Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 28, 2006

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a meeting and a public hearing on Tuesday, November 28, 2006, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. Members attending were Eric Strucko, Jon Cannon, Duane Zobrist, Pete Craddock, Marcia Joseph, Chairman and Bill Edgerton. Absent was 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 present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Bill Fritz, Chief of Current Development; Scott Clark, Senior Planner; Rebecca Ragsdale, Senior Planner; David E. Pennock, Principal Planner and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum*:*

Ms. Joseph called the regular meeting to order at 6:03 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.

Mr. Cannon arrived at 6:05 p.m.

Regular Items:

SDP 2006-087 Town Center Two at UVA Research Park – Site Plan Waiver: Request for a lighting waiver in association with the construction of previously approved 83,000 gross square foot office building on 33.260 acres zoned PD-IP (Planned Development Industrial Park) and AIA (Airport Impact Area). This waiver would allow the use of a light fixture that does not meet the definition of "full cut-off". The property, described as Tax Map 32 - Parcel 6A is located in the Rio Magisterial District on the south side of Lewis and Clark Drive approximately 1/2 miles west of the intersection with U.S. Route 29. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as Industrial Service in the Hollymead Community. (David Pennock)

Mr. Pennock presented a power point presentation and summarized the staff report.

- Request for waiver of Sec. 4.17, Outdoor Lighting in order to allow a light that is not a “full cut-off luminaire” Staff has reviewed this request with consideration for the required criteria. The review has resulted in mixed findings for and against approval of the waiver:

- Factors favorable to approval:
  1. This waiver will allow a more uniform “theme” for the lighting for the overall

area of this project.

- Factors unfavorable to approval:
  1. The light fixture does not meet the definition of "full cutoff luminaire".

- The approval of the request would allow the applicant to continue a theme that they have established so far with the buildings out there. The other option would be for the applicant to go back and retrofit the existing lights. It would probably actually not result in those lights being conforming either. So there is really no way to adjust what is out there.

- Generally staff finds that this request is inconsistent with the criteria of Section 4.17.5 for granting a modification. Therefore, staff is not able to recommend approval to the Commission of a modification of Section 4.17.4.

Ms. Joseph asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Edgerton asked if these lights were committed to under the site plan approval and now they want to change their mind on that.

Mr. Pennock replied that was correct.

Mr. Craddock asked if the proposal was limited to this section only or was it applicable to future sections of the development.

Mr. Pennock replied that if this light is approved there is a chance that it will be used in future sections as well. But, this request is for section 2 only.

Mr. Cannon asked if there was a natural difference not only in design but in effect in terms of the amount of reflective light that comes off or enters into the ambient.

Mr. Pennock said that if he understands his question correctly was he asking what percentage of light is actually affected upwards.

Mr. Cannon explained that he was really trying to get at the affect of difference in the impact on the light environment.

Mr. Pennock replied that it depends on a number of factors including how high the light is and what other possible screening, landscaping and things like that could be around. Margaret Maliszewski has spoken with lighting manufacturers about similar lights. He was able to download some information form this manufacturer. The actual percentage of light reflected up could be anywhere from fractions of a percent to somewhere in the neighborhood of 2 to 3 percent of the actual light. As far as what that translates to in luminaire and that sort of thing he did not have definitive answer, but there will be some greater than 0 percentage basically. Full cut off means that there is not light above the horizontal plane.

There being no further questions, Ms. Joseph opened the public hearing invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Fred Missel, Director of Design and Development for UVA Foundation, said that the parking areas are actually currently covered by the typical shoebox fixtures. That is all of the areas behind the central axis of the town center. The central axis of the town center and several or two or three at each building have ornamental fixtures, which is what they are calling these. They basically run down the central access of the town center and the side of the buildings, but do not cover the parking areas. Our request today is just a matter of consistency. As you walk through this town center eventually there will be seven buildings total and they want the lights and fixtures to look the same so that the town center reads more consistently. His first preference would for the Commission to allow these fixtures to be used uniformly throughout the town center.

