Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 21, 2006

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, November 21, 2006, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Calvin Morris, Vice-Chairman; Jon Cannon, Eric Strucko, Pete Craddock, Duane Zobrist and Bill Edgerton. 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 Rebecca Ragsdale, Senior Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Bill Fritz, Chief of Current Development 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.

Consent Agenda:

a. **SDP 2006-104 Martin Valley Farm – Site Plan Waiver**: Request for a site plan waiver for the addition of a fourth dwelling on Martin Valley Farm. The property, described as Tax Map 94 Parcel 22, zoned (RA) Rural Areas, is located in the Scottsville Magisterial District off Union Mills Road (State Route 616) approximately 240 feet south from the intersection of Union Mills Road (State Route 616) and Woods Edge Road (State Route 623) on the Albemarle/ Fluvanna County Boarder. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area in Rural Area 4. (Gerald Gatobu)

b. **Approval of Planning Commission Minutes:** May 2, 2006; June 13, 2006; October 17, 2006.

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

Mr. Edgerton asked to pull SDP-2006-104, Martin Valley Farm – Site Plan Waiver from the consent agenda for questions because he was a little confused by the staff report. He noted that there appeared to be multiple copies of the same map, but what he was struggling with was that he did not see any indication of how many development rights exist on the property.

Mr. Fritz replied that it has its full complement of development rights, which are five. There is no history.

Mr. Edgerton asked if they know how many homes will be accessing Martin Valley Farm Road. It looked like a 30' right-of-way and it appeared that there were more than two lots.

Mr. Fritz replied that all of the lots will be accessing the same road. There is no easement at this time because it is not being divided. Attachment B shows the proposed division of what it would look like if it were divided.

Mr. Edgerton noted that he was looking at the big map on page 11 where it appears to be a 30' right-of-way serving at least 3 homes and possibly more. He questioned if that was allowed.

Mr. Fritz said that this plat was approved, but never actually recorded. If that plat had been recorded it would have created parcel B, the 3.229 acre parcel, leaving the 37 acre residue. This plat never went to record and the approval has since expired. Martin Valley Farm Lane would have been a 30'easement at that point, but since the plat never went to record, it did not exist.

Mr. Edgerton asked what the Commission was being asked to approve.

Mr. Fritz replied that the Commission was being asked to authorize the construction of a fourth dwelling on this property.

Mr. Edgerton asked how it would be accessed.

Mr. Fritz replied that it would be accessed through Martin Valley Lane, which was just a driveway. It was not a private street at this time, but is being considered as a drive or an access that would go out to the public road. Whenever there are three or more dwellings on a parcel, regardless of the zoning designation, it requires approval of a site plan or a site plan waiver. There are already three dwellings on this property. This would be the fourth dwelling. The three dwellings were built prior to this requirement being in the ordinance.

Mr. Edgerton asked if they were allowed to access that lot from a driveway. He asked if there would be four homes accessed on a private driveway.

Mr. Fritz replied that was correct. But, at such time as they were to divide the property the road would have to be reviewed to determine whether or not it would be a public or a private road and then brought up to the proper standards. There is no subdivision and it is four dwellings on a single undivided lot. There will be one development right remaining.

Mr. Edgerton noted that was what had confused him. It seems like a round about way to build a subdivision without building a subdivision road.

Mr. Fritz noted that as a point of history, they actually have very few cases where they do site plans or site plan waivers and then ultimately get a subdivision. It is pretty uncommon. If they do, they still have to come back and the road would have to be reviewed, approved and upgraded.

Mr. Edgerton noted that Mr. Fritz had answered his questions.

Motion: Mr. Zobrist moved, Mr. Cannon seconded, that the consent agenda be approved.

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

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

Special Item:

StreamWatch Presentation – Brief review of the recently released 2006 StreamWatch Report. (Mr. John Murphy)

- In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session to receive an update on the newly released 2006 StreamWatch Report from John Murphy, Ecologist and Director of StreamWatch.

- Mr. Murphy distributed copies of the summary of the report, presented a power point presentation and explained the process and outcomes.

