Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 9, 2006

The Albemarle County Planning Commission met on Tuesday, May 9, 2006 and held a meeting and a public hearing at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Eric Strucko, Bill Edgerton, Pete Craddock, Jo Higgins, Jon Cannon, Marcia Joseph, Chairman and Calvin Morris, Vice-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 Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Bill Fritz, Development Review Manager; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Jack Kelsey, County Engineer and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Ms. Joseph 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:

Ms. Joseph 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 – May 3, 2006.

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on May 3, 2006.

- The Board had a Places29 Master Plan update. It was a discussion very similar to the one the Commission had the night before. To recall, there is an open house next week on Thursday, May 18 with the public and a meeting next Saturday, May 20, at Sutherland School on the three versions of the plan that are being put before the public for their comment and input. There was also a resolution that the Board of Supervisors passed to direct the Planning Commission to consider amending the Comprehensive Plan as regards some land in the Piney Mountain community adjacent to the National Ground Intelligence Center Facility. Their direction is that the Planning Commission would consider this as part of the Places29 process, including their public hearing on the Places29 Comp Plan changes. It is understood that there will not be any specifics for next week's public meetings, but that it will be part of what would be provided for the consultant to consider before the final draft plan recommendations are provided to the public and the Planning Commission. It is a total of 30 acres of land that they have targeted as potential addition to the Piney Mountain Community.

Mr. Cannon asked if the Commission would have any sort of staff presentation on that or any kind of background.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the Commission will have that information when it is before them as part of the Places29 process. Staff will try to bring something to the Commission that they can see before they have the final draft plans in front of them.

Mr. Cannon stated that he would take that a direction to consider this rather than a direction to include it.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that it was a resolution of intent. It is always as staff sees it a direction to consider the change.

Ms. Higgins noted that if it was going to be a federal facility isn't that by right in any district. She asked if the only kicker here was the Service Authority jurisdiction area. Technically, if the federal government owns the property they can do that kind of use in the rural areas.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that he was not too privy to particulars here. But, his understanding is that the land that they were talking about is land that is not going to be in the National Ground Intelligent Center.

Mr. Edgerton noted that this is an expansion of the development area.

Ms. Joseph suggested that instead of speculating, it would be good if the Commissioners could get some sort of information at some point so they could make an intelligent decision.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that staff wants to bring that back to the Commission so that they could see what that entails. One thing that was noted in the resolution as well is that there is under review in the Pantops area plan the removal of approximately 80 acres in that part of the development area. It was a consideration for the Board in this resolution to also consider adding the 30 acres.

Mr. Strucko asked if the Commission would consider the two jointly.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the Commission would be looking at that removal during the Pantops Plan, which actually should be before the Commission prior to final decisions on Places29.

Mr. Strucko noted that it would depend on what they do with the 80 acres. They could build homes by right. He asked if it would be treated as real rural areas.

Mr. Morris stated that they don't know what 70 to 80 acres. It could be on Dr. Clara Belle Wheeler's property.

Mr. Cilimberg understood that it was a property that was actually requesting the removal.

Mr. Morris noted that he thought that she was requesting it.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that he did not have anything additional to offer.

Mr. Strucko asked if the 30 acres in the Piney Mountain area had any time sensitivity to that issue. The impression that he got from the media was that there was.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that there was not according to the resolution. There was not any direction as to the time to have that decided. It was actually resolved that it would be part of the Places29 Comprehensive Amendment. That cannot happen until Places29 is complete and the Commission has received their report and gone through the public process of actually amending the plan for that Master Plan.

Consent Agenda:

a. **Review of South Garden Agricultural/Forestal District -** Proposal to conduct a review of the South Garden Agricultural/Forestal District. The District, which is contained within Tax Maps 110 and 109, consists of 5 parcels totaling 2,033.33 acres. The District is generally located in North Garden between Route 29 south and Routes 712 / 719 with northern boundaries adjacent to the South Fork of the Hardware River. Properties in the District are designated as Rural Area in the Comprehensive Plan and are zoned as Rural Areas District. (Amy Arnold)
b. **SDP-2006-022 Crozet Children's Health Center – Site Plan Waiver Request**: Request pursuant to Section 32.2.2 to allow a waiver of the requirement to draw a full site plan. (Tax Map 56A2, Parcel 33) (Francis MacCall)
c. **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes** – February 28, 2006 and March 14, 2006 (portions of).