Ms. Joseph invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter placed before the Commission.

Mr. Edgerton agreed with staff's judgment on this. He did not think that the Commission would grant this exception to anybody else. As far as setting a standard he felt that they should stick to it. It would be sending a very wrong signal to the rest of the community if they said if they had an aesthetic issue that they would work with them on it because that is not going to solve the lighting problem. Light pollution is a real issue. It is one that our ordinance tries to address. He felt that they should stick to the ordinance requirements on this.

Motion: Mr. Zobrist moved, Mr. Cannon seconded, to deny the applicant's request for SDP-2006-087, Town Center Two at UVA Research Park – Site Plan Waiver.

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

Ms. Joseph stated that SDP-2006-087, Town Center Two at UVA Research Park – Site Plan Waiver was denied.

Public Hearing:

SP 2006-020 First Christian Church (Signs #74, 77)
PROPOSED: New church on 15-acre parcel with seating for 306 persons, rooms for youth/community events, church office, and outdoor pavilions for church activities.
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA -- Rural Areas: agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre); EC Entrance Corridor - Overlay to protect properties of historic, architectural or cultural significance from visual impacts of development along routes of tourist access
SECTION: 10.2.2.35 Church building and adjunct cemetery.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Rural Areas - preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (.5 unit/ acre)
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes
LOCATION: Northeast corner of Richmond Road (US 250) and Keswick Road (Route 731).
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 79-24A

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville
STAFF: Scott Clark

Mr. Clark summarized the staff report.

Scott Clark presented a power point presentation and summarized the staff report.

- Staff has identified the following factors favorable to this application:
  - VDOT and the County Engineer are satisfied that the entrance design is adequate to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposal.
  - A church on this parcel would provide a community meeting place and opportunities for residents to take part in local community life.

- Staff has identified the following factors unfavorable to this application:
  - Construction of the church would require clearing of parts of this wooded site. Recommended conditions are intended to reduce the visual and environmental impacts of this clearing by controlling its extent and location.

- One small detail mentioned in the staff report is that in September this project went before the Architectural Review Board because it is in the Entrance Corridor. The ARB basically approved the layout as proposed with a couple of small changes. One was to clarify the location of the non-disturbance area and that has been done. There was an area shown on the plan for the septic fields for the use. That was shown on the earlier plan when the building was in a different location. Staff realized that the septic fields could not be located in the non-disturbance area. So in order to resolve the conflict the applicant has revised the boundary of the non-disturbance area to the west in order to have options for the septic field in order to be an acceptable distance from the existing well. He discussed this with the Design Planner and the visibility of the building will not change greatly. But, because the line has moved there may be some additional consideration on the actual design of the building. When this comes back for a site plan there will be a more detailed review by the ARB at that point.
- Staff recommends approval of the request subject to the nine conditions recommended in the staff report.

Ms. Joseph asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Edgerton asked if there was public water and sewer available in this area.

Mr. Clark replied that public sewer was not available in this area.

Mr. Craddock noted that only public water was available.

Mr. Edgerton said that he had questions on two of the conditions. It says all parking setbacks, undisturbed buffers required by the zoning ordinance section 21.7,

minimum yard requirements, shall apply if this use is developed. He asked staff to explain what that says.

Mr. Clark replied that the setbacks to the eastern edge of the property shall be 20' and along the edge of Keswick Road and Route 250 technically will be 10'. Actually what is shown on the plan is more restricted and the locations are farther in than those setbacks. This is just to ensure that it is clear during the development of the site plan that the scope or general accord of the plan is not to include variations beyond that point.

Mr. Edgerton said that condition #7 says that the prescriptive right-of-way along this parcel on Keswick Road shall be replaced with a public right-of-way at least 25' wide. He asked staff to show him that area.

