have a road that stops right there. They think that it was an oversight in the Comp Plan. They think that road was intended to come through and connect. So they have made that provision and that road would be connected into these other sites. There is an older house on the property. The shed is located on the adjacent property. At the intersection is a commercial intersection. On the left side they have a building that is either going to be 8 condos or 8 apartments, which will be affordable. So that is right in the middle of the community. This is another building that they thought would be appropriate for a commercial use, a church, a restaurant or any number of things. It is mostly in the CT zone that does not call for commercial. Frankly, they are open to what the Commission thinks is appropriate for that location. Ms. Grant had called them out on that one. Again, an alley runs through the site serving these houses. This area is fairly level and they felt it would be an ideal location for a ball field. It is about the size of two football fields. Between the two communities they have a total of about 200 homes with a large open space that active play would be an appropriate thing to do. In front there is a buffer which is required by the Comp Plan. That pond gets preserved just like it is. It is a fairly large open space in here and the trees would remain. The main discussion tonight would probably be this building. They envision this as main street. They are very open to whatever is appropriate. If they look at this site and counted rooftops, you have Western Ridge, Highlands to the right, R-2 projects and there is absolutely no commercial in this area.

Ms. Higgins pointed out the location of a daycare and Martha Jefferson. She also pointed out several other commercial properties in the general area.

Mr. Cetta stated that the image that he had was a child coming home from school and going to the dentist. What happens in Crozet now is that they essentially get in the car and their parents drive them to town, wait for them and then drive them back. That was truly the intent of the Comp Plan to have pockets of commercial that would be neighborhood serving to go get ice cream, go see your lawyer or real estate office. As was pointed out by planning that this area might be too intense, but they were wide open because whatever was right is what they were going to do. There is clearly no guideline in the Neighborhood Model or the Comp Plan that talks about the relationship of how much commercial you really want to have in there.

Mr. Edgerton noted that it was actually Wickham One that he was pointing to.

Mr. Strucko asked Mr. Cetta to briefly explain Wickham Pond One so that he could understand the relationship.

Mr. Cetta stated that the entrance was near Highlands. This is higher density which was mostly attached housing. The other was single family homes with garages in the rear. There is a row that loops through it with a combination of single family homes and townhouse. The affordable units are actually the lower level of these townhouses. It is owned by the person above and is rented to someone else there. There are ten of those and four over here.

Ms. Higgins asked if all of the first four buildings were residential.

Mr. Cetta stated that everything in here is residential in this community. There is a little park located in here.

Ms. Higgins stated that at the time that Wickham One was considered there was an issue about commercial uses. It has been raised in the staff report about the square footage of the commercial uses. She understands his idea about going to the dentist and children coming home, but gives us a perspective of 3 stories on 240 where you are driving down one side of Rural Area and then you have 3-three story buildings with a main street look. She felt that this was where the Comp Plan and this diverge. She did not see that. She knew he wanted to put the commercial on the front and not internally, but this is a controversial issue. Based on the staff report discussion, which is on page 9, where it says that it is not consistent with the Crozet Master Plan to have as much as 41,000 square feet. She noted that she had not heard anything convincing about that. That concern is a drastic change. It is not like he was starting with some residential and then two story to three story. He was going right from zero to three stories.

Mr. Cetta stated that the first question that he had for the board was if it was appropriate to have any kind of commercial here. If they asked him, he would say yes it would be kind of nice to have something here. He lived in a village that was all townhouses, which were built in the 20's, and there was a little store in the middle of it. It was a little sandwich shop and it could not have been more delightful. It was a wonderful spot.

Mr. Edgerton felt that they would like some commercial because that is what the Neighborhood Model asks for. But, he felt that Ms. Higgins's comment was correct in that maybe it should be pushed back a little bit and there be a little bit of sensitivity that in our Comprehensive Plan the growth area ends at this point. And on this side they hope that there will be some preservation of the rural feel. Without trying to redesign, but if this could be pushed back a little further into the site the commercial part or maybe they could have smaller structures at this edge. He stated that he wanted some commercial.