Ms. Joseph asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull an item from the consent agenda.

Ms. Higgins suggested that the Commission pull item c) until the full minutes are provided and reviewed.

Motion: Mr. Craddock moved, Ms. Higgins seconded, to approve the consent agenda items a. and b.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Ms. Joseph stated that the consent agenda has been approved for items a. and b.

Work Session.

ZMA-2006-001 Westhall- Phase V (Signs #49, 59 & 64)
PROPOSAL: Rezone 8.957 acres from R-1 Residential (1 unit/acre) to PRD Planned Residential District residential (3 - 34 units/acre). 38 single family detached units proposed at a density of gross 4 units per acre.
PROFFERS: No
EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Neighborhood CT4 - mixed residential and commercial uses (net 4.5 units per acre for Single family detached and attached units and duplexes; net 12 units per acre for townhouses and apartments; net 18 units per acre for mixed use). Neighborhood CT5 - mixed residential and commercial uses (net 12 units per acre for all housing types; net 18 units per acre for mixed use.
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No
LOCATION: portion of TM 56H Parcel A, located approximately 600 feet east of the end of Park Street (SR 1204) in the Community of Crozet.
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: White Hall
STAFF: Elaine Echols

Staff passed out a table with the current activity in Crozet of items under review including site plans, subdivision, and rezonings. (See Attachment A)

Ms. Joseph asked if staff notified the adjacent owners that they would be able to have some input into this work session and if they had heard from anyone.

Ms. Echols replied that the adjacent owners were notified. Since this letter was sent staff has not heard from any adjacent owners. But, initially staff heard from an adjacent owner who was concerned about access in that general area. It was not about this project in particular, but it had to do with the extension of Jamestown Court, which took place on a by right development. She summarized the staff report:

- This rezoning was originally scheduled for a public hearing with the Planning Commission on May 9, 2006. Based on the issues raised by staff and status of revisions to the plans to address those issues, the applicant agreed that a work session would be the best approach. Staff has identified several topic areas and questions to guide discussion: Conformity with Crozet Master Plan, Design and Layout, Streetscape of Eastern Avenue/Greenway Connections, and its impacts
- The application plan (Attachment D) shows the desired layout with 33 single family detached with zero lot line lots lining both sides of a proposed public road that runs north-south and 6 smaller affordable units on one lot with some facing the street and some adjacent to parking. The development is proposed as residential only with no mixed use. Amenities provided would include a tot lot and greenway trails. The applicant has also shown on-street parking for greenway trail head parking. Adjacent to the rezoning is an 80 foot wide right-of-way for future dedication as Eastern Avenue. This ROW is not included with the Westhall V rezoning application.
- It is located in the northeastern quadrant of Crozet, which is located to the west of Lickinghole.
- There is something that staff feels is important for the Commission to know about the Crozet Master Plan and the transect zones. Staff has been getting a lot of pressure to be as exact as they can about density in Crozet. But, when the map was created with the transect areas or the CT zones; it was not really intended to be interpreted in an exact way. They can not always make an exact determination of what those colors mean and where. On the map there are five different colors shown on the property boundaries. This was not a GIS based system. Staff applied the CT map to our own GIS, but when that is done you miss some things. The green strip down the middle was intended to be on either side of Eastern Avenue in part to provide a buffer on the western side of Eastern Avenue. Yet in this illustration it comes all the way through the parcel. Now it is possible that Eastern Avenue could come all the way through the parcel, but it does not have to because on the previous plats it has been located in a different alignment that works just as well. Staff looked at the colors on the map and then extrapolated what they thought the colors ought to be. Staff tried to extrapolate the colors onto the plan that they had, which was the best that they could come up using the brownish color for the CT-5, the salmon color being

the CT-4, the Kelly-green being the CT-2 and the lime-green being the CT-1. Therefore, the Commission can see how difficult it is at times to apply the colors to individual parcels.