Mr. Clark pointed out the area in the entire frontage along Keswick Road, which is the northern boundary of the property.

Mr. Edgerton asked if that was just to widen the right-of-way there.

Mr. Scott replied that was correct in order to address the concerns in the vehicular plan to widen that road.

There being no further questions for staff, Ms. Joseph opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Barry Creasy, a member of First Christian Church, said that he was a member of the team working on the church relocation. He noted that Mr. Clark has more than adequately covered the actual site. Under #2 of the favorable factors is the community's advantage of a church in this particular location. The area around it has many houses and a lot of subdivisions. Churches do add a community value as far a being there. This request has been labeled as a new church, but the church is definitely not a new church. Currently they are located in Charlottesville, Virginia at 112 West Market Street. The church has been in existence for 170 years. They are seeking to move the church because they are out of parking. All of the development downtown has cut them off from being able to park cars on Sunday mornings. Therefore, they are looking to move this church. They have a track record of being a very community friendly church. They have done many things in Charlottesville from running soup kitchens to doing plays for the community. Their activities may change on Route 250, but they still plan to be active in that community also by opening up the church to be used for various community activities.

Ms. Joseph asked if there were any questions for Mr. Creasy.

Mr. Craddock asked if they had sold the old church, and Mr. Creasy replied that they have a contract pending.

Ms. Joseph invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Commission.

Motion: Mr. Zobrist moved, Mr. Edgerton seconded, to approve SP-2006-020, First Christian Church, subject to staff's recommended conditions:

1) The church's improvements and the scale and location of the improvements shall be developed in general accord with the conceptual plan entitled "First Christian Church," prepared by McKee Carson, and dated 11-14-2006.
2) The area of assembly shall be limited to a maximum 306-seat sanctuary.
3) No grading or tree removal shall take place within the area marked "area not to be disturbed" on the conceptual plan or within the 75-foot setback adjacent to Route 250 East.
4) No erosion and sedimentation control plan nor building permit shall be approved for the area marked "area not to be disturbed" without prior approval of a tree conservation plan complying with section 32.7.9.4 of the Zoning Ordinance.
5) All parking setbacks and undisturbed buffers required by Zoning Ordinance section 21.7, Minimum Yard Requirements, shall apply if this use is developed.
6) All outdoor lighting shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from the abutting properties.
7) The existing prescriptive right-of-way along this parcel's Keswick Road (Rte. 731) frontage shall be replaced with a public right-of-way at least 25 ft wide and dedicated to public use.
8) There shall be no day care center or private school on site without approval of a separate special use permit;
9) If the use, structure, or activity for which this special use permit is issued is not commenced within sixty (60) months after the permit is issued, the permit shall be deemed abandoned and the authority granted thereunder shall thereupon terminate.

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

Ms. Joseph stated that SP-2006-020, First Christian Church will go to the Board of Supervisors on January 10, 2007 with a recommendation for approval.

Work Sessions:

CPA 2004-02 Pantops Master Plan: This is the third of three work sessions scheduled to review the draft Pantops Master Plan and will focus on Design Principles, Community Facilities & Service, and Implementation sections of the draft Master Plan. (Rebecca Ragsdale)

In summary, the Planning Commission held the third work session on CPA-2004-002, Pantops Master Plan. Ms. Ragsdale and Mr. Benish presented power point presentation and summarized the staff report.

- The first was held on November 7 and the second on November 21 to discuss the draft chapters of the Pantops Master Plan. On November 7 they moved

through the introduction and background, vision and guiding principles and a portion of the place types and land use chapter of the document.