Ms. Higgins stated that when she looked at it she felt that the mixed use was important, but what she was trying to get in context is that it is almost if Wickham Pond One and Two were added together you could have done almost like a center type thing. But, here it looks typical by putting the commercial up front and the houses behind it. Then they have done that again. She felt that it might have been a different design if he had done both of them at once. But, it is just now they have put the commercial at the front. When you put it on the narrowest piece on the flattest area that is at the elevation that you really can't deal with any human scale and use the topo to your advantage, it puts you in the flattest spot and then you are going three stories. She felt that it was going to be a pretty drastic view from 240. She asked how the 41,000 square feet compare to the available commercial like in the little downtown area of Crozet. She felt that everything this issue comes up that they have to balance these things. It is probably not walk able because it is too far to walk from here. Are they creating almost like a duplicate? Or is this one of the centers. Are they just looking for mixed use or are they looking for a center here. If they are trying to do a center, then you can't do anything across the road because they are on the edge. So that is the issues that she thought need to be addressed to make that work. You can't do it to the back because there is a railroad track. They have not tied it to Wickham One and now they have preservation to the other side. So how do you make it the center of something? It is on the very edge of the growth area. She challenged him to address these issues.

Mr. Strucko asked how many residential units are in Wickham One and Two combined.

Mr. Cetta stated that there are a little over 200.

Mr. Strucko stated that as Ms. Higgins's said a commercial enterprise needs a critical mass of people to remain viable. He was not sure if 200 residents were enough. There is no interconnection with the Highlands. Since it was built out they would have to demolish a house to make a connection. The railroad track limits you to the south to connect with Western Ridge. There is another private property owner who would probably want to keep the house and barn intact. He asked if the strategy to locate the commercial use on the road to pick up a bigger customer base for potential commercial users that will be living here, but can't access it any other way.

Mr. Cetta stated that there were several answers to this. But, first he happens to agree with everything that they have talked about. They also are prepared to proffer this portion of the site for a minimum because they won't have to start construction for at least three years. All of this parking, except for a little visitor out here, is all subterranean parking. When you go to a CT-4 you are dealing with the zones of high density. If you try to surface parking them it will essentially fill the entire site. That is why you have to bury the parking. They think that the product, frankly, is ahead of its time. It is something that is planned for, but they want to let the market catch up to it. At some point this will be appropriate.

Ms. Higgins stated that he was talking about the most level part of entry of this property to do a subterranean parking.

Mr. Cetta pointed out that the entrance was behind it here and here. One would park at the front of the building and then go in and pick up your dry cleaning and come right out at street level. The market today will not absorb this. There are not nearly enough rooftops to support this. That is why they have intentionally said let's wait a minimum of three years after the site plan is approved to even consider it. It is possible that another thing that the Planning Commission might want to do is just simply say let's go back to this portion of it at a later date. He stated that they want to do this right as well. He also agrees with everything that Ms. Higgins said that it is a massive building. They have a suggested solution that they want to show them. Everything they propose would reduce the amount of commercial to no more than one-half of this or less than one-half of what they have now. But, they still think that the appropriate solution is stacked flats with sub terrain parking and to hide the parking. They would leave the field open because it is the flat area of the site. Even those condos were several years away before the market will absorb that. If you look at what they did at White Gables, which are three levels over sub terrain parking. They are now finished. It is an awful nice look. But, it will not be absorbed today. People are not going to drive to Crozet without commercial and live in a condo. He did not think that is right. When they did the original there was no commercial in front. They felt that here they would take a shot of what they call main street.