- The numbers in the staff report come from the extrapolated illustration. It did not make any sense from the other illustration. That is where the density numbers have come from that are on the fourth page of the staff report.
- Staff has looked at the plan in relation to what the Master Plan suggested should be in this area. CT-5 sections are supposed to be fairly high intensity mixed use areas. CT-4 sections are also a mixed use sections, but not quite as intense. The applicant is showing all single-family detached. Staff thought that was a significant difference between what the Master Plan suggested and what the applicant is proposing. It does not bother staff a whole lot, but staff wants the Commission to come to the same conclusion or come to their own conclusion about whether or not the way the transect has been applied or not applied in this particular case is appropriate.
- Staff has given the Commission a list of the relationship of this proposal to the Neighborhood Model and talked a little bit about form and density. Staff asked that the Commission concentrate more on the questions unless there is more information that they would like about the proposal itself.

Ms. Joseph noted that the idea of the work session was also if the applicant wants to give a presentation or provide information. She suggested that might be step 2. She asked if there were any questions for staff.

Ms. Higgins noted that staff has referred the Commission to a table. If she was interpreting this correctly, based on her interpretation the range for residential units for this particular property for the 8.9 acres would be between 40 and 51.

Ms. Echols replied that it would be between 27 and 51.

Ms. Higgins pointed out that this proposal is for 38. Therefore, it was between low and medium with no commercial.

Ms. Echols agreed that there was no commercial or mixed use.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that staff commented in several places that they were unable to have an opinion about some of the proposed layouts because there is no suggestion on what kind of units or how big the units are going to be or where the driveway are going to be. He was hoping that they would have that sort of information as they usually do when they look at rezonings during the public hearings. It is awful hard to know how those lots are going to work without some suggestion on how they plan to build on them.

Ms. Echols noted that it is not a Neighborhood Model District. It is a PRD. So that would be something extra for the applicant to provide because it is required in the Neighborhood Model District, but not required in the PRD.

Ms. Joseph asked if the applicant would like to make a presentation at this time.

Chris Schooley, representative for Stonehaus Development, asked to clarify a few items. From the discussion he thought that the density issue is well presented by staff and the Commission could make that analysis on their own in whether they need more density or commercial. There was some clarification needed on the affordable housing units. It is staff's opinion that the housing units would be looking on to a parking lot. They wanted to make sure that was illustrated more properly on the back side of Phase IV of Westhall. Staff was comparing it to those townhouses. They were trying to create an independent structure for people to live in that was of a similar size of the townhouses where they have their own yards and the parking is still recessed on the back. What they really liked about this proposal, even though they know it is a little bit of a new idea for affordable housing in the county, is that it really keeps the same rhythm of the street on the other side with the other single-family houses. It is a similar type of massing. It will be a 2-story building. These detached units provide roughly 165 percent more yard on average than you would with a townhouse unit. He felt that creates a space for people to have a small garden of their own. They might need a lawn mower, but at the same time they have a little bit of a

front yard and some have a little back yard and enough room for a deck or a stone patio. It is a little bit of a different idea and they really got the idea from Fifth Street in the City of Charlottesville. In other words it is in the middle of a parking lot, but they felt that it gives a little bit more room to provide some green space around these units. So they would like the Commission to strongly consider this layout. They think that it is something that a lot of people would rather have in place of a town house. Incidentally, there is a park near by. They really feel that it is enough green space in the community for people to enjoy a nice product and still have room to walk their dog.

Ms. Higgins asked if he could tell the Commission what the brown roofs represent such as what is the square footage and how many units are under that roof.

Mr. Schooley stated that the units were 1,700 square foot 2-story single-family units with a separation of about 12' of floor space according to fire code separation.

Mr. Edgerton asked if they were talking about 6 single-family units.

Mr. Schooley agreed that it was single-family units with 6 parking spaces. They would probably look at the option of condominiums. One of the other issues brought up was the tot lot, which was in close proximity to the storm water facility. They got their comments on Friday and were taking a look at the options given by the engineers on what they can do with this storm water facility. He felt that a preference on our part would be to knock down the slopes so much that it could be mowed. It would be a grassy area that would handle some storm water. That way they could avoid some of the fencing that they were apprehensive to have on this site for aesthetic purposes. The tot lot of 2,100 square feet actually provides a good bit of space. They want this to be a usable park and have spent some time thinking about how they put this together. They are providing 4 parking spaces because the trail has to connect with the overall greenway system. Then they provided a picnic area and a little bit of open space here and there with landscaping. On this drawing they provided a berm in between the tot lot and the storm water management facility. If they need to they will fence either the tot lot or the pond or both if need be. But, their preference is that they can do enough of site design to create some safety for the people who would be using the site and create an amenity. Storm water management facilities don't always have to be ugly. They would like to make it look good. With a site of this size and shape it has to be on the site somewhere. Therefore, they want to make it look as good as they can. The last issue is the traffic issue, which may take a little bit more time. Bill Wensch, Traffic Engineer with the firm Fitzgerald and Holloday has joined us and he can provide some additional information.