- Last week they wrapped up the land use and place types discussion with the Commission noting that they needed to clarify the Rivanna River Corridor Overlay designation a little bit. They also moved through the green infrastructure and transportation chapters of the document.
- This evening staff wants to review a section that they have added to the green infrastructure chapter of the document, design principles, community facilities and services and talk about a bit about where they are with implementation and the implementation the priority areas map that staff has provided.
- As they have done previously, staff would like to move through after giving a brief overview of the chapters page by page so that they could get the Commission's comments and feedback on what they have provided.
- Staff added to the green infrastructure section, which begins on page 29. They added water resources and storm water management. That was something that they had in the design principles chapter, but felt that it should be moved up to the green infrastructure chapter. Basically, that refers to the 2004 Stream Assessment Data, which has perennial and intermittent streams mapped. This is recommending additional protection for the intermittent streams.
- The other recommendation that was added is that when properties that are already covered in impervious surfaces redevelop in Pantops, such as the Pantops Shopping Center, that they improve and meet current regulations for storm water management if they were developed under old ordinances or predate storm water management ordinance they may not have to make an improvement, but they could not make storm water conditions worse. So this is recommending that those areas be improved when they redevelop. It refers to a certain section in the Water Protection Ordinance. It is not saying that existing language will be used, but that section could be modified and there is a category called areas of infill and redevelopment. That section of the ordinance could be added to so that these recommendations could also apply to by right development. Those are recommendations for legislation actions, waivers and things you have discretion over in advance of the Water Protection Ordinance being amended. She hoped that clarified that section.
- The green infrastructure map shows some of those streams, both intermittent and perennial, and has recommendations as well for trails and enhancements. This is just adding to that. Staff asked if there were any additional comments on that chapter or the new section.

- **Ms. Joseph felt the additions were clear, but suggested some tweaking of the words to say that it is understood that the expectations are that the ordinance language may change as a result of this.**

- **Mr. Cannon asked if this contemplates a capital program for acquisition of open space that is not now public.**

Ms. Ragsdale replied that staff has on the green infrastructure map identified the areas they talked about last week for future parks. So when staff brings them the

implementation section that is when they would talk about what they would recommend for the capital improvements program funding.

- **Mr. Cannon replied that staff's general contemplation at this point is that there will be a capital program that would be designed to implement and facilitate achieving the plan.**

Mr. Benish replied that one of the tools for that in the implementation plan would be funding for capital improvements. The focus of those right now will be the Rivanna Greenway and hopefully the park that is on State Farm Boulevard, which is one that is subject to some concern with the Parks and Recreation Department on whether that should be public or privately developed and available to that area as open space. The trail systems connecting neighborhoods would probably be private initiative, but may be with some local monies.

- **Mr. Cannon said there is an initiative being a foundation or some other interested group or neighborhood association.**

Mr. Benish added that it could be through neighborhood associations or through development proposals or redevelopment proposals.

- **Mr. Edgerton noted that on page 2, the second to last paragraph says that it is not necessary that the entire greenway system be dedicated to the County and maintained for public access. It goes on and gives some possible variations. He asked if this paragraph is necessary and secondly, are we kind of working against ourselves here. The idea of having the green infrastructure would be to serve the community and the public. If they start giving exceptions in the language of the Master Plan it is going to set up a confusing dynamic. He realized that there was a budgetary concern about taking this on, but at the very least he would hope that anything that would be included in the green infrastructure, regardless of who maintained it or whether it was proffered as part of a rezoning, he would like to hope that it would be available for the public's benefit and use even if it was privately maintained or maintained by a homeowner's association. He felt that it seemed criminal to have gaps in the infrastructure plan that would be considered private property and regulated as such and to destroy the linkages, which he was hopeful that this Master Plan would develop over time.**

Mr. Benish replied that staff is sensitive to his concern. There is a perception of what is public and what is publicly owned to develop. Some of their language is being cautionary as to the expectation of what public investment and county investment can do as opposed to as a result of various tools can be in the public realm for use, such as the Peter Jefferson Place sort of circle is going to be privately owned, but it is going to be accessible to the general public. Staff will work on that language to make sure that they are not sending an inconsistent message.