Mr. Strucko stated that he totally supports the idea of commercial, especially in an area as such a critical mass of residential. He was not just talking about these two Wickham Pond site combined, but he was talking about the adjacent Highlands and the Western Ridges. Even though there are several physical barriers for these folks to get there other than using 250, but, yes, he saw a huge residential mass right there. He saw potential problems for achieving commercial transactions. There is a master plan and lots of people want to divert commercial activity to the downtown area, but in order for these folks to get to downtown it is a vehicle trip. And then there are the vehicle trips on 250 through the Ivy, which is the district he represents on this Commission, to get to town. So again, in the vein of helping Crozet become a self sufficient community there has to be commercial enterprises in critical locations and this might be one. He heard Ms. Higgins' concern about the Entrance Corridor. He asked if a building like this was consistent with what is currently along 240. The answer is no because there is a variety of things along this road such as nice entrances into residential areas to run down homes. He did not think there was a consistent style. He voiced concern about having that large of buildings located on 240 with such a beautiful view on the other side of the road.

Ms. Higgins stated that staff indicated that it was basically not consistent with the Crozet Master Plan. Since the Master Plan was so recently crafted and she did not know if they had deviated from the Master Plan except in a less dense way. No solution to that is suggested here. She asked if staff had a suggestion.

Mr. Edgerton asked what staff's view.

Ms. Higgins stated that on page 9 staff indicated that it was not consistent with the Crozet Master Plan and had concerns with the non-residential area. It is what they were dancing around. Typically, if it is not consistent are you talking about a Comp Plan Amendment or just ignoring the plan. CT-3 is the restricted uses and it says first floor, one story per 300 dwellings, and it was not near that.

Ms. Grant stated that CT-4 says limited uses.

Ms. Higgins stated that at this scale it was not consistent at all.

Mr. Grant agreed.

Ms. Higgins asked if they were trying to decide which scale or if at all, and Ms. Grant stated that it was both of those things.

Ms. Echols stated that both of those questions were up for grabs. She felt that staff's position was that it was too much. The question is how much is enough and how much is too much.

Mr. Edgerton asked what would be an appropriate amount.

Ms. Higgins stated that one story per 300 units would be a fraction of this.

Mr. Cetta pointed out that he felt that they were getting two things confused. That question relates to the back piece of the site. That question only relates to the one building. It is not the other area.

Ms. Higgins stated that when you say that as much as 41,000 square feet of commercial use is CT-4 you are referring to the front.

Ms. Grant stated that was correct that they were referring to the front.

Ms. Higgins stated that was what she was talking about.

Ms. Echols stated that they could see from that listing of sort of the types of uses that they were smaller uses. They were not great big uses. She felt that they were more of the supportive uses or the kind of things that Mr. Cetta was describing. It would possibly be an office, a sandwich shop or something like that, but not one of everything. She felt that was where the 41,000 square feet seems to be over the top. It seems like it is more than you could reasonably expect to be in the CT-4. But, to answer you question, Mr. Edgerton, she did not know what the right number is. Staff can get some additional information from our business facilitator. But, she felt that if the Commission could give some direction on the kinds of businesses and you either do or don't want commercial in that area, then that would provide a tremendous amount of guidance.

Mr. Cannon asked if Phase One of Wickham Pond contains no commercial.

Mr. Cetta stated that was correct.

Mr. Cannon asked if it was reasonable for them to think about this in terms of commercial demands that might be flowing from both Phase One and Phase Two.

Mr. Edgerton stated that was absolutely correct.

Ms. Higgins stated that was the 200 number that they were talking about.

Mr. Cetta stated that there is the Highlands and Western Ridge, which was well over a 1,000 people.

Mr. Cannon stated that it was bigger than a bread box, but not as big as the entire world.

Mr. Strucko stated that his view was what kind of commercial activity and neighborhood support commercial activity like a daycare center, a coffee shop or a small grocery or something that would alleviate the need to get into your vehicle and go to either to Charlottesville.

Ms. Higgins stated that it would be about one-half of all of those buildings to meet all of those uses.

Mr. Strucko asked if that would be for 200 residents or a greater number.

Mr. Cetta stated that there were more houses than just in these two developments. There were probably 500 to 1,500 people in the immediate neighborhood now.