Ms. Higgins asked the applicant to tell the Commission about the units on the regular lots. With the zero lot lines, what does a couple of these look like.

Mr. Schooley stated that it was a new urbanism type of unit or a traditional looking house similar to what they will be doing in the rest of Westhall. Hauser Homes will probably be providing these lots and then do building in Westhall III. So it will fit in with the rest of the development.

Ms. Higgins asked if the units would have garages and be front loaded.

Mr. Schooley stated that the garages would be in the rear with the driveways on the side. There is a 10 foot rear yard, which will help with some of the separation from the potential Eastern Avenue. There is 20 feet of current wooded buffer. So they feel pretty good about the buffer on the back side. This is a heavily wooded site. So with providing 20 feet of undisturbed buffer will make it pretty difficult to see from Eastern Avenue and then put setback on the rear yards. They feel that should be a pretty good view shed for Eastern Avenue.

Ms. Joseph asked if within those 20 feet they plan a walking trail.

Mr. Schooley stated that was the discussion that they have 80 feet provided for Eastern Avenue or at least it was adjacent to Westhall III. In this section staff is also recommending 80 feet. Within those 80 feet they could provide the pedestrian trail in there. With discussions with staff that probably made sense to at least have the trail on that side? There were some concerns from the Parks and Recreation Committee about the trail not being in place until the road was in place. They could provide a sidewalk,

which could function as the interim connection between the Cory Farm section and that greenway and the park. Once the trail is built with the road it should work pretty well.

Ms. Joseph stated that however, the trail is still within the 20 feet.

Mr. Schooley stated yes, that at this point that is their proposal.

Ms. Higgins noted that the way she read this it says that there is a 10 foot pedestrian easement and it has been recorded. There is a deed book and page number. So that 20 foot easement is in the 20 foot landscape buffer. Then another note says the trail to be provided within the right-of-way. So the right-of-way is 80 feet. Again, this is a work session just to point out things that got her a little confused. This opened her mind up to whether Eastern Avenue was once a part of this parcel.

Mr. Schooley stated no, that it was not. He asked Mr. Stoner if that was correct.

Ms. Higgins asked how this was created.

Frank Stoner, representative for Stonehaus Development, stated that it was.

Ms. Higgins noted that it says future connector and whose is it and why does it show like that because it makes some statements and has a deed book reference.

Mr. Stoner stated that the right-of-way was reserved and that was what created the parcel was the right-of-way.

Ms. Higgins asked if that right-of-way was reserved.

Mr. Stoner stated that when the parcel was subdivided two or three years ago.

Ms. Higgins asked if that was when the by right development was done and that strip was dedicated.

Mr. Stoner stated yes, that the expectation was that the road is going to go here so the logical place to subdivide was right where they have it.

Ms. Joseph asked if the location of that road had been determined.

Mr. Stoner stated that it was certainly on the Crozet Master Plan. All they did was overlay a Master Plan on the property and draw accordingly.

Ms. Higgins asked if the future right-of-way in the very right hand corner applies to that whole 80 foot strip.

Mr. Stoner stated that it only applies to the piece south. When they did Phase II he thought that there was a reservation of right-of-way.

Ms. Higgins noted that she did not see any deed reference that it has been dedicated.

Mr. Stoner stated that he did not think that it had been dedicated.

Mr. Schooley noted that it has been reserved.

Mr. Stoner stated that it was reserved for future dedication.

Ms. Higgins stated that the pedestrian easement looks like it has a deed book and page number reference to it.

Mr. Stoner noted that is behind Phase II.

Ms. Higgins noted that it was right along the edge of this. When they talk about the 10 foot buffer they want to make sure that is clarified. If it is going to be put in the 80 foot, then that is a different animal. She pointed out that might be one of the questions.

Mr. Stoner stated that no 10 foot right-of-way has been reserved or not 10 foot strip has been reserved and dedicated on it. He noted that he was not sure what that was doing.