- **Mr. Edgerton said that the green infrastructure is to support the whole Master Plan and the community that is going to live and work in this area. He would like to make sure that they don't put language in that is going to give an out for that.**

- **Mr. Zobrist noted that it does not necessarily mean public access. He asked if that was what he was trying to say. Obviously, they don't want to get a principle in the document that somehow requires the County to address how to acquire rights. He agreed with Mr. Edgerton that the County trails were very important, but he also felt that lots of open space was important also even if it was privately owned.**

- **Mr. Cannon suggested as they go through this that they can make choices about what is fee ownership, which he felt was appropriate for trails and so forth, and then maybe there were bordering areas that they want kept in the natural state, but it is not necessary for the purposes of the infrastructure program to have the public actually have access to those. Those could be protected by easement, which itself is a property interest, but not that a property interest that allows the public to go on the land. They could get what they want minimizing cost and assuring that what is necessary to be in fee ownership in the name of the public is there and what is where lesser interest may be appropriate and adequate to get those so that they stretch their money further and get more for their public expenditures.**

Mr. Benish said that he realized that from last week with the implementation plan. The plan is focused on certain areas, but leaves some of the green areas gray.

- **Mr. Edgerton suggested that possibly they might need two different colors.**

Mr. Benish noted that for example there were floodplain and critical slope areas along I-64 in the Peter Jefferson Place that are recognized because that plan shows it as open space areas. The way that development works it is generally available to the residents and tenants of that area and he did not think there was any intent to have passes or gates. So it is generally available to the public. But, there is not expectation that the County is willing to other than enforce those regulations through that rezoning requirement do anything else there. There is no distinction on this color from the other public spaces that they do expect to have developed as public land. That is part of the dialogue that staff is having with the Parks and Recreation Department. Staff will work on that some more.

The discussion moved to the next chapter on design principles.

- This is what staff had under the heading last time when they brought the public input tables and recommendations of character and aesthetics. It was under that heading previously. But, now it is under design principles.

- This chapter is where staff addresses view shed protection both from Monticello and important views from other vantage points, such as the City of Charlottesville

and also has the recommendations for the Entrance Corridors, Routes 20 and 250 in terms of urban versus rural character and transitioning into the development areas. On the framework map there are some buffer areas shown along the roadways.

- This chapter also discusses the concept of what green buildings and principles are. In Pantops it emphasizes certain Neighborhood Model principles, such as site planning that respects terrain. That is so important in Pantops given the topography. Also, to make sure that they don't leave anything gray, they include language in there that address what sort of edge treatments on the edge of the Pantops development area are expected on the fringes.

- Staff presented an illustration to show what staff is talking about with the Neighborhood Model Principle redevelopment infill with buildings closer to the road, a central green and establishing a block pattern. This is from the Neighborhood Model adding mixed use with apartments above. It is just emphasizing that principle, which may be applicable to Route 250. This is from last time of an example of a very current redevelopment project on the Old Moore's site, which was rezoned to the Neighborhood Model District that illustrates some of those principles.

- Staff is gong to be sharing these draft recommendations for the Master Plan with the Architectural Review Board. They would like to be informed of the Master Plan as they move forward to review the recommendations. The ARB will receive that information on December 4.

- Staff asked for comments from the Commission on the design principles.

- **Ms. Joseph said that on page 6 in the discussion of view shed protection, it was suggested that the language talk more about Monticello and the fact that it is important for local economics because of tourism. That is also covered in the beginning of the chapter.**

Staff indicated that they would add the why and the justification.

- **Ms. Joseph said that on page 7 in the discussion of Entrance Corridors on Route 250 east it says that they want street trees location within the right-of-way. Is this something that will be difficult with VDOT or is it something that they have come around? Also, where the 8' sidewalk came from.**

Mr. Benish replied that it was difficult, but they have had better opportunities to do that. He felt that it was something that staff would like to strive for in the plan. He replied that 8' was a minimum width for multi-modes bike and pedestrian. That is the minimum that VDOT will accept for a facility that can accommodate bicycles and pedestrians.