Mr. Strucko stated that he did not see Western Ridge people coming here with that railroad track.

Mr. Edgerton stated that architecturally he felt that he handled the massing of the buildings very nicely, but it is the scale that he was struggling with. He asked how much was being driven by the sub terrain parking.

Mr. Cetta stated that they did a three-story building with two over one and they said how many cars does it generate, and then that is what they need.

Mr. Edgerton asked if he realized that his football fields were gone.

Mr. Cetta stated yes, that they did not even try to do that. Also, they are proffering that plan. If you get other bigger projects that come through here they don't proffer the plan. They have every lot figured out and know the setbacks, etc. Another concept would have been to just describe what this was. They could say two story buildings with separating parking and limit it to 10,000 square feet of commercial space and limit it to 40 condo units. That could have been an answer and in some ways it may be the answer because it is down the road they are not going to spend their money on that. Nobody would because it is too early. At the same time you have an opportunity. Things are going to happen in Crozet. It is such a wonderful plan. There is going to be a need for it. He felt that everybody in this room agrees that some form of commercial needs to be there.

Mr. Craddock agreed.

Mr. Morris asked if at least some of the affordable housing will be in these buildings, and Mr. Cetta stated that very much so.

Ms. Higgins stated that was good and bad because that means that the affordable housing component that you are projecting will be done in the future, then where does that put the affordable housing component.

Mr. Edgerton stated that before they get completely away from the scale issue, on Wickham One these attached units here at least are presenting to 240 more of a residential scale. He was just wondering whether there might be a way to carry that scale up to where it fronts along the Rural Areas and maybe push the commercial back a little bit towards the rear. He felt that would help.

Mr. Cetta stated that their first reaction is to change the shape of these and make those two stories on grade with no commercial. That automatically would soften it because they would be breaking it up into smaller buildings. Then possible this other part would be the commercial area. That was their initial reaction. Regarding the affordable units, this phase in here requires eight affordable units and they have a lot selected for that. They have been working with Ron White of the Housing Office. They are prepared to do either rental or condos. It would be one building that they put in a very prominent spot. So they are going to have to design an interesting building. They want it to look like a big house. They are also prepared to delay the decision whether they are rental or condos until the County has an ordinance in place. But, that can happen within the next year. So this would have affordable in it as well. It would all be incorporated.

Ms. Higgins acknowledged that Mr. Cetta has been a leader of trying to implement the Neighborhood Model and build affordable unit. He has come to the table with a lot of ideas about that and she does respect that. She asked if they could talk about the other questions so that staff can have this input.

Mr. Cetta felt that they have covered all of the questions.

Ms. Higgins asked about question #2 on the residential density. You are less than the residential density. Staff believes that you are keeping with the Crozet Master Plan and she was not sure why it was on a point for discussion here. She asked if staff was just looking for an affirmation. She agreed.

Mr. Edgerton agreed.

Ms. Higgins stated skipping over the mixture of use going to the mixture of housing types, again she felt that the comparison with the Master Plan in the variety that he was offering is a good thing, but there is really no guidance about the specific number of the types of units. She was not as troubled by that. But, she did not know what staff wanted for that kind of feedback. She felt that the mixture was there.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he was looking at it with Wickham One and actually the variety that they got with the two together was quite a lot of variety of housing.

Mr. Strucko stated that the style was a Waylands Grant/Park Side style.

Mr. Cetta stated that was the intent.

Ms. Higgins felt that they would all be comfortable with that, particularly when you look at the two. She asked to touch on the interconnection one because she felt that was going to tie into that.

Mr. Morris asked if he could get feedback from Mr. Craddock on this. He noted that they have covered #1, #2, #3 and #4.

Mr. Craddock stated that he agreed with whatever had gone through on those, but was waiting for Ms. Higgins to get to #6.