Ms. Higgins noted that this says easement on their plat.

Mr. Schooley pointed out that he would look that up.

Ms. Joseph stated that the only thing that they know for sure is that there is an 80 foot reserve strip and that exists.

Mr. Stoner stated that the expectation was that the 80 feet would include a pedestrian walk with sidewalks on both sides so that it was an expanded to accommodate a pedestrian bike facility.

Ms. Higgins asked who the property owner of the 80 foot strip was.

Mr. Stoner stated that was Lickinghole Creek, LLC. of which they were a 5 percent member.

Ms. Higgins stated that it had that on the other side of the line. So it kind of implies that they don't know who that strip of land is.

Mr. Stoner stated that they bought the property originally and then they subdivided and sold off the piece to the north or the R-1 piece.

Ms. Echols stated that she was puzzled. She was unaware that the Eastern Avenue was on a plat anywhere for the part that is on the adjoining property. It is not reserved. All that is reserved to this time is running south of the property.

Mr. Edgerton asked if he was correct in saying that it was not an undisturbed buffer.

Ms. Higgins stated that the 10 foot pedestrian easement shows right along Westhall V and it is shown right on this.

Mr. Stoner noted that does not currently exist.

Mr. Craddock stated that it has a deed book listed, which was what Ms. Higgins had been saying.

Mr. Schooley pointed out that they would look it up.

Mr. Edgerton asked to back up because there was something that could not be both ways. He had said that it was a 20 feet undisturbed buffer. According to the drawings there is not shown whether it has been deeded or not, but they would find out later if there was a 10 foot pedestrian easement. Then there was a substantial note talking about the planting that was going to occur in the 20 foot buffer. That is very different from an undisturbed buffer. He asked if he was correct in saying that there was not an undisturbed buffer.

Mr. Schooley stated that it was their understanding that there is not a deeded 10 feet. So it would be an undisturbed buffer if the staff agrees that they would have the pedestrian facility in the 80 foot for Eastern Avenue.

Ms. Higgins stated that then the note that this says that trail is to be provided within right-of-way and implies an 80 foot right-of-way. That is where it would actually be. But, who is going to provide it. Is that part of this?

Mr. Schooley stated that it would be part of the road.

Mr. Edgerton noted that he was asking about this very specific landscape buffer note that says 20 foot landscape buffer and buffer shall include an informal mix of screening trees loosely staggered centered same species and screening trees shall be clustered in alternative groups and so on. That does not sound like an undisturbed buffer to me.

Mr. Schooley pointed out that their recommendation would be let's see what it looks like it once they meet a Code.

Mr. Edgerton noted that this is what they were looking at and it did not agree with what he was saying. So that was confusing.

Ms. Joseph stated that any kind of buffer that is undisturbed usually has fall downs because they are use to holding each other up.

Mr. Schooley stated that there are ways that they could handle that. If any trees that come down then they would plant them back and those kinds of things.

Mr. Cannon asked how he would describe the relationship between this, which was Westhall Phase V, and all of the other Westhall phases. Is this connected to them, is conceptually related to them and if so, how as a total packet.

Mr. Schooley stated yes, that he felt that it is very connected to them. The architectural styles would be very similar. The size of the lots will be very similar throughout. Westhall II, which is to the south end of the property, the lots will get a little bit larger as the topo increases in the flat areas. These are fairly small lots with a new urbanism type of housing. So the massing of the buildings will be very similar.

Mr. Cannon asked if there was a difference in density between these different phases.

Mr. Schooley stated that it has to be different densities because phase II was by right.

Mr. Cannon asked if the density was related to centers or other amenities or facilities.

Mr. Schooley stated that it was more related to the street than to any center.

Mr. Cannon asked if it was more related to the street than to whatever the category that they are working with, and Mr. Schooley stated that was correct.

Ms. Echols pointed out the zoning categories so that the Commission could see that the density corresponds to the zoning. She pointed out the R-2 and R-6 zoning. So what have been done by right under the existing zoning are different levels of density, but it responds more to the conditions out there.

Mr. Cannon asked what the conditions were out there.

Mr. Schooley stated that it was phases I through IV of the development.

Mr. Cannon asked if there was any commercial space within that area, and Mr. Schooley replied no, noting that all the phases were connected.

Mr. Edgerton pointed out that he saw three connections to this phase.