- **Ms. Joseph said that on page 8, there is gateway, underground utilities and signs. She questioned if staff wanted to do anything with lighting. She**

asked if there would be street lights out there at some point in time or whether that is just incidental.

Ms. Ragsdale replied that staff does mention lighting as far as County regulations with regard to the view shed and then in the transportation section they have mentioned the need to take a look at street lighting and see if there was a need for it. So it is something that is considered. Staff could add that as far as uniform design guidelines for the corridor section.

- **Ms. Joseph said that on page 9, it talks about site planning that respects the terrain and are limiting the size of retaining walls. The question was raised on how they were justifying that. Is it because of the visual impact? It was noted that 12' retaining walls had come in on Luxor. Was it a reaction to that sort of thing?**

Mr. Benish replied that it was in part and may be to take the opportunity to do more terracing that would create shorter spans that could be terraced and landscaped within the terrace to treat the same or similar grading. Obviously, there is more impact when someone has to terrace multiple small walls. In part it is that was one of the big concerns that staff heard from the community about the radical change and lack of respect of the terrain. While it is an urban area they want to consider density, but they want to try limiting it the best that they can.

- **Ms. Monteith felt that one of the concerns would be what is already there. That is retroactive planning, which is always a challenge. It seems that there could be planting that could be included in that, which would mitigate that. Staff has spoken about green roofs, but it is unlikely that green roofs will go up on existing buildings. Although, the County has provided a great example that can happen. If there could be more thought both in terms of long term view shed and immediate kind of Entrance Corridor perception or taking up grade on buildings where there are retaining walls with some additional language about screening without getting into real specifics of species or deciduous versus non-deciduous or height might be helpful.**

- **Regarding green development, Mr. Edgerton felt that it was a great start, but he would like to get more specific suggestions in there if possible. Particularly suggestions about opportunities to deal with storm water run off, such as rain gardens and paving that could be integrated with the grading section. If they are going to try to encourage folks to terrace, as described on page 9, retaining walls used should be 4' to 5' tall and terraced, that as previously suggested some of the planting could be included in that and some rain gardens could be included in that, which would contribute significantly to opportunities to protect the ground water. He suggested that they include a stronger statement about more specifics in the Comp Plan. This should make a reference to it to get people to start thinking about it. They should not miss the opportunity to educate as much as possible on this in the Master Plan.**

- **Ms. Joseph suggested that language could be included when they are day lighting or keeping streams channels above ground they could actually use those as examples to have interpretative signage. That is very specific. But, in the case of this they could make mention of the fact that these sustainability features could be used as educational opportunities for the community, also.**

Ms. Ragsdale noted that she had mentioned the boundaries with the rural area, but did not explain exactly what they meant by that. Staff wanted to make sure that if properties came in for development on the edges that there was not an expectation in the yellow areas that there will be an additional buffer on the edges. Most of it is either designated as green or neighborhood density residential on the fringes. In terms of its location with the transect, they will expect the lower end of the density ranges recommended. So they are not having any additional buffer or any sort of recommendation. Staff wanted to make sure that they covered those areas as well in the plan. So that is what they meant with that section. The proposed density for the yellow is 3 to 6 dwelling units per acre.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the Commission would move on to review the Community Facilities and Services section.