Ms. Higgins stated that #1, #3 and #5 are all interrelated because she felt that the perspective of these CT areas and that this parcel has two different CT classifications and the lower is towards the front. Since she was an implementation person and if you are going abut a road out and build it like it is going to go somewhere with the idea that it would be inconsistent with the Master Plan to do anything with the front, it seems that this interconnection is potentially doable back a little bit further and maybe that works in with what everybody is talking about making this area more focal. Maybe that could diverge from that. They almost have it, except it is parking area.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that they put the parking area over on the other side.

Ms. Higgins suggested moving things because she felt that the interconnectivity is going to be important if there was any idea if it was ever going to connect over to the daycare center. That would get you closer to the crossover, which possibly gives you the walk able connection over the railroad track.

Ms. Echols stated that there was one thing about that crossover because staff has not looked through that as far as an interconnection goes very much. She felt that there was a stream crossing that might be necessary in order to make that interconnection.

Mr. Cetta stated yes, there is a stream through there.

Ms. Echols stated that may or may not be something that they want to decide right now.

Ms. Higgins pointed out the pipe that was piped through this whole site. It would not necessarily connect here at the daycare, but maybe it could connect around a different way. She felt that it did not need to be gritted. If you look at the Master Plan there are a lot of places where the proposed roads cross streams. She felt that was going to be part of the elements of how to do it the right way and get the proper approvals. She thought that those interrelated and consistency with the Master Plan maybe if they can get those points, but just not in the exact configuration as the plan shows. Then the affordable housing, she felt that they were a couple of units short in the percentages.

Mr. Cetta stated that the affordable housing was right on target after working out the numbers. This project absolutely meets every principle of the Neighborhood Model and they were proud of it, particularly with their addition of the commercial.

Ms. Higgins pointed out that they don't have any proffer lists so she did not know how to discuss #7. She asked if they have looked at what their traffic impacts are or anything like that. Therefore, she was not sure what input the Planning Commission would have at this point.

Mr. Strucko asked if they have street trees, sidewalks and all of that.

Mr. Cetta stated that they have all of that.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he could not tell from the plans if the street trees were actually separating the pavement from the sidewalks and if it was in some areas, but not in others.

Mr. Cetta stated that was correct in that it is just like in an urban section with a few trees. There is a green strip and a sidewalk. It is a 6 foot green space required today. He agreed that there was only one exception to that in one area.

Mr. Edgerton asked if it actually separates the pedestrian.

Mr. Cetta stated that was correct.

Mr. Cannon asked why he would not take advantage of the maximum density. The question for the Commission is why they would not encourage them to do that.

Mr. Cetta stated that if you took a 25 foot wide townhouse in today's market you could sell it for $75,000 in a project like this. If you double that to a 50 foot wide lot, which they have here, you can't get $150,000 because it is too much and you have to get less than that. In reality you are losing money. But, at the same time look at the Comp Plan it is mostly an attached product. There is a real need for a detached product even though the lots are small. They learned here that people will accept a small lot because there is other open space around it. It is a marketing position and a question of how many townhouses can you absorb.

Mr. Cannon stated that he was saying that it was a marketing decision and not a decision that was reacting that they would say that they don't want that much density.

Mr. Strucko stated that involved the population controversy.

Ms. Higgins pointed out that would be discussed at a later time.

Mr. Strucko asked what the difference was in what was the potential and what was actually proposed.

Ms. Higgins stated that it was around 198 as stated in the staff report.

Ms. Echols stated that was something that staff would like to come back to maybe at the next meeting. Staff is doing some work right now on the densities and on the way that plays out. There have been some memos sent to the Board of Supervisors. Staff needs to go back and relook at these numbers and provide some additional information on. Staff will provide more information on that.

Mr. Morris pointed out that he had talked with Mr. Cilimberg today and he stated that from now on they will have a running chart for Crozet and this is what we have now with this particular property brought before us and it will be increased to such and such. Staff is hoping to have that information next week.

Ms. Echols stated that staff will provide that information at a later date.