Ms. Higgins noted that there could be four connections.

Mr. Schooley stated that they show three connections with a possible fourth connection through the trailer park.

Mr. Strucko asked how many dwelling units they were talking about in all four phases.

Mr. Schooley stated that in all four phases there would be 130 units.

Mr. Strucko stated short of Eastern Avenue being built, right now the only way back there is Tabor Street off of Crozet Avenue past the park.

Mr. Schooley stated that was correct.

Bill Wensch, Traffic Engineer with the firm Fitzgerald and Holloday, stated that he has been working with Stonehaus on this project. In particular this evening he would like to address the comments in the review packet asking that the roadway be widened from 21 feet to 22 feet or to about 20.5 feet to 21 feet now. He felt that there were some compelling reasons not to do that, which was what he wanted to talk about tonight. Through this discussion he would like to talk a little bit about the volumes that they would expect to see out there in the future. In the characteristics of the existing road he was talking about Route 1204, which starts as High and turns into Park and runs by Claudius Crozet Park and then to their site. Just a few notes about traffic calming, he spends a good amount of effort in the city and for other counties and localities. He would summarize in the end why this street really might not be advisable for the long term. He pointed out that their traffic study shows without construction of Eastern Avenue in the future they expect to see about 330 vehicles in a peak hour, which would be in the p.m. using that roadway. To break that down and put it in perspective, that is about 5 ½ per minute or one every 10 to 12 seconds. That was done by V.P. Cower. When you run the analysis, the computer models that they use that shows the level of service B. He noted that level F is failing, but that level service B was good and very functional. With Eastern Avenue constructed the volumes would be expected to drop down to about 140 an hour. That is a little more than 2 per minute. The passing point on the roads is pretty low. Some of the characteristics of the existing road out there are that it is about 20.5 to 21 feet in width. There is a natural tree canopy close to the road throughout the majority of the corridor. The speed limit is 25 miles per hour. It is a low speed facility. The existing road as it is out there is what they call naturally traffic homed. It has characteristics to it that they try to retrofit into the streets in the City of Charlottesville and Spotsylvania and many other places around the state. What makes a traffic calm roadway really is the narrow pavement widths and it is not a big open space to drive and drive fast, but rather people drive the speed that they are comfortable driving. The natural canopy is next to the road. It has some hills that are going to be there regardless. So it really is a pretty nice roadway as it is. It is rather aesthetic and again naturally formed.

Mr. Strucko asked about Park Street where there is a 90 degree turn coming down and then the underlying road past the park.

Mr. Wensch stated that he believed it was a VDOT generated comment that in order to widen the road to 22 feet, which added essentially a foot to the pavement, but in adding that foot they would be getting into the ditches on the side. They would have to move those out, which would impact the tree canopy out there. Therefore, they would lose some of the trees. It would make the road feel bigger and wider. He would argue that it would increase the speeds down through that corridor. Widening the road would take away from some of the natural features that have it existing formed corridor. It certainly was not needed for level of service reasons. Even without the Eastern Avenue, it has the level of service B. Of course, with Eastern Avenue there would be 140 cars an hour, which was very little traffic. He would argue that really another consideration is to consider that future condition out there.

Ms. Higgins asked if there was any discussion leaving out the widening for the length of the road for any kind of spot improvements because there is some traffic calmed to a negative extent. But, was there any discussion in lieu of the road widening.

Mr. Wensch stated that they have not done that part, but have just been addressing the corridor length widening. But, they could certainly go back and talk about it.

Ms. Higgins stated that she had run into this before. She felt that to go to two 11 foot lanes would not make that big of a difference, but it could make it so people could go faster. But, there are a couple of maneuvers in that passage to get back there that maybe some spot improvements or something could be looked at. The last time she was driving on the road that had occurred to her. Some of it has to do with trees in the way.

The Planning Commission held a discussion on the questions posed by staff.

Mr. Stoner pointed out that they were supportive of many of the suggestions for proffers. But, they did not want to proffer money that sits around for years and years and never does anything. Nobody would get any benefit from that if the County does not actually take the steps to get this stuff done. If they could proffer with the expectation that it was not built within a stipulated period of time, then that money would come back or the proffer is relieved. Hopefully, that would be some pressure on the process. He noted that they were open minded towards discussions about other ways to accomplish that.