- Based on where Pantops is located, its size and its vicinity to other service providers, the need for services is based on the long range service standards for the different entities. The public has expressed the need of a library and postal services. Staff has recommended continued monitoring and discussion with those service providers, such the Post Office and the Jefferson Madison Regional Library, so that they could get those facilities in Pantops as soon as they are warranted or needed. The one public facility that is planned is the fire station. As far as the other public facilities, the parks they talked about are in green infrastructure. This is really responding for those needs for services and then addressing business development facilitator expectations.
- The residents in Pantops also noted the need for certain kinds of businesses. As they go through the Master Plan they are taking a look at the jobs, housing balance to see what the needs are in each development area. So that is what that is referring to. Staff has established an implementation map with priority areas. In the text staff recommends that any new facilities or services be concentrated or relocated in those service areas identified geographically with the colors. The colors do not denote priority at this point. This is also going to act as the transportation map. Then when staff brings the implementation plan they will be referring to this map. For instance, in the text they would recommend the fire station in the State Farm Boulevard area. Then they have identified Route 250, this concentration of residential development, Route 20 to Riverbend as the four priority areas for implementation going forward.

Mr. Benish added that the linear ones are reflective of corridor transportation improvements. The areas of bubbles are where most of the improvements. State Farm and the area to the north is where staff sees most of the development that has been approved taking place. Martha Jefferson Hospital relocation will be a major reason to

focus in on the State Farm Boulevard area. The implementation plan also refers to the stream corridor, the Rivanna River crossing, which is a unique improvement that is a high priority in terms of scheduling to try to get constructed. This map guides them to the table. Hopefully, they will do the table in a way that is reflective of the priority areas.

Mr. Craddock asked about the road at Aunt Sarah's being aligned with State Farm Boulevard. He believed that there was an empty lot between Aunt Sarah's and social security. He felt that there was enough land there for a fire house, which would be a great central location.

Ms. Ragsdale noted that a Pantops Community Advisory Council would be created simultaneously with the adoption of the Master Plan. Staff is hoping to get Board approval when it is time to start advertising for public hearing to start recruitment of a diverse group of members consisting of property owners, residents and business owners in Pantops. That will be part of the implementation as well as those in Crozet. Staff hopes to have the implementation plan to the Commission on the second week in December.

Mr. Benish noted that staff plans to distribute the implementation plan to the Commission next week. At the end of the meeting he would like to talk about scheduling that in the December timeframe and what works for the Commission.

Ms. Joseph asked if anyone was present who would like to speak to the Pantops Master Plan.

Brian Wheeler, member of the Albemarle County School Board, said that he had not anticipated speaking tonight. But, in looking through the staff report he would like to speak as one school board member and not for the board, he noticed that there was information about future thoughts about school needs in this part of the community. As they look at the Crozet Master Plan and how that is playing out, they know that a school site was identified in the Crozet Master Plan and that may not work out as far as whether that development comes in for a rezoning or by right. But, he would encourage the Commission and staff to think about it and make sure that they working with the school division and if there is enough housing that is projected to come in to the Pantops Master Plan area that they go ahead and put on the map an idea about where a future school site might need to be. If they look at the total number of housing units that they are anticipating the potential in Places 29, they also need to think about middle school and high school sites being designated on the map and the County working towards securing that property. But, certainly they need to start thinking about elementary schools.

Mr. Benish noted that the CIP does not project the need for an additional school in this area at this time. Staff will be looking at the monitoring and looking at the need on a regular basis with the schools. They will be taking a look at some of the general recommendations for land for various public spaces that could be used as the County may see fit in the future for recycling centers and schools.

Ms. Joseph noted that they had talked about community centers at one point that may be a need, but it may not be a school. But, it might be some public space that might be needed.

Mr. Benish pointed out that staff would take a look at that need again.

Ms. Joseph noted that the work session had been completed since there were no further comments.

Mr. Zobrist commended staff for doing such a good job.

Mr. Benish pointed out that staff would take the comments and suggestions and go back and clean up the language of the document to bring it back and to work towards a public hearing.

The Commission took a ten minute break at 7:20 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 7:30 p.m.