- Stream Watch's role is to provide the community with science based information. They are an environmentally monitoring program. They don't do any advocacy or planning recommendations. If the Commission has questions about planning implications about the report Greg Harper, County Water Resources Manager and Tamara Ambler, County Natural Resources Manager are standing by.

- The Commission asked questions and made comments and suggestions.

    - The Commission was interested in other independent variables that come into play.
    - The Commission was interested in further evaluation of the impact from agricultural practices on streams.
    - The Commission was interested in further exploration of the relationship between density and stream quality and if it can be moderated through the use of buffers, etc,

- Any further questions will be answered by Mr. Murphy through email sent directly to streamwater@cstone.net or telephone. The phone number is listed on the summary.

- The Planning Commission took no formal action.

Regular Item:

SUB-2006-243 Handley Farm Estates: Request for preliminary plat approval to create 12 lots served by a proposed internal public road on 333.51 acres. The property is zoned RA, Rural Areas. The property, described as Tax Map 70 Parcel 14B, is located in the White Hall Magisterial District on the southwest side of Plank Road (Route 692) just south of its intersection with Rockfish Gap Turnpike (Route 250). The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Rural Area in Rural Area 3. (Bill Fritz)

Mr. Fritz summarized the staff report. (See Staff Report.)

- Staff has reviewed this request for compliance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and recommends approval of the site plan subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. No waivers are being requested.

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

Kurt Gloeckner, representative for owner, said that they wanted to do more of a cluster development with part of the farm that is really not farmable. He was present to answer any questions because of the by right division.

Mr. Edgerton asked if they wanted to preserve the large parcel and put it under easement why wouldn't they want to cluster the development and minimize the amount of road.

Mr. Gloeckner replied that this arrangement puts the homes away from the other development. The people across the street have the same question if they will be able to see this. There is possibly one home that will be visible from the entrance. But, it is really tucked away. The neighbor that asked that this be brought to your attention is really higher than we are. Nobody will be able to see this.

Mr. Edgerton asked if the residue is under easement.

Mr. Gloeckner replied that it was under easement with the Virginia Outdoors Foundation.

Mr. Edgerton asked if it should be noted on the plat.

Mr. Fritz replied that it would be noted on the plat

Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being none the public hearing was closed and the matter placed before the Commission.

Mr. Craddock noted that he was glad that the residue was under easement so it can't be divided out later. This is another example of dividing up rural landscape, but is by right.

Motion: Mr. Zobrist moved, Mr. Cannon seconded, that SUB-2006-243, Handley Farm Estates be approved with the following conditions recommended by staff, as amended with the addition of one condition:

The Current Development Division shall not accept submittal of the final site plan for signature until tentative final approvals for the following conditions have been obtained. The final site plan shall not be signed until the following conditions have been met:

1. Current Development Planner approval to include:
    a. Submittal of a final plat meeting the requirements of Chapter 14, Section 303 of the County Code.

2. Current Development Engineer approval to include:
    a. Approval of Stream buffer mitigation plan.
    b. Approval of Storm water detention plan.

3. Health Department approval.

4. Virginia Department of Transportation approval of road plans.

5. Approval of Road Names.

6. A note shall be placed on the plat that the residue parcel is under easement.

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

Mr. Morris stated that SUB-2006-243, Handley Farm Estates was approved with conditions.

Work Session:

a. **CPA 2004-002 Pantops Master Plan**: This is the second of three work sessions scheduled to review the draft Pantops Master Plan and will focus on the Land Use & Places, Green Infrastructure, and Transportation chapters of the draft plan. (Rebecca Ragsdale)

Ms. Ragsdale presented a power point presentation and summarized the staff report.