Mr. Cilimberg stated what he was anticipating based on what has been discussed at the Board level is that they are going to take up particularly funding local road projects and the Eastern Avenues is one of those projects that he anticipates that there is going to be a commitment to do location and design using County resources and to potentially in getting the project into the CIP for at least paying for part of what the bridge will cost. He felt that no one else is going to build the bridge. Ultimately there is only so much money that VDOT is going to put into anything. He felt that the anticipation even in the Crozet Plan was that Eastern Avenue would be built by the development community except for the bridge. So really the contributions that staff would anticipate being important are contributions of either construction or money towards Eastern Avenue, and then the County stepping up in terms of making sure that the road is designed and located in the right place and is committing to how it will make sure that the bridge gets built. He felt that some of that probably is going to be discussed and maybe decided by the Board in the next couple of months. But, he could not say that for sure. It may very well be that they can tie some of what that is in to what they might try to have the developer commit to as part of the project as that unfolds.

Cathy Mattigan, resident of Jamestown Court, pointed out that she had already had some interaction with the applicant because of a sewer easement being placed across her property. She felt that the work session was good. The reason why the other homeowner's did not come is that there is this distrust with the County as well as with development, which is her interpretation based on the conversations from her neighbors that she has spoken with. So that is why more people may not have been here. Also, the time of the meeting is inconvenient for people who work. What she has heard from neighbors, which she agrees with, is the traffic issues. That is the number one area of concern. The Eastern Avenue is something that has not been done and does not have a date attached to it. Therefore, the traffic congestion is on Park Road. She disagreed with the traffic study because she lives back there. Secondly, she was guilty of not following the 25 mile per hour speed limit as it was now. There are children playing in the area. There are many standard events that occur at the park such as swimming meets, July 4 celebration, baseball games and soccer games. At Tabor street it may fit the political and statistic, but in reality travelers are sitting there waiting to turn right or left. Also, there will be added traffic on Route 250, which does come into the picture. Therefore, infrastructure is a very fine point that needs to be addressed. The other things that she had heard was a concern is that they already have phase 1 and 2 and now there is another phase so what more are they going to take from the area that is back there. She felt that it is a good session, particularly with the interaction between everybody to try to resolve the issues. But it was something new that they needed to take into consideration that all of the property owners are not aware of. She felt that it was a good time because decisions have been made in the past without acknowledging the impact on the homeowners and what they have gone through with the decisions that the County has made. She did not think that feedback was there. She felt that at work sessions that could be incorporated into it.

Mr. Joseph noted that the public can communicate with the Planning Commission through email at planningcommission@albemarle.org.

In summary, the Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the proposal with staff and the applicants, took public comment, and then responded to the preliminary questions posed by staff. The Commission provided the following feedback on the issues mentioned in the staff report as follows:

1. **Density and Mix of Uses**

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

- In general, the Commission stated that the proposal was not necessarily consistent with the Crozet Master Plan and did not reflect the Comprehensive Plan, but it was something they could support and work with. The reason they could support it was that development nearby had been done by-right in a different form than contemplated by the Master Plan. As a result, it didn't make sense for this one small section to be very different from the housing development nearby. The Commission said that the density was appropriate and could be dealt with. The Commissioners noted concerns that the density places stress on the traffic.
- Mr. Strucko could not support the residential densities proposal because of the transportation issues and the pressures that it would put on the existing road network around the park. By right there are 9 units or 13 units with bonuses. Then this rezoning request is for 38 units. It is more than six times the by-right. Also, there is no funding for Eastern Avenue, the yet to be funded road that should be in place to support this kind of residential development, particularly for a rezoning that moves from 9 units to 38 units. Mr. Edgerton agreed with Mr. Strucko.
- The commercial element is not essential to the proposal. Leaving the commercial area out was positive because the Commission felt that the commercial element was not needed.
- Mr. Edgerton stated that he would have liked to have seen a commercial center created in Westhall, but it did not make sense here because the first four phases were developed by right.
- Staff needs to continue to work with the applicant on the layout and design of the tot lot with the storm water management facility.

2. **Layout and Design**

Is the layout and design appropriate? If not, how should it be improved?