Mr. Cetta asked if they could come back in two weeks for one-half hour and address the front part of the site. They could probably come back with some sketches. They all seem to be in agreement that the entire site in general seems to work. The big question is the front. They have a sketch which they have not spent enough time on. If they could have 20 minutes in two weeks they would appreciate that.

Mr. Morris noted that in two weeks that is going to be a very busy agenda.

Mr. Cetta stated that they would take their chances and come back to the Commission with this all reworked.

Ms. Echols stated that would be on the 21st.

Ms. Higgins stated that there were only two items on the 21st right now.

Ms. Echols stated that the 28th was going to be a very busy meeting, but maybe the 21st would be suitable. Staff will determine the date.

Mr. Cetta stated that they would make a submittal prior to the meeting.

Mr. Morris asked if they have enough information on all 7 items. He noted that they don't have it for #7. Does any other Commissioner have input on this.

Ms. Higgins stated that she would really like the relatively of the amount of commercial you propose to downtown. All of downtown might add up to something less than he is proposing. She felt that they need to weigh that. The other thing she was really struggling with is that is this the right place to approach a center. She felt that they have a lopsided area being on the side of the Rural Areas. She was really struggling with that for anything of this mass and size.

Mr. Edgerton suggested that Mr. Cetta scale it back a little bit and move it in a little bit that he felt that it would make it more specific to these two phases and what is existing out there. That would go a long way. On page 8 in the second paragraph, the front of the site has a hedgerow that is a continuation of the hedgerow adjacent to Wickham Pond. He asked where that hedgerow is.

Mr. Cetta stated that the hedgerow was located right along the road.

Mr. Edgerton noted that it looked like it had all been opened up. He asked if they were going to leave all of that.

Mr. Cetta stated that unfortunately when you widen the road you destroy a lot of hedgerow, but they were going to replace it like they did on the first phase.

Mr. Edgerton stated that he hedgerow would be gone.

Ms. Higgins asked if there was a way to get a right turn in there without affecting the adjacent property. They have moved the entrance so far to the west.

Mr. Cetta stated that was a pretty important question. But, the dilemma is that in order for them to do this they have to widen this road. They would have to go to this homeowner and the County is not prepared to condemn anybody's land. So the homeowner's right now want an absolute fortune for that additional land for that right-of-way. They are proposing to do the entrance another way without that land.

Ms. Higgins stated that the commercial proposed would probably require a 200 foot turn lane. She stated that they were going to have to balance that.

Mr. Cetta stated that the commercial was not going to be able to be that large.

Mr. Craddock asked if the affordable housing building was going to be built in the first phase.

Mr. Cetta stated that when the left side was built that would be built.

Mr. Craddock asked about the idea of Piedmont Housing building that building.

Mr. Cetta stated that the building was their business. They would be happy to give them the land to build it, but that is their business. They are obligated to build it and prefer to do so. They have good proffers and were going to contribute a lot of money to capital improvements.

Mr. Morris that ZMA-2005-018, Wickham Pond, Phase II will be scheduled for public hearing at a later date after all of the issues has been addressed by the applicant.

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on ZMA-2005-018, Wickham Pond – Phase II, to familiarize the Commission with the project, discuss several issues that would benefit from advanced input and provide feedback on the rezoning proposal and input on the discussion questions. The Commission reviewed and discussed the proposal with staff and the applicant, and then responded to the preliminary questions posed by staff. The applicant and the Commission agreed to meet in two weeks (February 21, 2006) to further discuss the design and layout of the commercial buildings near the front of the site and the proposed square feet of the commercial uses.

Old Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting moved on to the next item.

New Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- Jo Higgins distributed copies of "Preserving Farms in Real Estate" from the Progressive Farming magazine. Albemarle County was selected 9th overall as the southeast top best places to live in based rural counties. Albemarle County is 4th in Virginia and 9th over the southeast United States.
- Regarding the request for additional ARB staff, the Planning Commission deferred the discussion until next week.

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m. to the February 14, 2006 meeting at 4:00 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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