- Based on the Planning Commission's direction during the summer work sessions, the Pantops Master Plan document has been drafted by staff and revisions have been made to the Framework and Green Infrastructure Maps. The Preliminary Recommendations discussed with the Commission have been incorporated into the draft Master Plan. Similar to the series of meetings held in this summer, staff has scheduled three work sessions to review the Pantops Master Plan draft on November 7, 21, and 28, 2006. For the November 7, 2006 meeting, staff provided Chapters 1-4, including the Introduction, Vision and Guiding Principles, Background, Place Types and Land Use, along with the Framework and Green Infrastructure Plans for the Commission to review. Staff provided the Commission an overview power point presentation at the work session on November 7, 2006 and asked the Commission to review the material by moving through each chapter of the document. Commission comments are summarized below by chapter.

- **Chapter 1-Introduction**-no changes recommended
- **Chapter 2-Vision and Guiding Principles-**
    - The Commission discussed the five Guiding Principles and directed staff to revise #5 to delete a reference to specific public facilities and institutions to avoid leaving out any facilities that may be needed in Pantops in the future. The Commission also recommended that a sixth guiding principle be added that addressed future redevelopment in Pantops.
- **Chapter 3-Background-**
    - A correction was noted on page 7 to George Rogers Clark museum.
    - The Commission asked how the future Pantops Fire Station would be included in the Plan and were advised that there would be a Community Facilities chapter to address the fire station.
    - The Commission recommended that the Albemarle County Service Authority Jurisdictional Area and service designations be added to page 13 under Water & Sewer.
    - The Commission noted that it was confusing how the recommendations of the VDOT Route 250 East Study were included on page 14 of the report and that this section should be revised so that it is clear that the master plan does not recommended all of VDOT's long range alternatives in that plan.
- **Chapter 4-Land Use & Places and Framework Plan (to page 23 of the Chapter)-**
    - The Commission requested that the Conservation/Open Space land use designation, described on page 17, be revised so that there was no confusion or expectation that properties should be placed under easement in the Development Area.
    - The Commission asked for clarification as to why the Civic Green center type was listed separately.
    - The Commission asked that the Plan clarify the Community Center and Core designations recommended for the Pantops Shopping Center/Riverbend center.

- The Commission recommended that insets of the Framework Plan be included with the Place-Type descriptions in the final document to reference the area for recommendations described in text.
- The Commission discussed the need to designate State Farm as an Employment District and did not recommend any changes.
- The Luxor/Westminster Canterbury and Rivanna Ridge neighborhoods and their center-type designations, whether or not the more intensive center designation of Community Center should be applied to Rivanna Ridge instead of Neighborhood Service. The Commission did not recommend any changes to the Framework Plan or recommendations.
- The Pantops cultural center recommendation on Page 23 should be described/defined to clarify the intent of that recommendation.

- Due to the length of the meeting, the Commission agreed to stop and pick up the conversation on November 21.

The discussion picked up the review with Chapter 4 on page 23 where they left off at the November 7 work session.

Ms. Ragsdale and Mr. Benish provided an overview power point presentation and asked the Commission to review the material by moving through the remaining chapters of the document. The Commission discussed the remainder of chapter 4 and moved on through chapters 5 and 6 and transportation, including the maps, and provided comments and suggestions.

Chapter 4, page 23-24 and Framework Plan Map

- The Planning Commission had questions regarding what the turquoise cross-hatched River Corridor area was trying to convey and what expectations there would be in the master plan for redevelopment of those areas. The Commission directed staff to clarify this designation in the Plan because it is confusing as it is written whether those areas with hatching are intended to be preserved. The Planning Commission noted difficulties in such precise mapping of land use designations.

Chapter 5, Green Infrastructure and Map

- Page 28, The Commission had concerns regarding the fourth paragraph on this page which addresses ownership expectations and public access for the greenways trails and parks of the Green Infrastructure Plan. The Commission recommended that staff revise this paragraph and staff also noted that the Implementation chapter of the master plan would address this issue further.

- The Commission noted a correction needed to the Green Infrastructure Map on the Charlottesville Power Equipment site, which is not expected to be a park but will have a greenway connection from Route 20 to Free Bridge Lane.

- The Commission asked for clarification as to where the potential park location referenced on page 29 is located, described between Free Bridge Lane and Route 20, south of Elks Drive. Staff noted that it is not the Charlottesville Power Equipment site but the parcel with a significant portion of flood plain immediately adjacent to the south of the Elks Lodge.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:50 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 8:02 p.m.