CPA 2006-02 Eaglehurst Farm - Deletion of Proposed Road across Eaglehurst Farm:
PROPOSAL: Amend Comprehensive Plan to delete a proposed road across Eaglehurst Farm to Crozet Avenue from the Crozet Master Plan.
EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Corridor General (CT4) - mixed residential and commercial uses (net 4.5 units per acre for SFD, sfa & duplexes) (net 12 units per acre for townhouses and apartments) (net 18 units per acre for mixed use). Urban Edge (CT3) - supports center with predominately residential uses, especially single-family detached (net 3.5-4.5 units per acre) (net 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 (net 1 unit per 20 acres).
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes
LOCATION: 854 Crozet Avenue (Route 240), approximately 500 feet south of its intersection with Oak Drive
TAX MAP: 56 PARCELS: 14D1
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: White Hall
STAFF: Rebecca Ragsdale

Ms. Joseph pointed out that CPA-2006-02 Eaglehurst Farm has been removed from the agenda at the request of the applicant. It has been rescheduled for January 30, 2007. The Commission does not have to take any action on that. She asked if there was anyone present that came to speak to this item. There being none, the Commission will expect to hear this item on the January 30 meeting.

CPA 2005-05 Southern Area B and Granger Property (David Benish)

CPA 2005-05 Southern Area B Study - Review amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to include the recommendations of the Planning and Coordination Council's (PACC) Southern Urban Area B Study.

Granger Property - Proposal to amend the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use designation from Neighborhood Density Residential (3-6 dwellings per acre) to Office Service use for a 69.5 acre property located south of the Norfolk Southern railroad track and is bounded by I-64 to the west, Sunset Avenue to the South, and Stribling Avenue and Moore's Creek to the east. The property is located within the boundary of the Southern Urban Area B Study area.

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on two proposed comprehensive plan amendments that staff has been working on. One is staff initiated, which is the process of adopting the recommendations of the Southern Urban Area B Study, a Planning and Coordination Council's (PACC) study into the County's Comprehensive Plan. The second is an applicant request for an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the land use designation, which is referred to as the Granger property. That tract of land is approximately 69 acres of land, which is located off of Stribling Avenue. It is designated for Neighborhood Density Residential in the current County Comprehensive Plan. In the proposed PACC Area B Study is recommended for high density residential and mixed use development. The applicant is proposing an office/service designation in order to allow for a mixed use development consisting of primarily basic employment related office development with mixed commercial and possibly residential development.

Because the Granger property lies in the PACC Study, staff has been working on these two projects together and really has taken the approach as you look at the amendments to include the Southern Urban Area B Study take into consideration the request the applicant has made to modify the land use designation on that Granger tract so that really they could think of this as one comprehensive plan amendment. But, there is a private request, which is a unique request that is part of it.

Staff reviewed the recommendations of the study in the staff report and answered the Commission questions. Frank Cox, applicant, made a power point presentation and explained the Granger request. The Commission took public comment. The Commission provided comments and changes reflecting an office mixed use land use on the Granger site and the changes identified in the staff report.

Staff will bring back revised language and maps to incorporate in to the Comprehensive Plan to the Commission for future work sessions. Staff will also work on having a dialogue with Jim Tolbert on how to get City comment.

Old Business:

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any old business.

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.

- On December 19 the meeting will begin at 5:15 p.m. to allow Mark Graham to review the proposed work plan that will go to the Board in January.
- Mr. Edgerton suggested that the Commission do a resolution of intent to start the process of incorporating green building initiative into the Comp Plan. He requested staff to provide the appropriate language for the resolution. After discussion, it was decided that the Commission would consider the resolution on December 19 after hearing Mark Graham's presentation on the work program.
- On December 13 at 2:00 p.m. the Board of Supervisors will hold a joint Planning Commission work session on the Mountain Overlay District Provisions and the potential of extending any or all of those over the entire Rural Area. Staff will forward the staff report to the Commission prior to the meeting.

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 10:11 p.m. to the Tuesday, December 5, 2006 meeting at 6:00 p.m. in the auditorium at 401 McIntire Road, County Office Building.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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