- In general, the Commission asked the applicant to provide additional information on the specifics of the layout and design proposed for the lots, units and driveways.
- The Commission agreed with staff that the storm water management facilities should be designed so that they are not in conflict with adjacent residential uses, the tot lot, or causing negative visual impacts to future Eastern Avenue.
- Mr. Edgerton stated that if the layout forces a lot of garage doors all the way up and down Tremont, he would rather go with a less dense area by making the lots a little bigger so that they could relegate the parking. He did not want it to look like an alley of garages. Ms. Higgins disagreed with Mr. Edgerton and said that garages in the fronts of houses did not offend her.
- The Commission liked the proposal for affordable housing and did not state any problems with the proposed affordable housing units.

3. **Eastern Avenue and Greenway Connection**

What type of treatment or orientation should the development have to the Eastern Avenue edge? How should this incorporate a greenway trail in advance of full road construction?

- The Planning Commission, by consensus, requested that additional information be submitted on what the greenway trail connected to. They asked the staff to work with the applicant and the Greenway Planner on how to incorporate a greenway trail in advance of full road construction.

- The Planning Commission felt that Eastern Avenue and the greenway need to connect. Ms. Joseph and Mr. Edgerton felt that the 20' buffer was not big enough.

4. **Impacts and Proffers**

What impacts should be mitigated for this development?

In general, the Planning Commission made the following suggestions of impacts that should be mitigated for this development:

- It was noted that no proffers have been submitted for contributions to the roads, which should be pursued. Consideration should be given for contribution of the Lickinghole Bridge and Eastern Avenue.

- The design, but no proffer, has been submitted for affordable housing. It needs to be tied down.

- There were traffic concerns particularly if the existing road was wide enough and if it would hold the additional traffic created by this development. The Commission encouraged that spot improvements be looked at along the road.

- Other issues of concern were the impacts on schools and the need for an eastern park.

- The Planning Commission focused on the need for the construction of Eastern Avenue for interconnectivity.

***Old Business**:*

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any old business.

- Mr. Craddock asked if there was any new information available on Operation Misery. Mr. Strucko noted that he had received one email that contained no text, which was a link to a web page to the Lincoln Planning Association. It is a training type of program.
- As an item of old business, Mr. Cilimberg advised that the Board plans to hold public meetings on both the Rural Areas and Mountain Overlay District recommendations jointly with the Planning Commission. Also, tomorrow evening the Board will have a public hearing at Burley School on North Pointe.
- The Planning Commission will not meet next week. In two weeks the meeting will include discussion on Places29 after the public input. The Board of Supervisors has been invited to join the Commission for that meeting.
- Regarding Places 29, there is a public open house next Thursday, May 18 with a public workshop on Saturday, May 20, at Sutherland School on the three versions of the plan that are being put before the public for their comment and input.

There being no further old business, the meeting moved on to the next item.

***New Business**:*

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any new business.

- Mr. Craddock noted that he attended a meeting in Scottsville last week concerning tri-county growth. The basic jest of it was that all of the growth now is sprawling out even more so in Buckingham County. They are trying to make Scottsville more of a destination as opposed to a drive through. The roads were discussed, particularly the Rt. 6/Rt. 20 intersection. A good discussion was held on Biscuit Run and its effect on the traveling public from the Scottsville area.
- Mr. Edgerton noted that the Habitat has bought the trailer park adjacent to the Biscuit Run development. He hoped that there would be a way to get some collaboration with the Biscuit Run developer so that they could work together, particularly on the affordable housing issue.
- Mr. Morris noted that there would be a meeting on the Pantops Master Plan from 5 to 7 p.m. on Thursday, May 25 at Broadus Memorial Baptist Church.

- Ms. Higgins noted that she had attended the Farm Bureau meeting at Oakencroft. They are very interested in the Rural Area issues facing the county. They will be joining together. They are very vocal that the clustering they can totally support. But, the time release is a huge issue for them. They don't understand why someone would impose that on the farmers that have held the land for a long period of time. She felt that they would be finalizing some of that and bringing it before the Commission.
- Mr. Cilimberg informed the Commission that a FOIA request has been received from Tom Loach concerning the Crozet Master Plan and Old Trail. The Commissioners will be receiving an email requesting any pertinent information they have on the specific request. The email will contain the specific information being requested and indicate the date that the information needs to be provided for.
- **There will be no Planning Commission meeting next week, May 16.**

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

***Adjournment**:*

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m. to the May 23, 2006 meeting.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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