Mr. Benish presented **Chapter 6** regarding transportation. He provided a general explanation of the goals and objectives in the Pantops Plan noting that pages 31 – 33 intended to provide an overview of existing conditions. There may be updated traffic data to add to that section.

The Planning Commission suggested that the following items needed further discussion:

- The Commission recommended that the plan provide stronger guidance on provisions for bike lanes. On page 32, the second sentence references deficiencies.

- On page 33, add "and an escalator" following "estimated cost" in the second sentence of the last paragraph on that page.

- The Commission recommended that some graphic suggestion of the Eastern Connector should be provided on the Transportation Map. (now the Implementation Map)

- The Commission had questions regarding the proposed connections to the City of Charlottesville and why the connection from State Farm Blvd. to Market Street was not recommended in the Pantops Master Plan. Staff noted that there were difficulties with making that connection and that the City of Charlottesville was not supportive of that connection, which was shown into the Woolen Mills neighborhood of the City.

- Page 35, the Commission questioned why it would take until FY 2008 for headways of CTS service to be improved to Pantops, given the need for the service now. Staff noted that this was because of budgeting cycles.

- Page 36, Route 20 recommendations, the last bullet should be made stronger to read "Pedestrian paths should be made to Darden Towe Park" and "possibly" deleted from that sentence.

- Page 39, Emphasize the need for pedestrian improvements for pedestrian access and crossings of Route 250 that may need to be grade-separated. The Commission would like to see some commitment to get people safely across that road. The Commission agreed that a completed sidewalk system should be provided.

- Clarify the fourth bullet from the bottom on page 39 regarding Bike Lanes on Route 250. The expectation is that bike paths/multi-use paths would be provided behind the curb and that bike lanes adjacent to vehicular travel lanes would not be expected on Route 250.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Laura Hoffman questioned the connection that runs between Ashcroft and Westminister out of the back side of Gazebo. She asked if they were connecting North Pantops and Treemont into that road.

Mr. Benish replied that he did not know if this plan has gone into that detail to say whether it would or not. Staff felt that the plan could provide an option for doing that which would give more direct access into the community as opposed to around Lego. But, this plan is not specific

to say whether it would or not.

Ms. Hoffman noted that the community was not into more access because the trail runs along the top of it. The other question involves closing the exit from Hansens which would close the median.

Mr. Benish noted that the plan was speaking to just closing that intersection.

Ms. Hoffman said that the staff report lists in the short term to close the intersection and in the long term relocate the road, which leaves them with a small problem.

Mr. Benish noted that the idea was to relocate the road so that there is an option. If that intersection is ever closed is going to be dependent on VDOT. So it could stay open. Staff will work on that wording.

- In summary, concerns were expressed by the public regarding connecting Tremont and North Pantops and whether the median on Route 250 would be closed with the relocation of the entrance to Hansen Mountain. Staff agreed that the language on the top of page 40 should be clarified.

Mr. Morris noted that there was no further public comment and the Commission would move on to the next item.

b. <u>Six Year Secondary Road Plan</u> (Juan Wade/ David Benish)

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session to review and comment on the proposed Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements in the County. Staff reviewed the proposed Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements and explained the procedure. The Commission opened for public comment, but received none. The Commission discussed the priority list and provided comments. Staff was requested to obtain additional information from Scottsville to provide to the Board and also to make the Board aware of the Lowe's/29 soil erosion problem. The Commission took no formal action.

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.

- Mr. Morris indicated that he would be absent for the next two weeks.

- Mr. Benish pointed out that the staff report for the work session on the Southern Urban Study B was combined with the Granger review. He asked that the Commission keep in mind that it was two reports combined. He noted that some of the attached maps were redundant to the ones in the actual study and the applicant's submittal. He suggested that the Commission focus their attention on Section 3, which was the meat of the recommendations.

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m. to the Tuesday, November 28, 2006 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road in the auditorium.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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